

University Sabbatical Committee (USC)
Annual Report (AY 2016-2017)
Submitted to the Academic Senate Committee on Committees (June 1, 2017)

I. Executive Summary for the Academic Year:

- **The USC was charged with the task of reviewing and ranking sabbatical applications.**
- **Leaves with Pay Policy (Reference Number: S13-18) was used as a guiding principle: <http://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/leaves-pay-policy>.**

II. Committee Information and Review of Activities for the Academic Year:

A. Roster

- **Barbara A. Henderson, College of Education**
- **Philip G. King, College of Business**
- **David Landy, College of Liberal & Creative Arts**
- **Marcy L. Leech, College of Science & Engineering**
- **Mitch L. Turitz, Library**
- **Darlene Yee-Melichar, College of Health & Social Sciences (USC Chair)**
- **Grace J. Yoo, College of Ethnic Studies**

B. Regular Meeting Schedule and Committee Meetings:

- **The USC did not have a regular meeting schedule.**
- **Dates the USC met, and the members present:**
 - **Tuesday, October 25, 2016 at 10 am; teleconference; Henderson, King, Landy, Yee-Melichar, Yoo**
 - **Monday, November 28, 2016 at 11 am; in-person meeting; Henderson, King, Landy, Leech, Turitz, Yee-Melichar, Yoo**
 - **Thursday, December 1, 2016 at 12noon; in-person meeting; USC Chair Yee-Melichar met with Interim Provost Summit and Dean Bunge**

C. Action Items

- **Review and rank 58 semester sabbatical applications (completed)**
- **Review and rank (yes/no) 13 academic year sabbatical applications (completed)**

III. Committee Recommendations for the Upcoming Year:

A. Re: Committee Charge:

- **None**

B. Re: Committee Membership:

- Review and revise Leaves with Pay Policy (Reference Number: S13-18; <http://senate.sfsu.edu/policy/leaves-pay-policy>) with specific attention to section D. Guidelines and Procedures for Granting Sabbatical Leaves, part 4. The University Sabbatical Committee, to update number of committee members.
- Not all Colleges elected their USC member in a timely fashion, and this greatly affected the scheduling of the review process. In the future, all Colleges should nominate a USC member by a specific deadline.
- All 7 Colleges and the Library should be represented. In AY 2016-2017, College of Extended Learning was not represented.

C. To the Senate:

- Set dates earlier in the semester for sabbatical application submission to college committee, dean, and USC. Deans who are late meeting the university deadline goals are to be called out on it. If the applications are not forwarded to the USC by the timeline agreed upon by the Provost, then extra time will be allotted to the USC to turn in the results of the rankings and recommendations.
- Make sure the college LWP committees are clear on how the University Sabbatical Committee ranks the applications; that is, equally across the categories, instead of weighting one category as more or less than another.
- The 1000 word limit is not always adhered to. Consider enforcing this using a metric that is more easily verified, e.g., limit the number of pages, font size and margin width. This should be checked at the time of application, and not during the review process.
- Ranked lists from the college committee and the Dean need improvement. Ask to receive each colleges' LWP committee memo as well as the deans' memos. College Committees AND the college deans must submit the reasons for their rankings of each candidate for Sabbaticals. This is especially important if the dean does not agree with the rankings of the college committee. Item 5a in policy #S13-18 states: *"The college/library committee and the college dean/director shall prepare rationales for each ranking. These rationales shall be preserved as information for the candidates, as evidence of the basis on which the college awards leaves with pay, and for purposes of appeals, adjudication, and grievances."* Request that deans make a table to compare how their rankings differ from their college LWP committee rankings, as the COSE dean did, and that deans provide commentary on proposals that they ranked differently from the college committee.
- The college committee and dean comments should be shared with the applicants so that they may benefit from the feedback in order to enhance subsequent applications as needed.
- A note should be added to the sabbatical application to the effect of, "anyone who does not fulfill their sabbatical as stated in their application, may face possible negative evaluations in future sabbatical application."
- Not to go to an electronic system until and unless they are really ready to make it efficient and not more burdensome (the DRC online process was far worse). Once ready, can we push to have these sabbatical applications onto inter-folio or on e-folio system?

- **Better clarity to the colleges and faculty on how the difference in pay year-long sabbatical option are evaluated a bit differently because they create a net neutral in terms of funds.**

D. To next year's Committee:

- **None**

IV. Endorsement by the Committee

- **This report has been reviewed and electronically endorsed by the following Committee Members:**
 - **Barbara A. Henderson, College of Education**
 - **Philip G. King, College of Business**
 - **David Landy, College of Liberal & Creative Arts**
 - **Marcy L. Leech, College of Science & Engineering**
 - **Mitch L. Turitz, Library**
 - **Darlene Yee-Melichar, College of Health & Social Sciences (USC chair)**
 - **Grace J. Yoo, College of Ethnic Studies**