

**Marshall University College of Science**  
**Policy No. COS-Fac-03**  
**Sabbatical Leave Request**

Effective Date: December 15, 2020

Updated: January 22, 2026

## **1.0 Overview**

### **1.1 Definitions**

Per Marshall University Board of Governors Policy [MUBOG AA-1: Sabbatical Leave](#), a sabbatical leave is a merit-based professional development activity that allows faculty to enhance their potential as teachers, artists, and scholars, and thereby make additional contributions to the missions of Marshall University.

A sabbatical leave is an opportunity for a full-time faculty member to practice intellectual growth, professional development and personal renewal. A sabbatical leave, however, should distinctly add to the efficiency of the faculty member in the performance of their responsibility and clearly add to the significance of the College of Science and the university. A sabbatical is a privilege granted by the university for the advancement of the university, subject to the availability of resources.

As a condition of the approval of sabbatical leave, the faculty member shall agree to complete a comprehensive post-sabbatical report as described herein. This sabbatical report will be presented to the President of the university and may be made available to the Marshall University Board of Governors upon request.

While on sabbatical leave, a faculty member may not accept remunerative employment without the written consent of the President or their designated representative.

### **1.2 Application Forms**

**1.2.1 An applicant will initiate a request for sabbatical leave by completing the forms found at <https://www.marshall.edu/faculty-senate/sabbatical-leave/>**

- Sabbatical Routing Form,
- Sabbatical Request Form, and
- Sabbatical Leave Agreement.

**1.2.2 In addition to the completion of the required forms, the request for sabbatical leave must include a detailed project proposal. Section 2.0 Sabbatical Project Proposal Guidelines contains the details of the report**

**1.2.3 Applicants will submit all forms and a detailed project proposal to their chair to initiate the Approval Process.**

### **1.3 Review Timeline and Due Dates**

For specific due dates for sabbatical leave requests and sabbatical leave reports, see the [Marshall University Personnel Calendar](#). Here is an approximate set of due dates.

- Faculty applications to the department chair are due September 1.
- Chairs submit their recommendation to the dean September 15, who will pass the applications to college-level committee.
- The college-level committee will submit their recommendation to the dean by October 1.
- The dean will submit their recommendation to the provost/chief academic officer (CAO) by October 15, who will pass the applications to the university-level committee
- The university-level committee will submit their recommendation to the CAO by December 1.
- The CAO will submit their recommendation to the president by January 15.
- The president will issue final decisions by January 29.

## **2.0 Sabbatical Project Proposal**

The goal of the sabbatical Project Proposal is for the faculty member to clearly describe the goals and scope of the proposed Sabbatical Leave. The report will outline the activities, projects, and/or coursework to be undertaken. The proposal should articulate the anticipated outcomes of the leave and explain how the proposed work will benefit the college and/or university, as well as support the faculty member's professional development. This section provides guidelines for preparing and submitting the project proposal.

### **2.1 Project Proposal Guidelines**

**The sabbatical project proposal should address the following points and not exceed 3 pages, exclusive of references (if applicable).**

- Project Overview and Rationale
  - Overview / abstract of the project
  - Justification for sabbatical leave: explain why the work requires dedicated sabbatical time and cannot reasonably be accomplished as part of regular contractual obligations
- Expected Outcomes and Deliverables
  - List of anticipated outcomes
  - Dissemination plan, such as publications, presentations, grants, curriculum
- Impact, Qualifications, and Work Plan

- Institutional and professional impact: describe how the leave will enhance scholarly or professional capacity and benefit the university's teaching, research, service, or outreach missions.
- Applicant qualifications and prior results, including relevant preliminary work or progress to date: describe relevant background, prior sabbatical outcomes, peer-reviewed scholarship, grants, or related evidence.
- Work plan and location(s): describe where and how the work will be conducted during the leave period.

### **3.0 Approval Process**

#### **3.1 Considerations for Approval**

To be approved for a sabbatical leave, the following will be considered at each level of the approval process:

- Ability to cover required course offerings and service responsibilities in the department
  - Approval of a sabbatical is contingent upon the department's ability to provide such coverage.
- Value of the sabbatical to the individual, including its contribution to the individual's effectiveness in performing professional responsibilities and its impact on the applicant's professional stature.
- Value of the sabbatical leave to the University, college, department, and students
- Urgency of need for sabbatical leave
- Length of time since last sabbatical
- Track record of productivity and follow through on prior projects

#### **3.2 Chair Approval**

The chair will be required to provide a written recommendation for each sabbatical leave request which addresses the following points:

- Ability of the department to cover the applicant's teaching and service responsibilities
  - Approval of a sabbatical is contingent upon the department's ability to provide such coverage.
  - Requests for which the department cannot provide adequate coverage of teaching and service obligations should be designated Not Viable for the Current Academic Year and no further reviews are required.
- Overall merits and special strengths of the proposal

The chair will be required to provide a ranking of requests with rationale for all sabbatical requests to inform the college committee's review and ranking.

- When multiple requests are submitted, the chair should first determine whether the requests can be accommodated through staggering leaves across semesters and/or through available reassigned time or adjunct resources.
- The chair must rank the requests and submit the ranked list with the applications.

### **3.3 College-level Committee Ranking and Recommendations**

The college-level committee will review sabbatical leave requests and provide a written recommendation based on the merits of the proposal. The committee's recommendation may be provided in summary form and will include

- A ranking of the requests
- A short justification supporting the assessment

If the department review evaluates an application as Not Viable for the Current Academic Year, no college level review is required.

### **3.4 Dean Approval**

The dean will provide a written recommendation for each sabbatical leave request which addresses the following points:

- Merits of the proposal, including areas of special strengths of the proposed sabbatical

A ranking of the applications relative to other applications that are viable for the current academic year.

If the department review evaluates an application as Not Viable for the Current Academic Year, no dean level review is required.

## **4.0 Conditions of Approval**

### **4.1 If approved, the faculty member will be required to submit a detailed post-sabbatical leave report after completing their sabbatical, for the purpose of demonstrating the achievement of the goals of the sabbatical leave.**

The report shall reflect the activities accomplished and is the tangible outcome that demonstrates that there was a direct benefit to the college and/or university and to the individual's professional development. Section 5.0 Post-leave Report Guidelines contains the details of the report.

### **4.2 Changes to Approved Sabbatical Plans**

If substantive changes to an approved sabbatical plan become necessary (e.g., changes in scope, location, or timing), the faculty member must request approval in writing to their chair

and the dean. Any approved changes will be documented in written correspondence and included with the post-sabbatical leave report.

## **5.0 Post Sabbatical Report**

The goal of the Post Sabbatical Report is for the faculty member to demonstrate the achievement of the goals of the Sabbatical Leave. The report will reflect the activities, projects and/or course work accomplished. This report is the tangible outcome which validates the direct benefit to the college, and/or university, and to the individual's professional development. This section provides guidelines for preparing and submitting the post sabbatical report.

Failure to comply with the stated deadline in the University's Personnel Calendar will require a request for an extension from Academic Affairs prior to the missed deadline, with an explanation for the delay and an estimated time of completion. A failure to submit an adequate report may affect eligibility for future sabbaticals and other similar programs.

## **5.2 Post-leave Report Guidelines**

**The post-leave report should address the following points. The narrative section should not exceed 3 pages, exclusive of references (if applicable).**

- Sabbatical Leave Proposal Documents
  - The original sabbatical leave proposal
  - Any written requests and approvals for changes to the original proposal
- Narrative (3 page maximum), describing the work completed during the sabbatical following the structure of the approved proposal. Address how the sabbatical activities and outcomes aligned with those originally proposed.
- Tangible Items resulting from the sabbatical work, including but not limited to books, grant submissions, articles, course-of-study outlines, sample screen printouts, creative endeavors, transcripts of grades, degrees, photographs, specimens, and/or other relevant materials

## **5.3 Post-sabbatical Report Review Process**

**5.3.1 Applicants will submit a post-leave sabbatical report to their chair for review and approval.**

5.3.2 The chair will read and evaluate the post sabbatical leave report using the review form in Appendix A. If a post-sabbatical report does not adequately address the required elements, the faculty member will be notified and provided an opportunity to revise and resubmit the report.

### **5.3.3 After approval by the chair, the post-sabbatical report will be submitted to the Dean, Chief Academic Officer, and President.**

## **5.4 Due Dates**

Post-leave reports are due 30 days following the sabbatical leave. Here is an approximate set of due dates.

- Faculty taking sabbatical leave in Fall – report is due to the chair February 15.
- Faculty taking sabbatical leave in Spring – report is due to the chair September 15.

## **6.0 Evaluation Rubrics**

### **6.1 Sabbatical Leave Proposal Evaluation Rubric**

Sabbatical leave proposals will be assessed using both quantitative and qualitative review.

Feasibility and Department Coverage

- Can the department reasonably cover the applicant’s teaching and service responsibilities during the leave?
  - Requests for which the department cannot provide adequate coverage of teaching and service obligations should be designated Not Viable for the Current Academic Year and will not proceed to further review.

Reviewers will assign a score (1–5) and provide a written justification for each criterion:

- Objectives, Feasibility, and Resources
  - Are the goals of the sabbatical clearly stated and coherent?
  - Is the project realistically achievable within the proposed timeline?
  - Does the applicant have a strong track record of productivity and follow-through on prior projects?
- Scholarly Impact and Institutional Value
  - Does the project promise significant scholarly or creative contributions (e.g., publications, grant applications, innovations, curricula)?
  - Does the project provide clear value to the University, college, department, individual, and students?

Benchmark descriptors for each criterion are defined in Appendix A.

### **6.2 Post-leave Report Evaluation Rubric**

Sabbatical leave proposals will be assessed using both quantitative and qualitative review.

Reviewers will assign a score (1–5) and provide a written justification for each criterion:

- Objectives, Feasibility, and Resources

- Were the stated goals substantially achieved, exceeded, or adapted with clear justification?
- Scholarly Impact and Applicant Record
  - What tangible outcomes were produced (publications, grant submissions, innovations, curricula)?
  - Do outcomes demonstrate value to the University, college, department, individual, and students?
  - Does the report reflect on the applicant's scholarly growth and continued trajectory?

Benchmark descriptors for each criterion are defined in Appendix A.

## **Appendix A**

### **Evaluation Metrics, Rubrics, Descriptors**

#### **A1. Sabbatical Request Evaluation Metrics**

##### **A1.1 Department Coverage**

- Can the department reasonably cover the applicant's teaching and service responsibilities during the leave without undue burden on colleagues or students?
  - Requests for which the department cannot provide adequate coverage of teaching and service obligations should be designated Not Viable for the Current Academic Year and require no further review.

##### **A1.2 Benchmark Descriptors**

###### **A1.2.1 Objectives, Feasibility, and Resources**

- 5 – Excellent: Goals are clear, specific, and coherent; timeline is realistic and detailed
- 4 – Strong: Goals are mostly clear; timeline is feasible with minor gaps
- 3 – Adequate: Goals are somewhat clear; timeline is achievable but vague;
- 2 – Weak: Goals are vague or overly ambitious; timeline is unrealistic or poorly developed
- 1 – Poor: Goals unclear or missing; timeline unfeasible or absent

###### **A1.2.2 Scholarly Impact and Institutional Value**

- 5 – Excellent: Project promises high-impact scholarly or creative contributions and provides clear, direct value to the University, department, college, individual, and students.
- 4 – Strong: Project likely to result in meaningful contributions and moderate value to the University, department, college, individual, and students.

3 – Adequate: Project may yield modest contributions or benefits, but scope or impact is limited or unclear.

2 – Weak: Contributions are poorly defined; minimal or indirect benefit to the University, department, college, individual, and students.

1 – Poor: Project lacks scholarly or creative merit and provides little or no institutional value.

## **A2. Post-Leave Report Evaluation Metrics**

### **A2.1 Benchmark Descriptors**

#### **A2.1.1. Objectives, Feasibility, and Resources**

5 – Excellent: All stated goals fully achieved or exceeded; any changes clearly justified.

4 – Strong: Most goals achieved with only minor gaps; adjustments well explained.

3 – Adequate: Some goals achieved, but important objectives only partially met.

2 – Weak: Few goals achieved; major objectives unmet or not well explained.

1 – Poor: Goals largely unachieved or absent; no justification for changes.

#### **A2.1.2. Scholarly Impact and Applicant Record**

5 – Excellent: Produced high-impact, tangible outcomes (publications, grants, innovations) with clear, significant value to the University, department, college, individual, and students. Report demonstrates strong scholarly growth and clear future trajectory.

4 – Strong: Produced meaningful outcomes with evident value to the University, department, college, individual, and students. Report reflects continuing scholarly development.

3 – Adequate: Produced modest outcomes with some value demonstrated. Report shows limited evidence of scholarly growth or future trajectory.

2 – Weak: Outcomes are minimal, unclear, or of limited impact. Report provides little reflection on scholarly development or future work.

1 – Poor: No tangible outcomes produced; report fails to demonstrate value, growth, or continued trajectory.

## College of Science Summary Rubric Evaluation for Sabbatical Application

Name and MUID: \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Sabbatical Semester(s): \_\_\_\_\_

### Chair Feasibility Certification (Required)

The department has resources available to cover the teaching and service responsibilities

- \_\_\_ YES – please complete the rubric below and attach a written chair evaluation.
- \_\_\_ NO – the application is not viable for the current academic year. No other evaluations are necessary.

### Evaluation Criteria (Score each criterion 1-5 if supported at that level)

Criterion	Chair	Committee	Dean
Objectives, Feasibility, and Resources			
Scholarly Impact and Institutional Value			

### Recommendations and Ranking

Only applications supported at a given level are ranked.

#### Chair

Supported under MUBOG AA-1 and COS-Fac-03 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Rank \_\_\_ out of \_\_\_ supported applications from the department.

#### College Committee

Completion of this rubric constitutes the written recommendation at the committee level.

Supported under MUBOG AA-1 and COS-Fac-03 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Rank \_\_\_ out of \_\_\_ supported applications from the college.

#### Dean

Supported under MUBOG AA-1 and COS-Fac-03 Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_

Final rank \_\_\_ out of \_\_\_ supported applications from the college.