

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs
Tuesday, December 13, 2011
2:30 – 4:30
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: George Sheets (chair), William Beeman, Ben Bornshtein, Kathryn Brown, Haojun Caoxu, Arlene Carney, Dann Chapman, Linda Chlan, Randy Croce, Jennifer Fillo, Kathryn Hanna, Joseph Konstan, Frank Kulacki, Theodor Litman, Christine Marran, Benjamin Munson, Geoffrey Sirc, Pamela Stenhjem, James Wojtaszek

Absent: Barbara Elliott

Guests: Nan Wilhelmson (Office of the Vice President for Human Resources), Tracy Smith (Office of the General Counsel); Diana Harvey, Matt Sumer (University Relations); Carolyn Chalmers (Office for Conflict Resolution)

Other: Jon Steadland (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: (1) changes to the faculty emeriti policy; (2) salary instructions; (3) faculty impact and productivity; (4) college guidelines for sabbaticals and leaves]

1. Change to the Faculty Emeriti Policy

Professor Sheets convened the meeting at 2:00 and welcomed Mss. Tracy and Wilhelmson to the meeting to discuss a proposed change to the Regents Policy: *Faculty Emeriti* and the accompanying administrative policy and procedures.

Ms. Wilhelmson reported that the proposed change they are bringing is to provide an opportunity for the President to withhold or withdraw the emeritus/a title from tenured faculty members who retire. There was no provision in the policy allowing the title to be withdrawn or withheld if someone met the eligibility requirements but "(1) where a faculty member has retired during suspension or termination proceedings initiated under Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*; or (2) where evidence presented to the president demonstrates that the faculty member has engaged in conduct that violates the standards of Board of Regents Policy: *Faculty Tenure*" (proposed new language in the policy between quotation marks). The change allows the president discretion, in a limited number of cases, where misconduct or actions contravene the provisions of the tenure regulations.

When the policy was being reviewed some while ago, Ms. Smith noticed that there was no withdrawal/withholding provision, Ms. Wilhelmson related. They talked to the Board of Regents policy committee and proposed language; they also developed administrative policy language, including procedural protection for the faculty member:

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

- The president receives a recommendation with evidence to either withhold or withdraw the emeritus/emerita title based on the particular circumstances.
- If the president, upon review of the recommendation, is considering withholding or withdrawing the title, the president provides to the faculty or retired member notice and an opportunity to be heard in accordance with Board of Regents Policy: Faculty Emeriti, Section III, Subd. 2(b),
- Following the faculty member's or retired faculty member's opportunity to be heard, the president makes a decision with regard to withholding or withdrawing the emeritus/emerita title.
- The president provides a written report to the faculty member explaining the decision.
- Should the emeritus/emerita title be withheld or withdrawn, the services and privileges accorded that title, beyond retired status, should not be provided.

Ms. Smith explained that previously the emeritus/a title was awarded based on service and conferred at retirement if one met the eligibility criteria. It is very rare, but there are cases when a faculty member with disciplinary proceedings against him or her for fraud would nonetheless receive the emeritus/a title. Or the person may already have retirement from and left the University but subsequently commits a crime. These are very, very rare cases, Ms. Smith emphasized, but when they do arise, the University should be able to withdraw or withhold the emeritus/a title.

Ms. Smith pointed out that the substantive standards to be used are the five reasons set out in section 10.21 of the tenure regulations:

10.21. Termination Or Suspension Of A Faculty Appointment Before Its Expiration.

A faculty appointment may be terminated or suspended before its ordinary expiration only for one or more of the following causes:

- (a) sustained refusal or failure to perform reasonably assigned duties adequately;
- (b) unprofessional conduct which severely impairs a faculty member's fitness in a professional capacity;
- (c) egregious or repeated misuse of the powers of a professional position to solicit personal benefits or favors;
- (d) sexual harassment or any other egregious or repeated unreasonable conduct destructive of the human rights or academic freedom of other members of the academic community; or
- (e) other grave misconduct manifestly inconsistent with continued faculty appointment.

The administrative procedure would also provide due process.

These provisions would come into play in only a tiny number of circumstances, Ms. Smith reiterated, but the circumstances have come up.

Professor Bornshtein said the proposal makes sense. It seems that the emeritus/a title is conferred by the Board of Regents but can, with this change, be withdrawn by the President. Could the President's determination lead to a recommendation to the Board of Regents, Professor Sheets asked? Ms. Smith said they can ask the Board. This is a Board policy, and the Board could authorize the President to make the decision or it could require a recommendation from the President. Professor Hanna pointed out that the Board always has the final say on faculty rank and it would make sense for the Board to withdraw or withhold the status. That is up to the Board, Vice President Brown commented; it can delegate or not; it reserves the right to grant tenure but it could delegate this decision to the President. If it is delegated, that

would be good, Professor Sheets said; what is to be avoided is the President deciding and the Board overruling him or her. Vice President Brown said that she serves as staff to the Board of Regents committee that handles this policy and promised to bring up the question.

Professor Sirc asked if the withholding or withdrawal would be grievable with the Senate Judicial Committee. It could go to the Office for Conflict Resolution, Ms. Wilhelmson said but not the Senate Judicial Committee. Because this is not related to tenure and tenure rights, Professor Sheets explained, the Senate Judicial Committee would have no jurisdiction; that committee is created by the tenure regulations.

Professor Beeman asked if there is any prohibition on someone receiving the emeritus/a title and then obtaining a job elsewhere. There is not, Ms. Wilhelmson said; Vice Provost Carney concurred and said nothing precludes anyone from another job if he or she left the University in an honorable way.

Who do they perceive as making a recommendation to withhold or withdraw the status, Professor Sirc asked? Ms. Wilhelmson said it would start with the department chair and would need to be discussed with the dean.

Professor Sheets asked for a motion to endorse the change with the understanding that the issue of the President's authority vis-à-vis the Board of Regents would be discussed with the Board. The motion was made, seconded, and voted unanimously.

2. Salary Instructions

Professor Sheets turned next to the topic of salary instructions to be issued by the administration for any salary increases to be delivered for 2012-13 and the Committee's advice thereon. He noted that the Committee took the position two years ago that the salary instructions should contain a provision that some portion of the salary increases (for faculty and P&A staff) be across the board, rather than all based on merit. The recommendation came from the work of an ad hoc subcommittee, and it included the proviso that the decision to include an across-the-board component be left up to the deans.

Professor Sheets also noted that the recommendation from this Committee was discussed at two meetings of the Faculty Consultative Committee; FCC decided it would not support the recommendation. FCC believed it would constrain the flexibility of the deans in how they awarded merit increases and that it would send the wrong message to the public—because FCC believed the University wants to be an institution that awards salary increases only on the basis of merit, not across the board. As he reads the recommendation, however, it would not have reduced the deans' flexibility because they could do as they wished.

In the period since that recommendation was made, there has been a salary freeze and a temporary salary reduction for faculty and P&A staff (and a furlough for Civil Service and bargaining-unit staff), so there could be no increases that took account of merit. With the cost of living having increased, and the salary freeze and reduction, the suggestion has been made that one component of salary increases next year might include an across-the-board component for faculty and P&A staff, Professor Sheets said. This is the time when the Committee should make a statement, if it wishes to so, in advance of the promulgation of salary instructions by central administration.

Professor Munson said that within CLA, each department has its own merit formula, but at least in his department, even the lowest-evaluated faculty member would receive a raise (e.g., perhaps 1.25% in a year when the average increase is 2.5%). Are there departments where someone could receive a zero percent increase?

Professor Sheets said that the practice Professor Munson describes is not true for all departments. There are departments where faculty members receive no raise even when increases generally are given. That is in part because the CLA dean's office insists that raises be based strictly on comparative merit, echoing the directions from central administration, and it is sometimes the case that if the spread of raises recommended by a department is too narrow, the dean's office will ask for it to be widened.

Professor Beeman said that since the salary reductions were across the board there is a case to be made that if there are to be salary increases, they should be across the board to roll back the salary reductions.

Were the reductions returned to the faculty, Professor Kulacki asked? They were not, Vice President Brown said. It was a one-time 1.15% reduction that did not reduce anyone's base salary, so there was no long-term impact. The reduction was approved by the Faculty Senate. Senior administrators took a reduction of 2.3%, Professor Sheets recalled, so if the issue is framed simply as compensation for the salary reductions, senior administrators would have a proportionally greater claim.

Professor Marran inquired about the history of cost-of-living increases at the University—how do those play into discussions? Professor Sheets said it is his sense that they do not play into discussions about faculty and P&A salary increases at all. But it would be possible to do across-the-board increases as part of compensation increases because everyone has seen an increase in the cost of living, Professor Marran said. Professor Sheets said that cost-of-living increases are part of compensation for Civil Service employees, but Vice President Brown said that is not necessarily true. There is no institutional policy that says any group of employees receives cost-of-living increases. When there are salary increases, there is a pool of funds for adjustments to Civil Service salary adjustments (the salary increases for bargaining-unit employees are negotiated at the bargaining table). Civil Service rules do not provide a guarantee of across-the-board increases, Vice President Brown told the Committee, and the funds can be awarded on the basis of merit. Each unit manages the funds and could consider providing a cost-of-living increase—or not. There is no central mandate on the question, she said.

In his experience, at least in CLA, Professor Sheets said, at least a portion and sometimes all of Civil Service raises have been earmarked for cost-of-living increases. Different colleges do things differently, Vice President Brown said. Because they are given the discretion to do so with Civil Service staff but not instructional staff, Professor Sheets said.

Professor Hanna said the logic of Professor Marran's statement is that there has been an increase in the cost of living for all faculty and staff, so it would be appropriate to allocate a portion of salary increases across the board. [At this point the Committee moved to discuss issues of faculty productivity with guests who had arrived, and it picked up this discussion later in the meeting.]

Professor Beeman said that Professor Marran (who had to leave the meeting) asked him to present her views. She (and many others, especially those who must make salary decisions, Professor Beeman added) is continually fighting the plague of salary compression, which takes its toll on the

longest-serving members of the faculty. Often those are the best-serving faculty members and they fall behind their colleagues. He said he did not know if across-the-board increases would be a cure; in CLA they have been told that they cannot remedy salary compression unless there has been extraordinary merit—which means that someone would have to do twice as much as the other faculty in a department to warrant a larger increase in salary.

Will there be a salary pool and how much will it be, Professor Hanna asked? Vice President Brown said there has not been a firm decision but she believes there will be salary increases. The figure that was used with the unions for the second year of the biennium (i.e., 2012-13) was 2.5%.

Mr. Croce said that he would stand by the subcommittee report (on which he served) and believes its recommendations even more valid now, in view of the intervening reductions in pay. He said the Committee should weigh two matters: (1) What incentive is created by a small merit increase, versus (2) the feeling on the part of others, when they receive a lesser or no increase, that they are devalued even though they have been working hard? He said he believes there should be an across-the-board component of salary increases so that there is shared sacrifice. He said he voted in this Committee in favor of a salary reduction a year ago because he believed it would save jobs, and "we must all be in this together." The same spirit also justifies an across the board raise. For example, there could be a star professor who teaches only graduate classes and does research—because someone else is teaching the introductory courses.

Professor Sirc noted that the previous recommendation contained the language "could," not "should."

Professor Kulacki commented that he also had served on the subcommittee and recommends a two-thirds/one-third split of any salary increase funds, two-thirds across-the-board and one-third for merit. At a time of salary freezes and cuts and increases in the cost of living, there needs to be some measure of recognition for what everyone has done to put the University in a favorable position now vis-à-vis students and research. It does not raise the specter of unionization for the administration to include an across-the-board component for one year.

Professor Munson said there needs to be thought about public relations and countering the arguments about merit pay being necessary for motivating faculty to work hard. Professor Konstan, who had sent an email to the Committee about this issue, wrote that there were arguments on both sides of the issue, and observed that an across-the-board component would be good for collegiality and would mirror the across-the-board salary reduction. As for the belief that money is such a motivating factor, Professor Munson noted there was a report recently in *The New York Times* about a study of what motivates employees; what it found was that salary is a long way from the top of the list; more important was the sense among employees that they are meeting an important goal. The Committee would be well justified in saying to the deans that an across-the-board increase is the right thing to do because salary is not the only motivator.

Professor Sheets inquired of Vice President Brown her views on the matter. Vice President Brown said she was just listening. Since this is her first year as Vice President for Human Resources with responsibility for an academic compensation plan, she said she would prefer simply to listen.

Professor Hanna said that salary can also be a "demotivator" when one does not receive an increase; she said she has seen people almost come to fistfights over small disparities in salary increases. With a freeze and a salary reduction, it makes sense to do some portion of the increase across the board. In Duluth, typically the increases are split between across-the-board and merit components; that could be one model that has already been accepted by the administration and Board of Regents.

Professor Kulacki said that in high-demand fields, high performers receive retention offers, faculty whom the colleges wish to keep. He said it is his understanding that retention funds are held by the colleges. He noted that the University finds itself in a position where recruitment of tenured and tenure track faculty (i.e., a form of piracy) may become more prevalent in the current economic climate for the research universities, and that this will also have the effect of raising salaries for the high-productivity faculty members on both ends of the pirating. Given this as a factor in setting salary increases, some form of compensation increase for all faculty members could be justified and seems, to him, the right things to do.

Professor Beeman said he was more concerned about people who have devoted a long time to the University, people who may have ties to the community, and do not want to play blackmail. Such faculty members should not be punished for their loyalty.

Professor Sheets inquired if anyone wished to speak on the other side of the issue. When no one did, Professor Beeman moved to support the recommendation from two years ago, with a split between an across-the-board and a merit component to any salary increases. Professor Hanna noted that the previous recommendation included leaving the option open to the dean; should the Committee be more assertive now?

In CLA the discussion is more about special merit, Professor Beeman reported. An across-the-board component is not being entertained. A statement by this Committee could come as a surprise to some of the deans.

Professor Sheets agreed to draft a letter and circulate it to the Committee for an email discussion.

Mr. Chapman said that he is usually silent in Committee discussions, as an ex officio administrative member, but said he wished to make three observations. First, to be successful, any request for inclusion of an across-the-board component for academic salary increases would require the approval of the Board of Regents. Second, there is much to be said for the proposition that small differences in merit increases can cause more disruption and demotivation than none at all. Third, if one allocates only one-third of the increase to merit, it would be a waste of time to parse the small amount of money available for merit. Real merit increases in the private sector are bonuses that are a significant portion of one's regular salary. Because the time now follows a unique period of freezes and salary reductions, for THIS ONE TIME one can argue that the entire increase should be across the board.

Ms. Fillo commented that a "door in the face" technique may be effective in this situation. It has become clear in the discussion that the consensus in the Committee is that there SHOULD be an across-the-board pay increase of some magnitude. Making the proposal that ALL of the money should go to an across-the-board increase would convey the strength of the Committee's belief in that approach. Given that whatever the Committee proposes will probably be adjusted down the line, proposing that all the

money goes to across-the-board raises will increase the likelihood that others will agree to some kind of division between across-the-board and merit-based increases.

Professor Kulacki said it will be important for the new provost, who does not know the history, to be informed of faculty opinion on this issue. Professor Sheets said the new provost may wish to take a less active part in this decision because she was not here when the debate was occurring. Mr. Chapman's suggestion might be easier to sell to the Board of Regents than a partial across-the-board increase, especially when the merit sliver might be so small. Vice President Brown pointed out that the Committee also needs to persuade the President, who has publicly spoken in favor of merit-based increases. Professor Sheets said it is not necessarily true that across-the-board for one year is incompatible with recognition of merit.

Professor Hanna said she believed there are two good options: All across the board or a partial across-the-board component.

Professor Sirc said that this proposal (all increases across the board) might be a hard sell to faculty members working under the model of increases based on merit, particularly those who have had a great year. They might react negatively to a proposal to divert all of the increase away from merit ("that slacker gets the same as I do"). He suggested a 50-50 split. But that "slacker" is also paying more for groceries, Professor Munson observed. Professor Sirc agreed but said people who've been working on the assumption of a merit-only system might feel some resentment about having the rules of the game changed.

It was noted that the Committee on Finance and Planning was also considering making a statement on salary increases. Professor Sheets asked for and received Committee approval to talk to the chair of the Finance and Planning Committee to learn if statements could be coordinated and perhaps the same.

Subsequent to the meeting, the Committee by email exchange approved unanimously the following statement:

The Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs recommends to the President of the University of Minnesota that any salary increase that is earmarked for faculty and P&A employees to take effect in FY2013 be divided into two components as follows: 50% in an across-the-board allotment of equal percentage to all, and 50% to be distributed on the basis of normal merit reviews. This recommendation is intended to apply only to the coming cycle of salary increases, not to any increases thereafter.

COMMENT

Historically, salary increases for faculty and P&A employees at non-bargaining unit campuses of the University of Minnesota have been awarded entirely on the basis of annual merit reviews. In view of the perennial challenge of competing to attract and retain productive faculty, the policy of tying salary increases to competitive merit evaluations is generally sensible. The past three years, however, have been unusual. Apart from promotion and retention cases, no raises at all were given in the first and third of those years and an across-the-board temporary pay cut of 1.15% was imposed in the second. Additionally, as of January 1 of this year,

approximately \$12 million in the annual cost of health insurance has been shifted to employees in the form of higher premiums, higher co-pays, and reduced coverage.

After due deliberation, the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has concluded that this is a time when a partial across-the-board increase in salary for faculty and P&A employees is warranted. This is an occasion when recognizing and rewarding the shared sacrifice and collective merit of an entire workforce, in preference to ignoring those contributions by considering them in themselves unworthy of even minimal monetary recognition, can be expected to promote collegiality and institutional engagement. After a period of substantial austerity, a partial across-the-board allotment will send a unifying message of appreciation to the entire workforce and take a small step towards making employees whole after their shared sacrifices.

3. Faculty Impact and Productivity

Professor Sheets welcomed Ms. Harvey and Mr. Sumera to the meeting to discuss communicating more effectively with public constituencies regarding what faculty do and how they are accountable for the performance of their responsibilities. He recalled that the Committee met earlier with Ms. Harvey to have a conversation about initiatives undertaken in Texas and Florida that apparently equated faculty productivity chiefly to the amount of grant and tuition dollars generated by individual faculty members. At that meeting it was decided to appoint a small ad hoc group to develop strategies for better communication to the public of the full range and impact of what University faculty are expected to do. The ad hoc committee consisted of Professors Jacobs (Faculty Consultative Committee), Konstan, Munson, and Schiappa (Communications Studies) and also Vice Provost Carney and Ms. Harvey.

Ms. Harvey reported that the ad hoc committee had an excellent discussion and developed several ideas about developing messages about faculty accountability and productivity. She reviewed the proposals that had been made and how University relations would carry them out. This effort, she reported, is linked to a larger advocacy effort being developed with a number of University offices.

Committee members offered observations about the advocacy efforts.

-- One great strength of the University is that it does not make only economic contributions to the state; it also advances broader bodies of knowledge, does cutting-edge research, and develops new fields of knowledge.

-- The University is a center of creativity and new ideas, along with Boston and Silicon Valley, and the contributions of the University to the quality of life in Minnesota is crucial; the state would not have the quality of life it does without the University.

-- In addition to highlighting great teaching through stories, equally impressive are the statistics Vice Provost Carney has provided about the extremely high ratings students (with about 150,000 ratings per semester) give to ALL the instruction they receive at the University.

-- The research prominence of the University tends still to be lost on many. Graduate students come to the University from across the world. The University is a part of the state's international presence and identity.

-- One concern is that if the University only makes economic arguments about its contributions to the state, then everything it does must have some economic impact—it is necessary to make the point about quality of life and general culture and not box the University into economic metrics alone. Otherwise every unit that does not produce a direct short-term impact on the state's economy should be cut.

-- One can also point out, apropos of the immediate-economic-impact argument, that the University does things that business does not do; a unique element of the University is that it invests in research that might not have economic outcomes for 15 or 20 years—things that business does not do.

-- Students devote thousands of hours per term to many local organizations, activities that faculty must oversee; that is a large story.

-- The University needs a television and radio studio on campus. It would be relatively cheap and it is enormously important for public relations purposes.

-- It is important to involve parents, who can be among the University's strongest advocates.

-- One message that must get across to the people of the state is that this is their university; there appears to be something of a divide between the University and the community and some are afraid to come to campus out of a concern that people here will somehow look down on them. It must be made clear to the public that that is not true.

-- With regard to communicating, the University needs to have more people appearing on the national news. (As recently has happened with Professor Mendoza's bike trip across the country and his work with Hispanic communities.) When Walter Heller was chosen to be chair of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, Minnesota was in the national news a lot; it is less so now (even though it continues to have an outstanding Economics department—and many other equally outstanding departments).

-- Among the faculty who might be asked to testify at the legislature on behalf of the University, faculty members from the coordinate campuses must be included.

-- If the University had a program to send faculty members around the state to talk about their specialties, there are many organizations that would be pleased to have them speak.

Professor Sheets thanked Ms. Harvey and Mr. Sumera for their report.

4. College Guidelines for Sabbaticals and Leaves

Professor Sheets welcomed Ms. Chalmers to the meeting to discuss proposed guidelines for colleges for awarding sabbaticals and leaves.

Ms. Chalmers provided a draft set of guidelines that the Committee might wish to endorse (appended to these minutes). The first part of her handout included this recapitulation of the events that led to the drafting of the guidelines:

The Office for Conflict Resolution has informed the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs that faculty have raised issues on a recurring basis regarding intra-collegiate competitions for sabbatical supplements and single semester leaves. A committee comprised of Carolyn Chalmers (Director, Office of Conflict Resolution), Mari Magler (Assistant Director, OCR), John Blair (Assistant to Associate Dean for Faculty, CLA), and George Sheets (Chair, SCFA) reviewed and compared existing collegiate practices regarding these awards. Finding wide variation across collegiate units in how the awards are made, the committee concluded that the process would be improved by broader adherence to clear and consistent guidelines for the evaluation of applications for these limited resources. To that end the committee has attempted to incorporate its judgment of best practices in the recommendations below.

Ms. Chalmers noted that there is no recommendation that the guidelines be imposed on any of the colleges, but they could consider adopting them, perhaps adapted for their particular circumstances. Some colleges, she noted, appear to have no guidelines at all, a fact that Professor Sheets commented is surprising. In some units there is no competition for the funds, Ms. Chalmers said; the ad hoc committee found that the Graduate School and CLA guidelines were the most useful so developed recommendations using them.

Ms. Chalmers said they would like Committee views about the draft.

Professor Sheets pointed out that these are guidelines about research leaves for faculty members. If the Committee finds them a good model, it could recommend they be distributed to colleges and advocate their adoption.

Professor Beeman applauded the work of the ad hoc committee and said the proposal is an important step. What he faces as a department chair is the feeling that there is a lack of transparency in deciding how sabbaticals and leaves are awarded. The result is that there is much folklore about the process. The point about calling for feedback to faculty members is important so that they can see how to improve their proposals and so they can know what the committee thought about their proposals.

Professor Kulacki suggested circulating the draft to the deans for their comments. Once those are received, the draft should be brought back to the Committee for further review. Professor Sheets agreed and said he would write to the deans to ask them to look over the draft guidelines. The Committee can eventually adopt a resolution endorsing the guidelines and forward it to the Faculty Consultative Committee.

Mr. Croce noted that in choosing members for the collegiate committee, the conflict of interest language provides that no one from the same department as the applicant should review an application. He wondered if there is a balance between understanding the importance of a field and avoiding a conflict of interest. He agreed it is important to eliminate favoritism. Professor Sheets said that a committee can be appointed with representatives from various fields so there is likely to be someone in a cognate field. He agreed that one wants the committee to be in a position to make sound judgments. Professor Beeman agreed that recusal is important but observed that there will never be a perfect committee. He said he has been on panels that included proposals from the University of Minnesota; he is asked to discuss them and then leaves the room.

Ms. Chalmers said they are trying to be concrete about what a conflict-of-interest is but she agreed that "it can depend." She suggested that the Committee may wish to highlight the issue as something for units to consider as they evaluate committees for balance.

Professor Sheets thanked Ms. Chalmers for her work and for the report.

Following completion of the discussion about salary instructions, Professor Sheets adjourned the meeting at 4:25.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota

* * *

Recommended Guidelines for Evaluating Competitive Faculty Applications for Sabbatical Supplements and Single Semester Leaves

January 2012

1. **Review Committee(s).** The evaluation of applications for sabbatical supplements and single semester leaves should in all cases be conducted by a collegiate committee of faculty appointed by the Dean. The committee may be subdivided to do the reviews, if the number of applications warrants that. Each review committee or subcommittee should have a minimum of five members, each of whom independently reviews and rates all timely applications that have been assigned to that committee or subcommittee. Members should represent diverse disciplines, academic ranks, and academic experiences. An experienced staff member is appointed to staff the committee, circulate materials, and make arrangements to complete steps in accord with a schedule. The chair of the committee or subcommittee is appointed by the Dean.
2. **Conflict of Interest.** A committee member has a conflict of interest if an applicant is from the same department, is a co-researcher with the member, is a mentor or mentee of the member, is a family member, or is one with whom the member has a committed or other strong personal relationship. The committee member should not participate in evaluating or discussing such applications. A committee member who wishes to apply for a sabbatical leave or supplement should not serve on the committee. If an Associate Dean or Dean applies, that person does not participate in the collegiate review and decision-making process.
3. **Selection Criteria.** The collegiate committee will recommend the strongest nominees, whatever the scholarly field and without regard to distribution across disciplines, based on the criteria that have been established and publicized by the college. The following criteria are examples.
 - (1) the quality of the proposal—its importance, focus, and clarity of writing;
 - (2) the proposal design and methodology;

- (3) the potential for significant contribution to the applicant's field and professional development;
 - (4) the strength of applicant's publication record, taking into account the stage of his/her career, and productive use of past leaves and grants; and
 - (5) the feasibility of the plan for completion.
4. **Rankings.** Each committee member will review and rate each application according to each of the established criteria from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) using a standard rating sheet. The rating sheet is used as an aid to judgment and discussion when the committee members later convene, but the numerical ratings need not correlate with the reviewer's rank ordering. If a reviewer ranks some applications as equal, they should be ranked as the following example illustrates. *If numbers 4, 5, and 6 are judged to be equal, they should all be assigned the same numerical rank (e.g. #5). Leave the #4 and #6 spaces on the list empty.*
5. **Confidentiality.** Membership on the committee is public information; however, all committee discussions and ratings are confidential. Individuals' notes taken during the review process will not be considered public information. The College, however, must be able to provide constructive criticism and comment in response to inquiries from unsuccessful applicants after the final decisions are known. Therefore, reviewers are asked to provide their rating sheets and notes to the Dean's office at the end of the final meeting (which notes are destroyed after a reasonable period of time). Comments are always paraphrased and provided without attribution to individual reviewers.
6. **Application Form.** The form should be reviewed to assure consistency with the guidelines. It may be advisable for the form to prompt applicants to write their proposal in such a way that it is accessible to committee members who are not in their discipline.
7. **Calendar.** Each college should annually establish and publicize a calendar for receiving and reviewing applications. Each calendar should include the following items:
- | | |
|------------|--|
| Date _____ | The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs informs the collegiate Dean of the number of single semester leaves that can be awarded and the amount of funds for sabbatical supplements that will be provided centrally. The Dean's Office determines whether any funds will be set aside specifically for probationary faculty. |
| Date _____ | Applications due. Staff member checks that each application is complete and prepares them for distribution to committee members. |
| Date _____ | Applications distributed to reviewers. Each reviewer reads all the assigned applications and completes a rating sheet for each candidate. The reviewer then lists the applicants in rank order. (#1 is the highest rank.) The ranked lists are turned in to the Dean's office at least 2 business days prior to a meeting of the whole (sub)committee. Committee members bring copies of their rating sheets to the meeting. |
| Date _____ | The review committee meets and receives a collation (prepared by staff in advance of the meeting) of the individual ranked lists. Following review and resolution of differences in the individual rankings, the committee finalizes one ranked list of applicants to recommend to the Dean's office. Members turn in their individual rating sheets to the chair, to be made |

available to the Dean if needed until the process is complete.

Date _____

The Chair of the review committee provides a memo to the Associate Deans and the Dean forwarding the final ranked list and explaining the rationale for the recommendations. The Chair turns in all documents to the Dean's office.

Date _____

The Associate Deans, in consultation with the Dean, determine the awardees and announce awards.