**SABBATICAL LEAVE COMMITTEE, 2015**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

This questionnaire was produced to assess the Academic Senate’s sabbatical leave process as laid out in its *Sabbatical Leave Procedures* document; the last assessment occurred in 2012. It was sent out to the members of the Committee for the Fall of 2015; we received 6 replies from the 11 members who completed both meetings. The answers are recorded in blue.

**The Academic Senate Council would be most grateful if you could honestly respond to the following questions; answer any and all that interest you. To maintain full anonymity please do so electronically on this document, print it out, and place it in Nenagh’s mailbox in the Administration building.**

**Thank you on behalf of future sabbatical leave committee members – and the faculty who apply for leave!**

**I THE PROCESS**

As you know the process for evaluating sabbatical leave proposals at Moorpark College is determined by the AFT contract and then within this by the Academic Senate’s *Sabbatical Leave Procedures* document. The Senate Council relooks at this every year and updates it as needed. What suggestions do you have for the Senate concerning its processes for sabbatical leave as you experienced them this year in the following areas?

The membership of the committee?

Good.

A really great balance representing all constituencies involved with FT faculty.

Perfect.

Appropriate to have faculty who have already gone on sabbatical.

Its need to meet twice (first for informational purposes without the proposals, second for voting)?

Could review the info on my own, but it’s good to get to know fellow committee members.

Yes – very valuable. An informational meeting, and then the discussion/ranking meeting.

This takes time but as a result we did a really thorough and professional job. I felt good!

Totally reasonable to meet twice.

The rubric it presents to help evaluate the proposals?

Helpful.

Clear and helpful.

Very valuable as well!

This was really useful to me in evaluating the different proposals.

Rubric is excellent and should be used to make evaluation of projects fair.

The two votes of the committee (first ranking the proposals, and then deciding whether to forward all proposals to the district committee)?

Essential – I don’t support proposals going forwards that haven’t been thought through and presented professionally. We are asking for money here!

This process works fine.

Works well.

Fair.

Yes – very appropriate.

The decision to evaluate the projects based on the written proposals alone, without presentations or opportunities for questions to be answered?

I think the project should stand on its own; no presentation is necessary.

Worked find. Didn’t need applicant visits.

I was concerned about this but having been through the process I really support it.

Can go either way – since we had so few proposals we did not need presentation. But with a greater number of proposals it might be helpful to have the presentations . . .

Fair. Everything should be clear in the written proposal. In the end, when the proposal is read by the masses, the proposal has to stand on its own without the opportunity for people to ask questions. The tech review prior to submission is the place where clarifications should be made.

Any other parts of the processes laid out in the *Sabbatical Leave Procedures* document?

Is a very good document – helpful for those who follow it!

**II THE TECHNICAL REVIEW GROUP**

In our discussions we agreed it was beneficial for all faculty to submit draft proposals to the Technical Review Group. Within the parameters of the contract what suggestions do you have to encourage all applicants to do this?

Should be compulsory!

Not necessary- it may not be possible for all participants to do so.

Those of us who have done it should spread the idea through word-of-mouth.

Make it clear to submitters that those who go thru the tech review group have a chance to make their proposal even better, with a great chance of success!!!

If it is encouraged in emails to those that are submitting a sabbatical proposal, then that is all that I believe can be done. The faculty know that it would be advisable to go to the technical review group, and if they don’t, then it’s nobody’s fault but their own.

**III BROADENING DISCIPLINES SUBMITTING PROPOSALS**

The Senate is committed to encouraging faculty from many and varied disciplines to apply for sabbatical leave. What suggestions do you have to further promote this?

The sabbatical leave flex workshops help notify the campus of this opportunity.

The Flex workshop you offered awhile back was a great way to find out about sabbatical.

I can’t think of anything – just keep sending the offer to all faculty – and keep saying this – “we encourage faculty from many and varied discipline to apply for sabbatical leave”.

Promote it more through Senate and its reps.

Announcing it at the required Flex day event that takes place at the PAC at the start of the year. I don’t know if this is appropriate or not. Or at division meetings that take place during the year.

**IV ANYTHING ELSE**

Please give the Senate Council any other suggestions, comments, reactions to any part of our sabbatical leave process as you experienced it this year. Thank you very much!

Great job! I enjoy participating.

The process seems to work very well!

We are lucky to have such a thorough process.

I never want to be on the committee but it is really worthwhile.

Thank you for all your work and commitment to make this process fair and open to all.

**Nenagh**

Faculty Co-Chair, Sabbatical Leave Committee

Moorpark College