CFA's Final Recommendation on Sabbatical Tie Breaking Charge

| | |
|---|---|
| TO: | Steering Committee |
| FROM: | Committee on Faculty Affairs |
| RE: | Sabbatical Membership Tie Breaking Charge |
| DATE: | February 2019 |

**Background:**
The state of NJ allocates to the College a fixed number of one-semester sabbatical leaves. Sabbaticals are awarded based on numerical scoring by members of the Sabbaticals Committee. An issue arose when a single one-semester sabbatical slot remained, but the Sabbaticals Committee ranked the next two applicants in a tie. Since there were no guidelines for such a situation, Provost Bresnehan (2011) asked for a solution to be developed through governance. The Steering Committee charged the CFA to develop guidelines for dealing with such ties in scoring by the Sabbaticals Committee. CFA made a recommendation that became the existing Sabbatical Tie Breaking policy

**Charge:**

According to TCNJ policy (the Policy Framework), all campus policies should be reviewed every five years. The Sabbatical Committee Tie Breaking Policy has not been reviewed since 2011.

Steering asks CFA to review this policy according to the timeline below. In its review, CFA is asked to carefully consider the current language of the policy and any new language that may be written to ensure that the policy is clear.

**Preliminary Recommendation:**
As directed by Steering, CFA collected testimony from the current and previous Chair of Sabbatical Council was sought regarding the Sabbatical Tie Breaking charge. It was noted that there was never a situation that necessitated implementation of the tie breaking procedure and both the chairs concurred that the current procedure would work well in case such a situation arose. In addition, testimony from Senate President was also sought and it was clarified that the current policy regarding tie breaking was indeed a procedure rather than a policy. Based on the above testimonies CFA recommends:

1. If the policy remains in effect (see #2), minor changes are needed. Sabbatical Committee needs to be changed to “Sabbatical Council” and the policy history needs updating. Please see “Sabbatical_Council_Tie_Breaking_Policy.docx” document for wording changes proposed by CFA.

2. CFA feels that the Sabbatical Tie Breaking Policy is a procedure rather than a policy. CFA believes that these procedures should be integrated into the general charge of the Sabbatical Council and the Sabbatical RFP. For example, the following language could be added to the RFP: “At the request of the Provost, the Sabbatical Council may be asked

to rescore any tie-scored applications as many times necessary until the applications' scores are no longer tied". This would mean that the policy could be rescinded, which would eliminate the need to host and maintain a specific policy for what appears to address very isolated situations.

**Campus Testimony**

CFA circulated the preliminary recommendation electronically and solicited campus input. We received feedback from 4 campus members and from the Sabbatical Council. All respondents agreed that the Sabbatical Tie Breaker procedure should not be a stand-alone policy and all agreed that the procedure could be incorporated into the Sabbatical RFP. One respondent suggested that the procedures should be added to the Memorandum of Agreement (#101) that concerns the Sabbatical Leave Program. One respondent suggested that the language should be revised to make the Provost "obligated" to ask the Sabbatical Council to break the tie. One respondent expressed concern about the procedures of re-scoring the proposals in the event of a tie.

**Final Recommendation**

Based on the campus testimony CFA has revised its recommendation:

1. If the policy remains in effect (see #2), minor changes are needed. Sabbatical Committee needs to be changed to "Sabbatical Council" and the policy history needs updating. Please see "Sabbatical_Council_Tie_Breaking_Policy.docx" document for wording changes proposed by CFA.

2. CFA feels that the Sabbatical Tie Breaking Policy is a procedure rather than a policy. CFA believes that these procedures should be integrated into the general charge of the Sabbatical Council and the Sabbatical RFP. For example, the following language could be added to the RFP: "The Provost should ask the Sabbatical Council to rescore any tie-scored applications as many times necessary until the applications' scores are no longer tied". This would mean that the policy could be rescinded, which would eliminate the need to host and maintain a specific policy for what appears to address very isolated situations.