

Faculty Senate Sabbatical Review Sub-Committee

SABBATICAL REVIEW EVALUATION FORM

Faculty Member:

Department/Division:

College: **Liberal Arts and Sciences** ____ **Luter School of Business** ____

Leave Period Proposed:

Proposal Initiative:

Evaluator(s):

Evaluation Date:

Step 1: ELIGIBILITY CHECK		
	(a) Full-time tenured or tenured-track instructional faculty and full-time administrative faculty	Yes/No
	(b) After six years of service at CNU, and may reapply after intervals of no less than six years of service after receiving a sabbatical.	Yes/No
	(c) The terms of the sabbatical enable a recipient to elect to use one full academic year, nine months, at one-half salary, or one semester (fall or spring) at full salary.	Yes/No

If all answers are “yes”, go to step 2; otherwise STOP.

Step 2: APPLICATION PROCEDURES CHECK		
	(a) Timeliness	Yes/No
	(b) Completeness of Application	Yes/No
	(c) Use of Approved Format and Forms	Yes/No
	(d) Departmental Recommendation (for a Chair, the Dean’s Recommendation	Yes/No
	(e) Professional Resume	Yes/No

If all answers are “yes”, go to step 3; otherwise STOP.

Step 3: CRITERIA		
<i>*Ranking (0-5): 5—Excellent; 4—Very Good; 3—Good; 2—Fair; 1—Poor; 0—Absent ?—Cannot Determine</i>		
1. APPLICATION PROCEDURES		
	(a) Overall Clarity of Proposal	
2. INTRINSIC MERITS OF THE SABBATICAL PROJECT		
	(a) Current Status & Feasibility (including access to materials, archives, collections, institutions, etc.)	
	(b) Deliverable Activities (by end of leave)	
	(c) Commitment to Completion of Project	
	(d) Project’s Specific Relation to University’s Strategic Plan	
3. RELEVANCE TO FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES		
	(a) Quality (or promise of quality) of applicant’s work as Teacher & Scholar	
	(b) Professional Development	
	(c) Instructional Development (short range & long range)	
4. SENIORITY (Length and Quality of Applicant’s Service to the University. 6 years: 1 point; 7 years: 2 points; 8 years: 3 points; 9 years: 4 points; 10 years and plus: 5 points.)		
5. PROJECT’S POTENTIAL BENEFIT TO THE UNIVERSITY		
OVERALL EVALUATION (Average points of section 1 to section 5)		

*Ranking	
5—Excellent	Outstanding. Excellent Potential. Highest Quality.
4—Very Good	Important contribution. Very Good Potential. Recommend support.
3—Good	Competent, but contains deficiencies. Some Potential. Recommend with reservations
2—Fair	Satisfactory in part. Potential is routine. Suggest declination in present form.
1—Poor	Unsatisfactory. Not Sufficient Potential. Cannot Recommend.
0—Absent	Not in Application. Not addressed. Does not support.

EVALUATOR COMMENTS

Briefly describe strengths and weaknesses of the proposal for each of the following criteria.

1. MERITS OF THE SABBATICAL PROJECT. Please comment briefly on the concept and organization of the Sabbatical Project.

2. RELEVANCE to TEACHING and FACULTY DEVELOPMENT. Please comment on how the proposed activity will enhance the applicant's Teaching Effectiveness and Professional Development.

3. BENEFIT TO UNIVERSITY. Please comment on the potential benefit this project will have for the university.

4. OVERALL EVALUATION. Please give a brief summary of the overall merit of the sabbatical application.