**Faculty Senate Benefits Committee**

**Sabbatical Evaluation Criteria**

**DIMENSION 1: OVERALL QUALITY**

**Relative weight 0.5**

**Comprised of handbook criteria a, b, g, k**

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

**a. How well the proposal meets the purpose of the program for which the application is made**

a1. Promotes the professional development and effectiveness of the faculty

a2. Results in scholarly activity and research, advanced study, or artistic performance

a3. Is an effort that needs the additional time a sabbatical supplies to complete

This project represents value, merit, or worth to the applicant’s …

**b. The value of the project to the applicant’s growth and professional status; the value of the project to the scholarly community**

b1. Academic development

b2. Professional growth

b3. Scholarly community

**g. The ability of the applicant to convey the content and importance of the project to those outside his/her own academic discipline**

For those in other academic disciplines, this project’s …

g1. Content is described clearly, coherently, and non-technically

g2. Importance is readily understandable or knowable

**k. Overall quality of the proposal**

This project …

k1. Follows the requested format by addressing all requirements of the application

k2. Presents a logical, reasoned argument

k3. Provides adequate academic references and in-text citations

**DIMENSION 2: OVERALL VALUE**

**Relative weight 0.3**

**Comprised of handbook criteria c, d, e, j**

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

**c. The value of the project to the applicant’s teaching responsibilities and students**

This project has potential utility, merit, or worth for …

c1. Teaching and instruction students in classroom or field settings

c2. Coaching and mentoring student research or creative projects

**d. The value of the project to the University**

This project has potential utility, merit, or worth to the University’s …

d1. Community, regional, or national reputation and status

**e. The value of the project to the non-academic community**

For practical application in real-life situations, this project has utility, merit, or worth to …

e1. The general, non-academic community and/or;

e2. Public sector, government, education, or social service community and/or;

e3. Private sector, business, commercial, retail, or industrial community.

**j. The urgency of the project to be undertaken**

This project clearly explains that it…

j1. Requires time-sensitive efforts and action by the applicant

j2. Addresses an urgent need or pressing problem

**DIMESION 3: APPLICANT DILIGENCE**

**Relative weight 0.2**

**Comprised of handbook criteria f, h, i**

Strongly Disagree Disagree Neutral Agree Strongly

Disagree Agree

1 2 3 4 5

**f. The probability that the project will be carried out (to be measured in terms of the applicant’s background, previous successes, and attainability of the goals stated)**

This project …

f1. Has goals that are achievable in the time allotted

f2. Is likely to be performed or executed, given the applicants’ background, expertise, and prior accomplishments (i.e. publications, presentations, references, creative activities, previous grants, etc.)

**h. Contribution of the project to the applicant’s ongoing scholarship or creative activity**

The applicant …

**i. Investigation of alternative funding sources**

h1. Will be able to use this project to advance their ongoing scholarship or creative activities

This project …

i1. Has examined other funding sources for this project, including at the department level
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