Sabbaticals Council meeting

6 Feb 2019

Minutes

Present: Terrence Bennett, Nina Peel, Michael Bloodgood, Pierre Le Morvan, Michele Naples, Taras Pavlovsky, Romulo Ochoa, Christopher Ault, Brian Girard, Jennifer Wang

Excused: Sudhir Nayak

1) Cookies

2) Minutes from December 5, 2018 meeting approved

3) Comments to CFA on preliminary recommendation regarding the sabbatical tie-breaking policy.

Discussion:

Our job currently: rank applications, hand over list to Academic Affairs. Who gets funded is decided by Academic Affairs / Provost. Would accepting either of CFA’s proposed recommendations on revisions to the tie-breaking policy fundamentally alter our task? i.e. we would be deciding who gets funded or not if we were to tie-break at the request of the Provost.

Consensus: Tie-breaking procedures should not be a policy, but built into process.

**Motion to respond favoring option#2 in CFA’s preliminary recommendation (to rescind the policy and integrate a tie-breaking procedure into the general charge of the Sabbatical Council and the Sabbatical RFP) unanimously approved.**

4) Changes to the RFP.

Dates

a) Submission deadline:

2nd Monday (conventional) Oct 14, 2019 (happens to be Columbus Day and Monday after fall break).

OR 1st Monday Oct 7, 2019 (fall break).

**Motion: 7th Oct. Unanimously approved.**

b) **Fall workshop –Wed Sept 18.**

5) Discussion of amendments to the RFP for 2019 submissions.

Whole doc uses ‘should’, not ‘must’.

* Page limit should be definite. Change to: proposals must be no more than four (4) single-spaced numbered pages (inch margins, standard 12pt font)…
* Add: ‘Applications that do not follow these guidelines may be penalized’ into ‘application format’ section after date.

CV section:

* Replace second sentence with ‘The section should describe scholarly activities in reverse chronological order and should indicate for all publications and…
* Bold ‘teaching, librarianship, scholarly activity, academic advising and service’

Section 4: other evidence of outcomes – no capitals.

Reward those re-engaging? Discussion. Decided no points should be added to the rubric for this explicit purpose.

Nina will provide marked up RFP and circulate.