

APPENDIX L: Sabbatical Evaluation Form

Proposer's Name: _____

The Sabbatical Subcommittee assesses proposals to determine if proposed activities and outcomes are appropriate for the length of the requested sabbatical. While the outcomes of a sabbatical will vary, expectations of activities and outcomes of a one-year sabbatical exceed those of a one-semester sabbatical. While sabbaticals are granted on the merit of past academic contributions, prior academic achievements to not take precedence over addressing the criteria listed in the Faculty Sabbatical Program (Section IX) and in the chart below. Please assess the degree to which the sabbatical proposal addresses these criteria (the questions suggest considerations).

Rate the criteria using the following scale. Do not leave a blank.

1-2 Poor. Minimal potential.	3-4 Fair. Has deficiencies that should be addressed.	5-6 Good. Workable idea. Has minor deficiencies.	7-8 Very Good. Fundable in present form.	9-10 Nearly Perfect. <i>(Use sparingly.)</i>
--	---	---	---	--

Criteria	Rating
1. Details provided describing the sabbatical activities. Have the sabbatical project and project activities been described in detail? Has the scholarly value of the project been described and supported? Has the project method/process/approach been described in detail? Has the project method/process/approach been adequately justified? Is the environment of the sabbatical clearly described and appropriate? Why was a specific location or learning environment chosen? What other locations were considered but not chosen? Are off-campus activities planned for high-quality institutions/organizations?	
2. Relevance and Professional Development. Are the sabbatical activities clearly related to the faculty member's responsibilities in teaching or research? What courses has the faculty taught or will he/she be teaching? How does the sabbatical relate to these courses? Has the professional development been described in detail? How will the quality of instruction and/or research be significantly enhanced? What is the overall quality of the sabbatical activities? Has the proposal demonstrated clear momentum in the development or completion of a major project?	
3. Feasibility. Have the key elements of the sabbatical project been identified and described? Has documentation been provided to support the feasibility of the project and the expected outcomes within the proposed timeline?	
4. Goals and Outcomes. Are the proposed goals and outcomes identified? Are the proposed outcomes appropriate for the length of the sabbatical?	
5. Eligibility and Merit. Do the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and service contributions at the University merit a sabbatical leave? Have any awards for excellence in teaching, scholarship (creative work or performance), service been received?	
6. Timeline. Has a timeline been included in the proposal? Does it provide sufficient detail?	
7. Outcomes. Are the tangible and intangible outcomes outlined such that the Faculty Development Board can assess the success of the sabbatical? Are the proposed outcomes appropriate for the length of the sabbatical?	
8. Clear and Concise Writing. Reviewers will likely be from outside the proposer's subject field. Therefore, avoid technical jargon and define terms/concepts. Proofread for organization, grammar, readability, clarity of objectives, sufficiency of details, length of proposal and legibility. Reviewers are instructed to "grade low" rather than to "give the benefit-of-the-doubt" when they cannot understand crucial ideas.	
9. Adequacy of provisions for the unit's needs during the faculty member's absence. (UW System guidelines require a detailed listing or description of how the University will accommodate the faculty member's absence.) Has this requirement been met and is departmental letter attached?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Total	

Auxiliary Amount Recommended: _____ \$ **Reviewer Recommendation:** Approve Deny

Comments:

(continue on back if needed)

Reviewer: _____