**Criteria for Review and Evaluation by the   
Sabbatical Proposal Review Committee**

The following criteria will be used during the review process. Criterion #1 will be the most important. Criteria #2-5 will be weighted equally.

1. Overall quality. Is the proposal well conceived? Considerations should include clarity, thoroughness, and organization. Are the goals stated clearly and are they understandable by a general audience? Is this a substantial project meriting the leave time requested? Is the methodology clear, precise and well-planned? Does the author make explicit connections to appropriate scholarship? Is there consistency between the project focus, goals, methodology and scholarship?
2. Relationship of the proposed activity to the plans and/or goals of the department, the university, and the system. Does the proposal make explicit, relevant and demonstrable connections to the plans and goals of the department, the university, the UW, and the Board of Regents ? (See section 4 of the [UW System Policy](https://www.wisconsin.edu/uw-policies/uw-system-administrative-policies/the-faculty-sabbatical-program/#policy), and the “Policy Statement” section of the [Regents Policy](https://www.wisconsin.edu/regents/policies/sabbatical-leave-program-for-instructional-faculty/).) The system policy states that “the purpose of the faculty sabbatical program is to enable recipients to be engaged in intensive study in order to become more effective teachers and scholars and to enhance their services to the University”. The regents policy states “as required under s. 36.11(17), Wis. Stats., sabbatical leave shall be limited to the following purposes: (1) enhancing teaching, course and curriculum development; or (2) conducting research or any other scholarly activities related to instructional programs within the field of expertise of the faculty member taking such leave.
3. Significance. How significant are the potential contributions of the project to the candidate’s discipline, in terms of (a) the development of teaching and student learning; (b) contributions to scholarship; (c) contributions to service? The proposal should make explicit, relevant, and demonstrable connections to area (a). *(Note: This criterion does not rule out proposals that focus on issues other than teaching. Proposals that address research in the applicant’s area of expertise are encouraged, however, a connection between the applicant’s research interests and teaching responsibilities must be established.)*
4. Potential of the project to enhance the applicant’s overall effectiveness as a teacher/scholar. How well do the proposed activities mesh with the applicant’s long-term professional plans and accomplishments? How well do the proposed activities mesh with the applicant’s ongoing contributions to teaching and student learning?
5. Feasibility: Does the applicant have the background and expertise necessary to carry out the proposed activity within the time lines indicated in the proposal? How do the final reports of any previous sabbatical leaves by the applicant match with the proposals for those sabbatical leaves?
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