

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Sabbatical Evaluation Criteria

Purpose: Sabbatical leaves are awarded to full time, tenured faculty and department chairs for scholarly and artistic work, research, and advanced study that requires time beyond traditional responsibilities for completion. After twelve (12) semesters of employment at the University, excluding summer terms, faculty are eligible to receive a sabbatical leave.

Scoring Note: To be marked N/A the applicant must make it clear that the item/criteria was N/A to their project. N/A does not influence the overall evaluation score.

DIMENSION 1: OVERALL QUALITY
Relative weight 0.5
Comprised of handbook criteria a, b, c, d

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

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

This proposal...

- a1. Promotes the professional growth and effectiveness of the faculty
- a2. Requires additional time for the completion of scholarly activity and research, advanced study OR artistic performance in the pursuit of academic objectives.

b. Overall quality of the proposal

This proposal ...

- b1. Follows the requested format
- b2. Addresses all requirements of the application
- b3. Presents a logical, reasoned argument for the project
- b4. States goal(s) and/or objective(s) of the project (**new**)
- b5. Provides a detailed project description (i.e. background, importance, procedures, etc.)
- b6. Provides a tentative timeline for the project that is feasible.
- b7. Utilizes adequate academic references and in-text citations
- b8. Identifies specific, tangible outcomes/products of the project using SMART goals (**new**)
- b9. States fair criteria for evaluating the success of the project (**new**)

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Sabbatical Evaluation Criteria

c. The urgency of the project to be undertaken

This proposal clearly explains that the project ...

c1. Requires time-sensitive efforts and action

c2. Addresses an urgent need or pressing problem

d. The ability of the applicant to effectively convey the project information and importance of the project to those outside the applicant's own academic discipline

This proposal's ...

d1. Content (i.e. importance, value, procedures, etc.) is described in a clear, coherent and non-technical manner that is readily understandable or knowable

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Sabbatical Evaluation Criteria

DIMENSION 2: OVERALL VALUE

Relative weight 0.3
Comprised of handbook criteria e

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

e. The value, utility, merit or worth of the project

The proposal addresses the potential value, utility, merit, or worth to ...

e1. Professional growth and/or status (i.e., professional development - advancement of knowledge, skills; advancement in rank or position, etc.)

e2. Teaching and Students (i.e., academic development; effectiveness of faculty - improved teaching or instruction in field, class, or online setting; coaching or mentoring student research or creative projects)

e3. Scholarship and the Scholarly community (i.e. scholarly activity, research, advanced study or artistic performance; *AND* potential impact on scholarly community)

e4. The University (i.e., community regional, or national reputation and status)

e5. The Non-Academic community (i.e., General, non-academic community; Public sector, government, education, or social service community; Private sector, business, commercial, retail, or industrial community)

Faculty Senate Benefits Committee
Sabbatical Evaluation Criteria
DIMESION 3: APPLICANT DILIGENCE
Relative weight 0.2
Comprised of handbook criteria f, g, h

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

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 proposal clearly explains ...

- f1. The project has goals that are achievable in the time allotted
- f2. The project 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.)
- f3. The success of the project is dependent on the acceptance of another FDA award.

g. Alternative funding sources and other commitments

This proposal clearly explains ...

- g1. Investigation of other funding sources examined (received, may receive or investigated) for this project, including those at the department level
- g2. Other current or potential commitments from NKU and/or other institutions

h. Inclusion of Supporting Documents

The proposal includes ...

- h1. Support documents (i.e., vita, previous awards and FDA; Letters from collaborators, publishers, or other individuals' groups or organizations; supportive dean/chair letters) demonstrating the applicant's ability to complete the project.
- h2. Adequate support (i.e., supportive dean/chair letters) indicating the strong merit of the proposal.