

Senate Document SD 24-21  
Expired

MEMORANDUM

TO: Fort Wayne Senate

FROM: Cigdem Gurgur, Chair  
Senate Executive Committee

DATE: 02/25/2025

SUBJ: Amendments to the Sabbatical Policy SD 22-7

---

WHEREAS, the current Sabbatical Policy specified in SD 22-7 assumes the existence of a Professional Development Subcommittee, which has since ceased to exist (due to the April 2024 revision of the Bylaws); and

WHEREAS, it has placed an undue burden on the reviewing committee to write detailed and individualized explanations for rejected applications even if applicants simply failed to follow applicable guidelines;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Fort Wayne Senate approves of the proposed amendments as shown in the color-coded text below.

“Before being evaluated by the ~~Professional Development Subcommittee~~ Review Committee as specified in the Bylaws, applications for sabbatical leave must have been reviewed to ensure that the applications meet the guidelines specified in this document by appropriate administrators (chair/dean or director). A departmental or division faculty committee (e.g., the Promotion and Tenure or Personnel Committee) must make a written recommendation about sabbatical applications to the appropriate administrator at that level, which must factor into ~~PDS’s~~ the Review Committee’s evaluation process. The administrator will consider this recommendation in his or her own recommendation that is forwarded to the next level.”

“The ~~Professional Development Subcommittee~~ Review Committee is responsible for recommendations to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs regarding sabbatical leave applications. The ~~Professional Development Subcommittee~~ Review Committee should follow only this document and department criteria in evaluating sabbatical applications.

“~~PDS~~ The Review Committee operates as an independent faculty committee. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs makes final decisions regarding sabbatical leave applications. Process questions should be brought to Faculty Affairs Committee for guidance. Denied applications should be given clear and individualized explanations for the rejection of their applications, which may be unceremonious and brief in case guidelines were not followed, with an opportunity to respond.”  
(SD 22-7, pp. 1–2)

Approved	Opposed	Abstention	Absent	Non-Voting
Kristen Barker				Craig Ortsey
Bernd Buldt				
Cigdem Gurgur				
Jay Johns				
James McHann				
Jeff Nowak				
Lee Roberts				