**Faculty Affairs Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**April 10, 2019**

**6:00 pm**

**Roll Call:**

Chairperson Crowley (present)

Senator Baur (present)

Senator Dawson (present)

Senator Enriquez (present)

Senator Jenkins (present)

Senator Martinez (present)

Senator Pole (absent)

Senator Woody (present)

Senator Winters (absent)

**Items Discussed:**

1. **Policy 3.2.8 Item F**

Discussed and approved changes to item F

* In response to concerns of a faculty member regarding the acceptance and application of grant funding to a full-year sabbatical leave, the committee drafted and approved the following language following discussions during the March 27th meeting with Associate Provost Catanzaro and follow-up work by Catanzaro and Senator Baur.
* The approved language reads: *When an individual receives a grant (e.g., Fulbright, National Endowment, or National Science Foundation grant) that is directly related to the focus of the sabbatical project, that person may be granted sabbatical leave with pay, and may accept the grant provided the amount of such grant allocated to salary plus the amount of the salary on leave does not exceed the normal salary for the period of sabbatical. However, should the amount of the grant exceed the normal salary for the period of sabbatical, the individual may be allowed to accept some amount as summer salary with institutional approval in accordance with the requirements of the University Policy 3.2.11 Employment in Excess of Full Time Employment.*
1. **Policy 3.2.8 Item C**

The committee approved revising the proposed language to read: *A person qualifies for a leave after seven years of full-time employment and every seven years of full-time employment thereafter.*

1. **Policy 3.2.8 Item D**

Discussion points:

* Language implies that sabbaticals are an entitlement rather than a competitive opportunity. The committee must draw a distinction between the two and make it clear the sabbatical is not an entitlement.
* The language indicates that an individual can collect and later redeem sabbatical-application opportunities, which some committee members see as problematic. Could lead to abuse of system. For example, should a faculty member “bank” several application opportunities and successfully redeem them every four years, will that be seen as, or actually, favoring senior faculty over junior faculty and/or diminishing the number of sabbaticals awarded to the faculty as a whole (see “a” under Procedures)?
* Language sets a “waiting period” of four years of full-time work between sabbatical applications for those who have accrued multiple application opportunities. It is suggested that, should this section be adopted, should the “waiting period” be extended to five years to be consistent with Procedures, item “b,” which addresses credit for prior service?

No revisions to the proposed language were approved. Further discussion and revision will continue beginning in fall term, 2019. Some additional questions were raised and will be part of future discussions and include, but are not limited to:

* What impact will this have on the traditional, seven-year sabbatical period overall?
* Does the proposed change in policy favor people who have been at the University for a long time and limit opportunities for younger faculty?
* What impact would the change have on the retention of younger faculty?
* Does the language favor those individuals with particular skill at crafting proposals?
* Given the addition of new language regarding opportunities for senior faculty, should there be new language for pre-tenure leaves?