Guidelines for Review of Sabbatical Applications
for the Academic / Sweet Sabbatical Committee (ASC)

1. All applications are to be evaluated based on criteria clearly identified on the application form. Rank, seniority and/or number of previous sabbatical leaves held by applicants will not be used as criteria on which to evaluate and/or rank applications for academic sabbaticals. In the event that two applications are ranked equally on the enumerated criteria, the faculty person who has served longest without academic sabbatical leave grant will be ranked the higher of the two.

2. Applications should be considered on their own merit; applicants should not be in competition with other applicants from their own or other disciplines. Applications should be ranked only in the broadest terms, such as "Best," "Good," "Fair," "Weak."

3. Applicants who meet the stated guidelines should be recommended for an academic sabbatical.

4. When the number of deserving applications exceeds available funding, the Academic Sabbatical Committee will determine which applications will be funded. This decision will be based on equitable criteria created by the ASC and clearly identified on the Academic Sabbatical Application form.

5. If a sabbatical is not granted, the applicant will receive a letter from the Academic Sabbatical Committee identifying why the application was not recommended.

ACADEMIC SABBATICAL GRANT REVIEWER FORM

Applicant Name:

Eligibility and Frequency:

> **Applicant is eligible to receive grant: (   ) Yes   (   ) No**
> **Applicant has received the following WU Academic Sabbatical Grants:**

Proposal Assessment Section

All applications are to be evaluated based on criteria identified on the application form. The applicant should explain how the scope, nature, or location of the project, would make it difficult or impossible to carry out as part of the normal activity expected of Washburn University full-time teaching faculty. Rank, seniority and/or number of previous sabbatical leaves held by applicants will not be used as criteria on which to evaluate and/or rank applications. In the event that two applications are ranked equally on the enumerated criteria, the faculty person who has served longest without academic sabbatical leave grant will be ranked the higher of the two.

Assessment categories are outlined below so that committee members will consider similar criteria in evaluating proposals. These categories should serve as a basis for committee discussion; in addition a summary of all committee comments and ratings will be given to each grant applicant by the committee chair.

Please note that categories have not been weighted, leaving it to individual reviewers to assign greater or lesser value to some (for example, academic value) over others (for example, clarity of writing). Thus, the sum of the ratings across the assessment categories may **not** necessarily reflect the overall rating of the project (see page 3 for ratings categories and directions for initial and final ratings by individual reviewers).

Assessment Categories

Rate the application using the following criteria. Indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement by writing your rating on the line to the left of each statement. Please provide any additional comments you want to raise for discussion following each item.

Use the following rating scale for your ratings:

1	Strongly Agree
2	Agree
3	Disagree
4	Strongly disagree

_____   1.   The proposed project is of value to the applicant's discipline, and will enable him/her to produce or make substantial progress toward producing significant scholarly work, or will substantially enhance the applicant's teaching effectiveness by increasing his/her body of knowledge or skills.

Comments:

_____ 2. The applicant has documented the value of the project, by providing evidence that: the work will constitute a contribution to his/her academic field; the project will enable him/her to teach additional courses in his/her field; or that the project will otherwise directly benefit the University.

Comments:

_____ 3. The applicant has documented that his/her qualifications are appropriate for pursuing the proposed project.

Comments:

_____ 4. The proposed implementation timetable and/or funding plan seems a realistic one in which to achieve the stated goal(s).

Comments:

_____ 5. The description of the implementation schedule suggests that the activities have been carefully planned.

Comments:

_____ 6. The proposed activity justifies at least a semester's leave. The applicant has documented that the scope, nature, or location of the project makes it difficult or impossible to carry out the project while engaged in the normal activity expected of full-time teaching faculty.

Comments:

_____ 7. The proposal was clearly written, with an explicit description of the project's value, goal, implementation timetable, and expected product. It is understandable to the average educated reviewer.

Comments:

Suggestions for improvement of application:

PROPOSAL RATING SCORE

Each individual reviewer should provide a provisional rating score for each application prior to the first committee meeting. Following discussion, all ratings will be reassessed by individual reviewers, and committee voting will be based on the total of all final rating scores. In the case of ties, where the number tied cannot all be granted sabbaticals, tied applications will be discussed again, and a new vote will be held to break the tie.

Use the following rating scale to rate each application:

(1.) "Best" proposal. Clearly an outstanding proposal, one that definitely should be granted if at all possible.

(2.) "Good" proposal. One that is thoroughly meritorious and well above average, and that you reluctantly would see declined in a very intense competition.

(3.) "Fair" proposal. One that has merit and is worthy of support, but that demonstrates no particularly remarkable characteristics that might warrant a higher priority.

(4.) "Weak" proposal. one for which you have serious reservations, and about which you wish to provide a negative recommendation for the application as it now stands.

INITIAL SCORE (1 High; 4 Low) **before** discussion:

_____

FINAL SCORE (1 High; 4 Low) **after** committee discussion:

_____