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***Call to Order***

Academic Senate Chairperson Susan Kalter called the meeting to order***.***

Senator Kalter: We have a single item tonight, which is the Sabbatical Leave policy. We noticed, as I said in Exec, some (snoring sound) among the student Senators, like they are sort of not really enthusiastic about spending a lot of time on this thing, so we decided to pull it into Caucus, have a detailed debate in here, and then send it back to the Senate, because it’s not technically a Faculty Caucus policy that we have total control over. I did check, we did have a little conversation in Exec, about whether or not APs in particular are under this policy, and there is a different AP Educational Leave policy. So this does seem to only apply to faculty, is that correct Dr. Catanzaro? Did you hear what I said by any chance? So I just was saying that we checked about APs and whether they ever take sabbaticals but it looks like they’re always under the AP Educational Leave policy. Is that correct?

Dr. Catanzaro: Yes.

Senator Kalter: It is correct. Terrific.

Dr. Catanzaro: Yes.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. All right.

Senator Pancrazio: The Educational Leave policy that you’re talking about, is that the general Leave policy, is that like 3. something? Is that the one we’re talking about?

Senator Kalter: It’s 3. something. I don’t remember what the AP numbers are exactly.

Senator Nikolaou: 3.1…

Senator Kalter: 3.4.8, yes.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay. Well, there seems like there’s another one but…

Senator Nikolaou: There is another one.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay.

Senator Nikolaou: There is also the 3.1.11, the Leave of Absence, and underneath it there is an Educational Leave subsection.

Senator Pancrazio: That’s right. That’s right. Yeah.

Senator Kalter: Oh. Okay. That’s interesting. Because usually a leave, I think that the Leave of Absence one is usually an unpaid leave of absence. But, in any case, we’ll look at that and work that out. What are you pointing at Senator Pancrazio?

Senator Pancrazio: To our committee chair.

Senator Kalter: Ah. Yes. Thank you. So as you said, we’re going to turn it over to Senator Crowley from Faculty Affairs to conduct the Information Item.

***Information Item:***

***04.02.16.01 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Current Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

***10.11.19.06 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Mark Up (Faculty Affairs Committee) 10.11.19.05 Policy 3.2.8 Sabbatical Leave policy Clean Copy (Faculty Affairs Committee)***

Senator Crowley: Okay. Thank you. Well, when we discussed this last time, as you recall, we cut the session a little short, we weren’t able to get to all the issues that folks wanted to talk about. So I wanted to let you know that there have been some conversations via email and telephone with some individuals who have asked questions, asked for clarification, that sort of thing. And this educational leave one was a part of those discussions. And what I was trying to emphasize was that if a faculty member wants to pursue an additional credential using the sabbatical leave, that they’re going to have to make an argument that it is relative, directly related actually, to their scholarship, because that’s what the sabbatical leave is designed to support. But we have in policy 3.1.11 the opportunity for a faculty member to apply for an educational leave. So that does not mean we have to have anything in the Sabbatical Leave policy to address the educational leave, we have another policy for that. In addition to that, that policy is with or without pay. So it sounds to me like if you are interested in pursuing a credential that is not directly related to your area of scholarship, that’s the option you would take. And to be honest with you, I would reserve my sabbatical for direct research purposes, as opposed to pursuing an additional credential, and use the educational leave for the pursuit of a credential. But that… What I would like to emphasize is that the Faculty Affairs Committee is not the ultimate arbitrator in this situation. It goes to the department or the school, the college, the Provost’s office, the President, then the President makes the ultimate decision on that. So it sounds to me like a faculty member who’s interested in pursuing that will work with his or her department or school to begin with, lay it out, and go from there. So what we decided we would do is add a little heads up to the policy. So if you look at your mark up under Rationale, at the last paragraph. At the last sentence, it includes this comment, “…based upon the recommendation of the Provost and the Deans of the individual colleges,” and then what we would add to that is, “for faculty interested in pursuing an additional credential degree (certification), please see policy 3.1.11.” That would have anybody who is looking at the Sabbatical policy, it would give them the heads up to look at 3.1.11, and they would then be able to pursue that for their additional credential. So that’s one of the things we would like to add to the markup.

Then under Procedures, we had some questions as you recall that came up. A question specifically that dealt with item “b” under Procedures. And that was the one where we made reference to… or we didn’t actually make reference to it, but the idea was that you would have to be here for five years of full time service before you could apply for a sabbatical. And the rationale behind that, the under… The non-stated purpose behind that was to allow someone who was given two years of credit for prior service when appointed to the faculty, could work an additional five years and be eligible for a sabbatical. Our colleague suggested that we needed to be consistent and make it all say five years. So, what we thought would be an appropriate way to handle it was to change the language a bit. And then we also realized that when we changed the language in item “c” from the, “No individual may…” the sort of negative tone, to, “A person is eligible…” a more positive tone, we didn’t do that with “b”. So we would like to revise “b” to read in this way, “A person who has received two years credit for prior service at the time of appointment to the faculty may apply for a leave after he or she has completed five years or more…” and so on.

Senator Mainieri: Could you repeat it?

Senator Kalter: Could you just repeat that a little bit, more slowly?

Senator Crowley: Certainly. Yep. “A person who has received two years credit for prior service at the time of appointment to the faculty may apply for a leave after he or she has completed five years or more,” dot, dot, dot.

Senator Kalter: Terrific. Thank you so much.

Senator Crowley: And then on “c” we made a modification in response to some of the comments from colleagues. And that reads in this fashion, “A person is eligible to apply for a leave for the seventh year of full time employment until a leave is granted. And seven years after the award of any sabbatical leave.” So the addition to it was the phrase, “…until a leave is granted.”

Senator Kalter: Let me just clarify something there, Senator Crowley. So currently after… where it says, “After every seven years of full employment, thereafter,” and then it has a comma that says “although no academic employee,” etc. you’re ending the sentence… suggesting to end the sentence now with just what you said, or was the sentence supposed to go on and say the rest?

Senator Crowley: It was also to go on and say the rest.

Senator Kalter: Oh. Okay. So…

Senator Crowley: So, it would be, “A person is eligible to apply for a leave for the seventh year of full time employment until a leave is granted, and seven years after the award of any sabbatical leave.” And then it would continue with, “Seven years of employment thereafter although no academic employee may have more than one sabbatical leave in a seven-year period.” So, that would be the total item.

Senator Kalter: Okay. Thank you.

Senator Crowley: Is that clear?

Senator Kalter: Is that clear to everybody, or do we need more clarification there?

Senator Meyers: The issue about applying in a year, or after a year is confusing, and I think that it needs to be consistent in part “b” and “c”. Sorry. I assume that the change that you just read in for part “c” was because a person could go on sabbatical leave on their seventh year, not because they have to wait until their seventh year to apply and then go on the eighth year. Is that right?

Senator Crowley: Oh, I’m sorry. Yes. That was brought up, and we did make a change to that, so it was clear that the person… it didn’t have… We eliminated, and I can’t remember now where I put that. Sorry about that. But it would read, “A person is eligible to apply for a leave for the seventh year of full time employment until the leave is granted.” So that eliminates the after seven years of full time employment.

Senator Meyers: Right. Right.

Senator Crowley: So the questions, and I guess is… Nah, I think that takes care of it. So it’s… We’ve eliminated the notion that you must apply after seven years. We’ve indicated now that you may apply for a leave for the seventh year of full time employment until a leave is granted, and seven years after the award… or, sorry. I’m getting my notes… I’m kind of double reading here. And every seven years of full time employment thereafter, although no academic employee may have more than one sabbatical leave in a seven year period.

Senator Meyers: Right.

Senator Crowley: So, there is nothing that indicates that you have to wait until the seventh year to apply.

Senator Meyers: Right. My question is, shouldn’t that same parallel wording apply to part “b”?

Senator Crowley: Let’s see, how did we do that? We’ve got it reading, “A person who’s received two years credit for prior service at the time of applying into the faculty may apply for a leave,” Oh, good point, yeah, that it shouldn’t say after. So we will… we’ll make that correction.

Senator Meyers: Okay.

Senator Crowley: Thank you.

Senator Ferrence: So, one concern that I have about the modification is I know of situation, for example, a colleague in my department was planning to go on sabbatical one year, and the chair said, please, this is really a bad year for the department, could you do it next year? And they said, well, yes, but only if I can apply six years later instead of seven. So it seems like this sets up a scenario that guarantees that the faculty member will not be willing to work with a department if a department says it would be better to wait until your eighth year for sabbatical, because they’re going to say, no, I want it in my seventh, because I only get it every seven years, or if you took one, for example, in the spring. Normally you take a sabbatical in the fall, but, if you took one in the spring, then you would force yourself into always taking it in the spring seventh year. You couldn’t take one at six and a half years in the fall by this. Because it says there has to be at least seven years pass between sabbaticals.

Senator Crowley: It says you can only have one leave in seven years. So I assume…

Senator Ferrence: Right. So you can’t have another one six and a half years later.

Dr. Catanzaro: This Sabbatical policy has always been interpreted to read academic years. So if you take… You’re not forced to take leaves the same semester every time you go on sabbatical your entire career.

Senator Kalter: All right. Further questions? Senator Nikolaou. Okay. I meant to call on Senator Mainieri first, but go ahead Senator… either one. You guys choose.

Senator Mainieri: Mine is fairly quick. Can we please make sure that there’s gender neutral language throughout the policy, and eliminate any he or she’s from the policy, please.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a question about the Procedures. If the committee talked about… because part “e” talks about, if you get a grant, that the salary cannot exceed the salary that you usually get from the university. So I’m wondering what if, let’s say I take sabbatical for the whole year, and I go to a different university to do some research. And then the other university says that I’m going to cover for the salary, you would be paid at ISU. But also what if I go to New York City, and, in that case, I would have to pay for the differential cost of living, I would need to pay for the travel expenses, and I would have to pay for additional housing. So, did the committee think about building a provision in here allowing for the possibility that you may be getting more, in terms of your salary, but it’s not salary, it’s to cover for differential expenses, travel, and housing that may be associated with your sabbatical. That was one comment.

Senator Crowley: Let me respond to that then, before I lose my train of thought, if I may. All right. In item “e” under that, we did consider this, and we talked with Dr. Catanzaro about this as well, and our conclusion was that the best way to handle this, because again, the FAC is not the final arbiter of this, how this policies applied, that’s done in the department and the college. So, what we concluded was that the best way to handle that was in that last section of “e,” where if the individual has a grant of a certain amount, and that grant covers those extra expenses that you’re referring to, so that it wouldn’t be out of pocket (I guess you could say), that the faculty member can work that into their proposal, and it can become a summer salary, so that you get… So that you don’t exceed the amount of salary that you are entitled to during the four and a half months. You can carry the extra money into the summer. Does that make sense to you?

Senator Nikolaou: But it talks only about a grant. So, if I don’t have a grant, if I’m getting reimbursed from the other university where I go to do my research, it is not a grant. It comes from New York University’s funds. So I cannot build it into a grant because they are complimenting my salary.

Senator Pancrazio: Can I ask a question here? Are you talking about taking a full year sabbatical?

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay. And if you take a full year sabbatical, you only get one semester of pay. And then in that... so that you’re having a university pay you in the second one?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes.

Senator Pancrazio: Technically, that’s a semester you’re not being paid anyway.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. But, based on this policy, it would say that in the second semester…

Senator Pancrazio: Sam, we need your help.

Senator Nikolaou: I wouldn’t be able to get… Because I’m not getting paid from the university, if that’s the case, could they offer me $20,000 per month?

Senator Pancrazio: Or just enough to eat.

Dr. Catanzaro: I’m sorry, I’m just going to clarify that the idea of… I think the technical language in the policy is exceeding your salary for the length of time. So in the scenario where one is on a one year… full academic year sabbatical and gets 50% pay over that period, you can get the other 50% paid by another institution or grant. Was that the question? Or that was part of the question?

Senator Nikolaou: Yes, but even if it is for a semester. For a semester, I’m going to get paid fully from the university. But then, the university that’s in the most expensive area, they might say we can offer you more to cover for these additional living expenses, for your housing, for your travel. But right now, there is not something specific in the policy because the policy talks only about grants. So, whatever you get from another university, it’s not necessarily a grant. And that was my questions, if we need to build a provision in there, even if it is that… even if it’s just a sentence where it says additional… differences in differential living expenses, travel expenses, and additional housing expenditures may be allowed to add, upon documentation… something along those lines.

Senator Blum: Yeah, I just want to speak in. I had this exact same question. So, in particular, you know, people that are going somewhere else. We allow people to work at full FTE pay and then also do overage work, alright, as they’re doing their regular jobs. And so, in the course… whether it’s funded from a grant, or whether it’s funded from consulting work, you have to go through the proper approval channels. It seems to me that there are things that would be inherent in some executions of some sabbatical work, travel to another place, another country, to be able to actually do it, you need your full salary, which maybe come from different sources, and then maybe even a little extra, right, because you’re living in Europe, and making a house payment, which is not excessive or abusive, but inherently to be able to execute that kind of sabbatical. And so, yeah, I just want to speak in support of that. And maybe looking at language, because I find the grant language restrictive.

Senator Kalter: Yeah. I’m gathering three questions here, and I had one down before we started, which is, I think it would be advisable here, or elsewhere, to add a reference to the policy that Faculty Affairs Committee did last year about Employment in Excess, I think it was, because we seem to be referring to what Senator Blum is talking about where you can be either at 100% or 125%, but no further. You have to have your Institutional Base Salary, it was defined as an IBS. And I think that that’s what’s probably driving and restricting somebody making three times as much as they make here. Is that correct, Dr. Catanzaro?

Dr. Catanzaro: Yeah.

Senator Kalter: So, it might be advisable, first of all, to have a reference to that policy in this policy, so that people are understanding where it’s coming from. But it begs… it does beg the question that Senator Blum just asked, why are we limiting it to 100% of the salary, rather than 125%? Which would then take care of at least some of the, what if I go overseas, or what if I go to New York City, or to California.

The second two things that seem to be coming up here are that this language in “e” currently only talks about grants; is that as it should be? Or should it also say salary? Or is that too restrictive? Because Senator Nikolaou was talking about, you know, whether or not… what about a salary that you would get from another institution, as opposed to a grant.

And then my question, and I think that probably the committee talked about this, is, are there some grants where you would not be able to arrange it so that it has summer salary? And so is that again too restrictive, is kind of the question that a lot of people are asking.

Senator Murphy, you had your hand up.

Senator Murphy: Yes. Milner Library also had some concerns about section “d.” As it stands, Section d. 2. can be interpreted as meaning that Milner employees, or general employees, on 12-month contracts are only eligible to apply for a three-month sabbatical leave. And we also were concerned that, as it stands, faculty working on nine month contracts are currently allowed to take a sabbatical equivalent to their entire annual contract, and earn up to half of that contract salary. And if you look at the Educational Leave policy for Administrative Professionals they’re allowed to take up to six months, which is half of their 12 month contract. In the spirit of fairness, we though we also should be eligible to take up to half of our 12 month contracts as a sabbatical leave. So we proposed, in Procedures d. 1. Replacing the term nine months with “the full term of the employee’s contract.” Eliminating d. 2. entirely, and in d. 3. replacing, “four and one half months pay…” with “half of the contracted salary.”

Senator Kalter: Senator Catanzaro, I’d like to get your response on that just to understand whether we have cleared that idea through the Provost’s office. And whether that’s budgetarily possible, feasible, etc.

Dr. Catanzaro: We haven’t had a chance to fully discuss what that might look like. I mean, I will say that on the face of it, it does seem like a very reasonable and fair suggestion. But in the absence of consulting with AVP Elkins and Provost Murphy, I’m not prepared to say go for it, yet.

Senator Kalter: Thank you.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. Let me see. When we made the recommendation about having… about creating that option for the summer, we did so specifically because we’d had the request, I thought, from Milner Library. So, we were trying to be helpful.

Senator Murphy: We completely understand that you were trying to be helpful, and we greatly appreciate that you thought of us, and were trying to be helpful.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay. So I had one follow-up.

Senator Murphy: Yes.

Senator Pancrazio: Would you like the two options? Or would you like to eliminate the summer? Because in the first rec… and I think it was the lengthy email that we receive from… Dallas?

Senator Murphy: Yes.

Senator Pancrazio: The lengthy email they asked for that option because it was not available, it was currently not available because the policy was written so that they could only take it in spring or… a spring or fall. And we thought we were opening that door. So if we… and the situation, as we understand it, is that no one has had the opportunity… no one has taken a sabbatical in about 10 years. Is that..?

Senator Murphy: Uh-hum.

Senator Pancrazio: Okay. All right. We’d like to make sure all… have as many options as you can. So, would you like both of those options, would the group that you’re… would they want both of those options? Or to eliminate that summer option? We’re here to help.

Senator Murphy: Absolutely. Unfortunately, I don’t think there had been a lot of communication between Dallas and the rest of the faculty at that point that he communicated with you. Yes, the more options available the better. Thank you.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you.

Senator Nikolaou: Under Proposals, 6. I’m wondering if we should keep the now crossed “if any.” Because it says a complete proposal needs to have a copy of the written summary report filed from the last sabbatical. But if it is my first time applying, I don’t have one, so you automatically exclude the individuals who are applying for the first time. So it should have the “if any” or “as applicable.” That’s one thing.

Under criteria, I’m wondering if 7 should be crossed out, because “Time elapsed since last sabbatical,” my understanding is, it doesn’t matter if I’m going to be ranked higher or lower, that was my understanding.

Senator Kalter: Could you say that one again?

Senator Nikolaou: So under criteria, 7, “Time elapsed since last sabbatical.” I’m wondering if it should be part of judging if you’re going to get a sabbatical. Because if it is mainly about the contribution that you’re making… this one would say that someone who hasn’t gotten a sabbatical for 14 years, they might have priority over someone who may have a better proposal, but it’s their first time that they are applying, or that they got it once.

Senator Pancrazio: Or the contrary.

Senator Nikolaou: Or the other way around. Yeah.

Senator Pancrazio: Or the contrary. Yeah. It could be even less.

Senator Nikolaou: One more thing. Under Obligations. I’m wondering why we’re restricting it to three contract months to submit the written report? So I was thinking of it in terms of, you know, there are certain fields where there’s going to be significant delay with the publications. So, for Economics, for example, on average, we have to wait six months to get a first response. So, if I have only three months to generate a report based on what I did based on my sabbatical leave, then it may show that I haven’t done anything during my sabbatical. So I was thinking, maybe we can do it similar to what URG does, where they ask for one year follow-up, and then they also ask for a second year follow-up. What were the outcomes you produced based on the URG you received within the year, or you know, within the two years.

Senator Crowley: The reason that we inserted the three contract months is because very often you have the summer preceding the leave, summer after the leave sometimes. And if you are expected to turn in a report in three calendar months that might put undue pressure on the faculty member. So, we felt that three contract months would be more logical. The original language simply read, within three months of the completion. Now, with regards to waiting for confirmation of publication, it seems to me that in that report you can indicate (and tell me if I’m wrong here) I have submitted X number of articles to these journals and am awaiting a response, that should cover the report. It would indicate that you wrote three articles, you’ve submitted them for publication. They’re under review. I know as a chair or a director, I’m not going to read that and say, well, he didn’t do anything. That’s a little narrow minded. So, if you could kind of, I would, as a director or chair, I would look at that and say, Professor Nikolaou has accomplished quite a bit in his leave. So that’s… I’m interested in knowing why you feel like three contract months would be inadequate, and why someone might interpret the lack of confirmation of publication to be an indication that you haven’t done anything.

Senator Nikolaou: Because the current language it says, “…and listing the publications or other accomplishments resulting therefrom.” So it says, in the report, I need to list my publications. And also, in terms of the three contract months, I can understand the summer, but not everyone takes their sabbatical in the spring. So if I take it in the fall, I’m at a disadvantage because I actually have to do it within three months. And someone who does it in the spring, they actually now have six months. So, it’s not equal for, you know, depending when you get it, if I get it in the spring or if I get it in the fall.

Senator Crowley: So, from your perspective, then, if I would follow that through, then we would eliminate contract and go back to three months.

Senator Nikolaou: My recommendation was why we don’t have… it might be that in the three months you ask for a report, but then you also allow for a follow-up report after a year. So that was the idea. I’m not saying eliminate three contract months, I’m just wondering why we don’t have a follow-up report to allow for, you know, delayed outcomes that you may have based on the sabbatical.

Senator Kalter: Let me just agree with Senator Nikolaou about this. Because I think that if the report is meant to show that something was done during the sabbatical, both to make sure something was done on the sabbatical, and to pave the way for a next sabbatical, it’s not entirely clear why we need it within three months, particularly if things might get published six months or a year later. So, I’m not even sure whether we need the three months, or if a six month, or a one year after the sabbatical period. Now obviously, that gets into sort of reporting issues, like are you going to remember, etc. But it…I’m trying to understand the logic of why we need it so quickly, if the function of it is to say, you used it well, and you might be able to have another one.

Dr. Catanzaro: I cannot comment on the original logic behind this system, but I can comment on the logic that has evolved in the presence of this requirement. And the report, I think, functions as more of an activity than an outcomes report, as several of you’ve noted. And I think there’s…I mean, I kind of like the idea of a longer time frame for a report, you know, as someone who has read hundreds of sabbatical proposals over the years, many of them with reports on them. But I also note that, as it functions now, and I’m not saying this is necessarily optimal, that reporting function then becomes ASPT annual evaluation, right. So… because the initial report may be submitted with your material on the following January 5th, and that gives your DFSC some documentation of sort of what you were working on, and I don’t know that anybody ever goes back to the original proposal and says, oh, he said he was going to submit a publication to, you know, Economics Review, and he sent it to Economics Letters instead. Right. There’s not that level of scrutiny because research is organic and opportunity arise that you don’t anticipate when you’re writing your proposals, so there’s that piece. The hesitation I have is to create another reporting system layered on top of the annual ASPT reporting system. And I think that the need, the timing need is to have documentation that… of what was done. And that something was done, and that the time was used appropriately. Because there’s an external piece to this, and fortunately on our campus, this has not yet been an issue, but, to those outside the academy, sabbaticals are somewhat of a mystery. And you know, we are always prepared, when we report on sabbaticals, to talk about how important they are for the vibrancy of the intellectual community we have, the professional development of our faculty, the vigor of our curriculum, the opportunities it creates for students, and the benefit to society of the knowledge created, and the talent cultivated in that process. So it is… It’s important, I think, to have a timely accountability format that is reasonably burdensome, right. Because any report creates a burden, and we want to balance how much of a burden we put on faculty, for doing good work, and being ambitious, and trying to advance their agendas, their scholarly agendas, I should say.

Senator Kalter: If you are somewhat favorable to a slightly longer period, how does six months strike you?

Dr. Catanzaro: Let me think about it. You know, a thought that comes to mind is by the end of the next fiscal year, within 12 months of the end of that sabbatical. That’s a little harder to manage but we also, you know, I hope sometime, not really fast, you know, this is all a paper based clunky process too. Right. I have a pile in my office right now of sabbatical proposals. Putting this into an efficient, secure, online process will make everyone’s lives easier, eventually when we are able to build that, which will make it easier to do sort of bespoke deadlines, if you will, at least for fall versus spring, and full year sabbaticals.

Senator Blanco-Lobo: Please correct me if I’m wrong here, but in practice, there is a second report, and that would be the next time that you apply for sabbatical, where you also have to list what were the outcomes of the previous one, right?

Dr. Catanzaro: The only requirement is the report that you file from the previous sabbatical. So, let’s say you got your sabbatical in 2010, you submitted your report, and then you applied again in 2016 to go in 2017, all you would need to append was the same report you submitted in 2011, let’s say.

Senator Crowley: One of the difficulties that occurs in the management of this sabbatical process that I experienced was that securing that report in a timely fashion was very difficult, and in some cases, in the early stages of my service here, there was no sabbatical reports submitted before the next application for the sabbatical came in. And so, we had nothing from that individual on the outcome from their sabbatical, so they would run something off, and that was not substantive enough. And so, it’s because of a situation in which I became an ogre who pursued them to get these… to get these reports in, usually not within three months. It would usually take me six to eight months to get the report, okay. At least I got one that year. So, I would be comfortable with seeing it extend to six months or the end of the fiscal year, providing that we make it clear to the faculty that it is in fact an obligation, and that if they want to get a sabbatical leave in in the future, they’ve got to get that report in in a timely way. So that’s, I think, part of the reason we were trying to make it a little more flexible by adding the three contract months instead of just three months, but if that strikes us as too abbreviated a time then let’s extend it. But let’s make sure that it’s clear to everyone that they have that obligation.

Senator Mainieri: This might be a question for Dr. Catanzaro actually. One of the criteria to be used in judgment in the leave proposal, number 5, is convenience to the university, except the faculty member cannot be refused on this basis alone for more than three successive years, and I wonder how frequently that is the only reason why a sabbatical is not granted?

Dr. Catanzaro: Not very. Usually it’s a little bit more like the conversation that Dr. Ferrence imagined. And I mean, it is the case that sabbaticals are not an entitlement, right, as a faculty collective, we are entitled to a sabbatical program, but no one of us is… actually I had two sabbatical proposals rejected back in the day. Not bitter. But the… usually it’s a conversation and people understand that there’s no one else available to fill in here, we’re down because of resignations, retirements, whatever it might be. But it’s quite unusual that, you know, convenience to the university, I’m not sure that’s the most felicitous language, but it is the case that it’s a resource allocation, and sometimes there are limits to what we can do with that. I would say it’s more common, although still not typical, that there are more applications than there are slots available. So that gives you some idea.

Senator Mainieri: The reason I asked is because I feel like that’s slightly… Not doing a sabbatical on the typical timeline for that reason is different than if I choose not to take a sabbatical. And so when I think about the… I understand the logic behind no more than once every seven years, but if I’ve been delayed three years because of number 5, right, then that’s much different than if I have on my own accord just chosen not to apply for sabbatical. I just I feel like it’s slightly different and it complicates the idea of every seven years.

Senator Kalter: I want to piggy back on that, but differ just a little bit, because sometimes I think the university structure attributes to faculty some cynical motives. In other words, we are “choosing” not to take a sabbatical as opposed to we are timing our sabbaticals for the best research outcome. And so, you can have a faculty member who starts to work on a book length project that they know it’s not going to be best to take that sabbatical seven years after their last one, it would be better to take it in the eighth year after, or the ninth year after. But then we penalize that kind of good use of university resources that, sort of, strategizing how that works. I also think that there are… You know, we are not in a university anymore that’s all male, and that there are some good reasons to sort of think about family, and the way that women’s careers sometimes can be different from men’s. That this having to wait exactly seven years because you didn’t take it right on schedule is perhaps not as family-friendly as we should be. And as you said, nobody’s entitled to a sabbatical, but making it so that people can be eligible at least to go up if for some reason they have not been able to take, you know, apply for sabbaticals or take sabbaticals, whether because of good strategy or because of what Senator Mainieri’s talking about. I think it would behoove us to really think about that and to give a little bit of room there that we could justify in the outside world.

Senator Vickers: I wonder if in an attempt to address Senator Nikolaou’s concerns if we could just add that an amendment or an addendum, rather, could be contributed at the discretion of a faculty after their sabbatical leave, particularly if they wanted to say my first submission I did submit an article, I’m waiting to hear back from the press or I’m waiting to hear back from the journal. And then they find out nine months later, oh, it did get accepted, so they could at their own discretion submit an addendum to their sabbatical report.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. I want to, considering the comments that we have from Dr. Catanzaro, I appreciate those, and I think those were spot on. I don’t think that we need additional bureaucratic processes. I think the additional reporting… the reporting is already part of the ASPT process and as a department, when I first came in, we had boxes and boxes of materials that were presented every single year and I really stand very strongly against adding another bureaucratic process to that. I think we’ve got plenty of things and that, if we have something to report, we can report that without ASPT.

Senator Meyers: I agree with that, and also I think that it gets kind of fuzzy what… what… I have a publication that came out three months after my sabbatical…

Senator Pancrazio: Or a year.

Senator Meyers: Maybe that was something I submitted before my sabbatical started. And so, you know, I think like we could make the deadline whatever we want, it’s always going to be fuzzy what was really a sabbatical product and what wasn’t. It seems to me like the important part of this report is to justify that we were doing something productive with the time, and that the ASPT process is what gives us credit for the publications.

Senator Kalter: We could have an “S” added to the annual report structure so that people could say, in other words, this project and put an “S” behind it and it would mean that I did that one during my sabbatical, now it’s coming out three years later, or something like that.

Senator Meyers: Well, in fact, Digital Measures at the College of Arts and Sciences uses that.

Senator Nikolaou: Yeah. And the main reason I mentioned the three months, it’s because of the last clause that was added, where it says, “and consideration for future sabbatical leaves.” Because, if it is three months, and I took my sabbatical because I’m writing a book, the book is not going to come out in three months. But then, if I submit the report that says, I don’t have the book, and this is the report that you are going to use to evaluate the next time I’m going to apply for the sabbatical, I’m already at a disadvantage compared to someone who used it to have a publication. That was the main reason for that one.

Senator Kalter: I’m not sure if Senator Pancrazio is about to speak to this but I’m wondering if we could take care of that in the place where we talk about proposals. A copy of the written summary report filed from the last sabbatical leave, if any, and any important addendum, or something to that affect, right. I’m not… I don’t think important addendum quite sounds correct, but something like that, and that way it only… it’s not bureaucratic because it only gets written if you apply again. But it is there to take that into consideration. Senator Pancrazio, you put your hand down.

Senator Pancrazio: Yeah. I think that Senator Crowley was talking specifically about making sure that somebody did support… did submit, from a department chair’s perspective, just as I mean that he wanted to have the evidence that the person has submitted the report, and tracking those people down, and making sure… and I think… I don’t think it was going to be used against people or comparatively. Tony, did I get that correct?

Senator Crowley: Yes, you did.

Senator Pancrazio: Thank you.

Senator Blanco-Lobo: What Senator Kalter just mentioned is precisely a point that I was trying to make before. That’s practically the second reporting that goes on.

Senator Horst: First off, I wanted to support my colleagues in their interpretation of “e”. It could be expensive to go to a foreign country or a foreign… a different city, particularly since the tax code changed. You used to be able to take a business deduction on all of that, but that’s no longer possible. So I support the idea of creating a summer salary. My one question is whether… if you get some Fulbright that would be foreign money, and it can be a matter of debate when the money that’s coming in from the Fulbright is exchanged, and especially if you’re allowed to go over the amount of your salary now, that the university might want to work with the faculty on considering when you’re going to do the exchange rate. I support Senator Ferrence with this idea that you should be flexible and not be so rigid with the seven years. And then my final question is for the criteria to be used, I’m just wondering from Sam Catanzaro what he thinks of… does he support the idea that we have a clause saying “and personal welfare”? This sentence that says, “The criteria is contribution of the sabbatical to the professional development and personal welfare of the faculty member,” do you think that’s needed material?

Dr. Catanzaro: Again I don’t know where that… I don’t know the origins of the phrase or the rationale behind it. I’m not sure I ever understood why it was important. In my opinion, I think we could eliminate that, and focus on the professional development, and the contribution that the sabbatical will make to the faculty member’s career, and work at ISU, and the contribution to the university, and the discipline. Again, I can say different people handle that in different ways in their applications and narratives about how this will make me a happier person, if you will, sometimes are in there, and I understand why because it’s very vague and I’m not sure that’s what’s critical on evaluating sabbaticals.

Senator Nikolaou: I had a smaller one, under Rationale in the second paragraph, the last sentence, where it says, “Projects shall be evaluated primarily on the basis of creative or scholarly merit and promise.” Should we mention the teaching aspect in there to be consistent with what is stated under Priority Categories? Because under Priority Categories it says, “…the first priority criterion would ordinarily be either item 1 or 2.” So it is either scholarly or teaching, improvement in performance in teaching. But then the Rationale at the beginning says that it is only about scholarly. So, these two seem to contradict each other. So that was the one thing. And then, I don’t know, because I haven’t seen ever… A sabbatical, how the sabbatical outcome looks like. So if, let’s say, I apply for a full year, and then at some point I decide that I actually need it only for one semester, is there a time period when I would need to notify, you know, the Provost or the dean, or my chair, that I just need the six months, I don’t need the whole year? So, is that something that we would need to include in the Procedures part, or is that something that when I apply and I get the letter from the Provost office that says congratulations you have been awarded, you have until then to accept or you have until that period to make any changes? Because otherwise, if we don’t have a deadline, I could say in December, oh, I don’t need the spring anymore.

Senator Kalter: Dr. Catanzaro, I think you’re thinking about that, because I think you are seeing that’s kind of directed towards you, right?

Dr. Catanzaro: And what I’m thinking about is in practice we handle requests to change from either one semester to two semesters, or vice versa, on a case by case basis. And it’s a conversation. Certainly, to my knowledge, no one has ever asked to change from a full year sabbatical to a half-year sabbatical in the middle of the year, in which case we would probably say we can’t do that now. Right. So right. So I was thinking about, if we were to set up a deadline for changes, what that would look like, because of the planning, and the budgetary issues, and if the policy were to eventually include that, I think that we would also want to think about how much we would want to say about changes in substance, and you know, our position has been as long as good quality work is being done, someone says, I propose this series of experiments, and, you know, they’re writing a proposal in August and September to be on a spring sabbatical the following academic year, it’s like an eighteen month window. In some fields something might be published in that interim that makes your proposal a complete waste of time and resources. It’s possible. I would much rather someone say, hey, I’m just going to do a different series of experiments now and sometimes I’ll get emails from people who are really worried that they’ll be in trouble, and I’m like no, do the work that needs to be done. And I don’t want people to be too constrained to miss opportunities to do better work than they proposed, if that’s what happens. So, that’s a long winded way of saying, there are two aspects to change requests, one is the timing and the budgetary planning piece which is, I think, we need to be very careful about, but we can be somewhat flexible with some advance timing. And then there’s the substantive content which… again I wouldn’t be supportive, necessarily of someone who’s proposing to do three chapters of a book and then said I want to change that to a blog post, right, to use a really dramatic example. Right. So something reasonable of the same scale but different topic perhaps, or slightly different plan. So, I think that’s an intriguing idea, and we might want to discuss a little further, and think through how that might work.

Senator Kalter: So, we’re about four minute off our hard stop time, so I’m just going to drop my last three in that time. Going back to what Senate Nikolaou had brought up about Criteria 7, I think if we don’t do away with that one, one possible thing, how we could reword it is “a longer time elapse since last sabbatical,” because I think the original purpose of that line was, if you’ve got several people in a department competing for sabbaticals, that the person waiting the longest should perhaps, if they’ve got equal merit to their sabbatical proposal, go first. So rather than getting rid of it, just make it not, so that it prevents the opposite there, if you know what I mean.

The second one was, I have a question for Sam about… And I may just drop this question, but not have you answer it, so I can go to the one that I’m bringing from Senator Ferrence, but in “a” of the Procedures, it says, “Sabbatical leaves to be granted each year should be limited to one out of every twenty-five full-time academic employee members or major fraction thereof.” So, that’s what limits the number of people, and what you said earlier about how there are more people who want them than can get them. When we look at the sabbatical report that goes to the Board of Trustees, it’s hard to understand that 1/25, because there look to be more than that in that report. So I’m just trying to figure out whether an additional wording might help in terms of public reporting and that kind of thing. And what I wrote out was “a sabbatical leave of less than nine months will be prorated in the count as less than one year and counting for the semester in which it is taken for these purposes.” In other words, a person takes a sabbatical in the fall, another person takes a sabbatical in the spring (I guess I’ve got that backwards, in terms of the visual) but that would be counted as a single year-long sabbatical and so that’s the one in twenty-five.

And then Senator Ferrence had brought something up, I think, in or after Exec last time which was that (you may be able to phrase this better) but that when you took a year-long sabbatical, it was considered by HR to be a four and a half month sabbatical and a four and a half month educational leave. So that rather than taking nine months of sabbatical, they consider it, they… in other words, you were saying they considered all sabbaticals to be half-year sabbaticals and then tacked on an educational leave, and we were trying to figure out whether getting rid of that term educational, that Senator Crowley had told us about last time, is that going to be a problem to get rid of that because the committee (Faculty Affairs Committee) may have been thinking that that was attached to the other stuff that they were crossing out about getting an advance terminal degree and all of that, but when Senator Ferrence brought that up, I thought maybe that’s why that’s in there. And so, it seems like we need to check with Janice Bonneville in HR about that piece, so that we’re not accidentally preventing ourselves from taking year-long sabbaticals. Does anyone… We’ve got how many more minutes? That’s it. So, it looks like this one is probably not coming back too quickly. We’ll see when it can be scheduled and Faculty Affairs will work on it. All right.

Senator Crowley: I just wanted to… I think I’ve taken pretty good notes here, but I know that I’ve missed some things. So, if you could send me emails about your concerns and your suggestions, then I can collect those, put them in some sort of order, and bring them back to the committee for our review. And that way I’ll know that I haven’t missed anything that you’re concerned about.

Senator Kalter: Wonderful. And we’ll also try to get that from the recording as well.

***Adjournment***

Motion by Senator Horst, seconded by Senator Ferrence, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.