

Joint Faculty/Staff/GPSA Budget Proposal

President Schmidly and Board of Regents,

The leadership of the faculty, staff and graduate students appreciate the difficult position the university now finds itself in, with recently tightening state revenue and bleak prospects in the coming months and perhaps years. As we have done in the past several years, we have sat together to make a joint proposal for your consideration.

Before we continue, a disclaimer: since we were not directly involved in discussions that developed the recommendations sent to the president, our base assumptions will be drawn from second-hand information - that is, we will assume that figures presented in the documents submitted to the president and provost are mostly valid, except where we note below.

In summary, we are pleased with the recommendations of the President's Task Force in general, and will draw mostly upon these for our recommendations. We are mostly dis-pleased with the proposals from the Provost's office, and reject several of these below with justification. The deans' submissions are mostly given without dollar figures, but the generalities of these proposals are supported in our recommendations. Several of the proposed budget reductions are discussed separately below. Finally, the EVP for administration's submissions have dollar figures, but are without supporting documents, so we find it difficult to comment on these proposals.

Recommendation	Estimated Total Amount to be Saved	Estimated I&G Savings	FS	SC	GPSA
Cell Phone Stipend	\$300,000	\$90,000	Yes	Yes	
Evaluate Reducing Reliance on I&G Funds for Intercollegiate Athletics	Potential = \$975,053 (the full amount of current I&G support)	\$975,053	Yes	Yes	
Consolidations of UNM Email and Calendaring Systems	\$854,991 to \$3,419,000	\$256,497 to \$1,025,700	Yes	Yes, but see short term cost increase and few long	

				term savings	
Central IT Desktop Image	\$90,000 to \$180,000	\$115,000	Neutral	Neutral	
Move the UNM Telephone System from analog to VOIP	\$1,000,000	\$300,000	Yes	Yes, but see no immediate cost savings	
Standardize University Edge Network Devices	\$1,386,000	\$415,000	Yes	Yes, but has an upfront cost	
Evaluate Long-term Care Insurance	\$560,000	\$185,000	No	No	
Explore Tuition Remission for Continuing Education	\$1,000,000	\$300,000	Neutral	No	
Administrative Fees from Revenue Producing Units	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	Yes	No – shifts costs, doesn't save money	
Continued Reduction of I&G Support for Extended University	\$300,000 (in addition to \$300,000 saved in FY11)	\$600,000	Yes	Yes	
Evaluate I&G Support for Alumni Relations	TBD, knowing that \$733,040 is the full amount of I&G support currently given)	\$733,040	Yes	Yes	

Evaluate a Reduction in Stop-loss Insurance	\$500,000	\$165,000	Yes	Yes	
Explore a Buyout of the Energy Educators Inc. Contract	TBD	\$2,400,000	Yes	Yes, but contract buyout not likely. Contract is tight.	
Explore Creation of a Marketing and Communications "Service Center"	TBD	TBD	Neutral	No	
Explore Merging Office of Graduate Studies with the Office of the Vice President for Research	TBD	TBD	Yes	Yes	
Evaluate Structure of the Office of Equity and Inclusion	TBD	TBD	Yes	Yes	
Explore Consolidation of Offices of Student Affairs, Enrollment Management, and Equity and Inclusion	TBD	TBD	Yes	Yes	
UNM Foundation's Continued Reduction of Reliance on I&G Funds	Potentially \$1,493,000	\$1,493,000	Yes	Yes	
Negotiate Accounts Payable Terms	\$173,184	\$51,950	Yes	Yes- discount should go back to the	

				department	
Post Capital Project Blueprints & Project Manuals in .pdf Format	\$315,000	\$0 (Savings realized in capital funding)	Yes	Yes	
Eliminate Bottled & Water Cooler Water	\$83,000	\$14,940	Yes	Yes	
Obtain Furniture Quotes	\$198,532	\$59,560	Yes	Yes	
Negotiated Dell Contract Pricing	\$1,000,000	\$300,000	Yes	Yes – already in place	
Shift Printing from Desktop Printers to Copier Fleet	\$280,000	\$84,000	Neutral	No	
Microsoft Campus Licensing Agreement	\$1,000,000	\$300,000	Yes	Yes- already in place	
Benefits Dependent Audit	\$500,000	\$165,000	Yes	Yes	
Contributions to Educational Retirement Board	\$360,000	\$160,000	Yes	Yes	
Hold Staff Positions for Two Months	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	No	No	
Academic Program Review Operating Budget	\$20,000	\$20,000	No	Yes	
Provost Office Reorganization	\$70,000	\$70,000	Yes	Yes	
Freshman Family Day Budget	\$40,000	\$40,000	Yes	Yes	

Extended University's Reduction in I&G Allocation	\$300,000	\$300,000	Yes	Yes	
Elimination of Paper Flyers	TBD	TBD (Recurring)	Yes	Yes	
Reduced Frequency of Office Cleaning	\$269,532	\$269,532	Yes	Yes	
UNM Foundation's Reduction of Reliance on I&G Funds	\$200,000	\$200,000	Yes	Yes	

Elimination of one-semester sabbaticals

The Provost's proposal to eliminate one-semester sabbaticals, with the idea that it will force people to choose full-year sabbaticals at 2/3 pay is one of the most troubling proposals to come from this administration. Not only does it not recognize the value-added to the institution during the sabbaticals, but it over-estimates the cost *and* potential savings to the university, while at the same time not acknowledging the financial *benefit* to the university through increased revenues from research grants developed during sabbaticals.

Both the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee and Faculty Senate have passed resolutions opposing any changes to the sabbatical policy. The text of the AF&T resolution is:

AF&T has concluded that Faculty Handbook Policy C200 cannot be abrogated by administrative fiat. If the administration wants to invoke financial exigency, AF&T does not believe that the financial exigency allows this step, and, on available evidence, the cost saving would be negligible and the cost to the mission would be significant.

The text of the Faculty Senate resolution is:

Whereas the University of New Mexico is a Carnegie Research Extensive university, and

Whereas one of the three main goals of the University of New Mexico is high quality research and other scholarly creation, and

Whereas sabbaticals play a vital role in the research and creative works mission of the institution, therefore,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends the University of New Mexico make no changes to the Sabbatical Leave Policy and its implementation.

At the end of this document, we attach an analysis done by the College of Arts and Sciences, as well as a nice analysis of the purpose, history and benefits of sabbatical leave in general.

Pause and Hold

A great faculty cannot function well without a great staff as support. We believe that the continued use of the pause and hold strategy, originally proposed as a short-term tactic to help with budget shortfalls, is no longer in the best interest of the institution. Many staff are overworked and most are underpaid for their baseline job descriptions, let alone the additional tasks that have fallen on them due to understaffing.

Additionally, faculty are now being tasked with more and more administrative duties, mostly as a result of mandates from upper administration, but which can no longer be delegated to staff because of the current stresses.

Rather than a pause and hold, we support the idea of more local decision making as to where and how staff shortages can be resolved. In some cases, vacancies in one area of a unit could be permanently "paused", moved to another area of a unit, or rehired immediately because of need. These decisions are best left as local as possible.

Athletics

We appreciate greatly the Strategic Team's recommendation for reducing the I&G allocation to athletics. However, this will have no impact on the classroom if I&G money is just replaced by other funds that would normally go to instruction or other mission critical units. What needs to be reduced is the total allocated funds to athletics, including non-I&G sources.

Centralization of IT and Service Centers

The idea of service centers only makes sense in the case for smaller departments without resources to hire additional FTE staff, as a means to pool resources across units. Again, decreased service is not the same as increased efficiency.

Significant changes to university organizational structures are worth considering, but should be approached very carefully with lots of input from affected groups. In some cases, the centralization of IT staff and the creation of administrative service centers could result in improved or stable service as well as gains in efficiency.

If centralized IT can remain as reactive and supportive of department needs as the department IT personnel, then it makes sense. If not, then this is not an increased efficiency, but a reduced service, which, again, will impact productivity of the faculty and staff in departments. Any major restructuring would have considerable upfront costs for relocating staff, remodeling offices, productivity downtime, and disruption to existing processes, so this is not a decision that should be considered lightly. Definition of Service and Service Level Agreements would have to be completed in advance of any major restructuring to ensure continuity of service and quality.

APR Budget Cut

As the university moves forward in bleak economic times, it makes little sense to cut the budget for a unit that adds important information about productivity, vitality and future prospects of units. We believe that the Academic Program Review should play an important role in the decision making process of the Provost's office, and should therefore be supported at its current budget.

Faculty Senate and Staff Council Budgets

We have eliminated the use of Faculty Senate and Staff Council funds to provide fruit, cold veggies and drinks at our monthly faculty senate meetings in order to help meet the budget shortfall. We would hope that similar cuts to perks given to upper administrators be considered.

Appendices

College of Arts and Sciences Analysis of Sabbatical Leave Issue

College of Arts and Sciences

Adjustment of approvals for faculty sabbatical leaves

January 28, 2010

Provost's Proposal

Savings assumptions were the following: using the 2008/2009 sabbatical data, savings from those faculty who elected 2/3rds pay was \$550,000. There were a total of 76 participants, we assumed that each of the 76 participants would need 2 replacement courses at \$3,400 each which calculates to a cost of \$516,000, for a net savings of approximately \$33,000. If we assume all faculty took 2/3rds pay, savings would be \$2.2 million and we assumed 4 replacement courses at \$3,400 for all 76 participants for a cost of \$684,000 for a net savings of approximately \$1.2 million.

Comment

We feel it necessary to point out that the UNM *Faculty Handbook* stipulates that there should be no costs to instructional budgets from the approval of sabbatical leaves. As Sec. C200-5 states:

As a general rule, the regular faculty members of the department concerned will be expected to absorb the teaching load of the individual on leave, and the departmental chairperson (or the dean in non-departmentalized colleges) shall present with each recommendation for sabbatical a statement of the planning in this regard. A department may, for example, decide to alternate courses or to cancel certain offerings. Further, it is expected that the department shall prepare its program over a period of years so that essential courses need not be neglected because of the temporary absence of a member of the staff.

In essence, this means that department chairs are not to apply for PTI funds in order to cover courses vacated by faculty on sabbatical. Of course, hidden costs are probably inevitable as departments shift their faculty members around to cover vacated courses.

Strengths

The primary strength of the proposal is to suggest a method of gaining absolute savings for Academic Affairs.

Weaknesses

1. Under-estimation of the number of faculty who would opt for a full-year sabbatical

It is not self evident that all faculty members who would normally desire a semester sabbatical only in a given year would elect to take a full-year sabbatical at two-thirds of their salary if the semester sabbatical were not an option. While we in the College do not have systematic data on this, it is reasonable to expect that very few, if any, faculty members not able to have a semester off would actually apply for the full-year sabbatical. The reasons are economic. Since one-third represents a major salary reduction, the chances are strong that all but the most highly paid senior faculty members, or those who could obtain external funding, would opt for it. Indeed, at least half of those who apply for full-year sabbaticals in the College indicate a plan for having their one-third reduction covered by a grant of some kind.

2. Discriminatory effects

It is important to note that sources of external (foundation) support to supplement sabbatical leaves are quite rare for, and in many cases not available to, faculty members in the humanities and social sciences. The policy of making only 1-year sabbaticals available will prove discriminatory to faculty members in these disciplinary clusters.

3. The actual level of savings to expect from a pause on the traditional allowance of sabbatical leaves

If our assumption that "few if any" one-semester applicants would assume a two-thirds reduction in salary holds, it would then reduce the actual savings to be expected from the model. We in the College have been examining the list of applicants for sabbaticals in Fall 2010, Fall-Spring 2010-11, and we have estimated the figures for Spring 2011 with full pay and Spring-Fall 2010-11 with full pay. As you can see in the table attached to this memo, the total basic savings on 29 full-year sabbaticals is \$343,589. Assuming a few more applications for a full-year sabbatical from faculty who would otherwise want the one-semester option would improve the savings marginally.

While this represents an important savings for the College to be able to address salary costs that arise in course of the fiscal year (counter offers, chair SACs, etc.), it appears less significant from an institutional savings standpoint.

Parenthetically, and for illustrative purposes, we have also calculated the cost-savings ratio in relation to the entire field of one-semester and two-semester applications assuming a cost per course of \$3400. As you can see, this analysis shows a total savings comes to \$3,589.

4. The forfeiture of significant research monies

Among those who would be prevented from taking a one-semester leave are faculty members who would use their sabbatical to finalize and submit a significant research grant. Every year, the College of Arts & Sciences has a number of such faculty. The University could well lose millions of research dollars if they are not permitted the time to fully develop their research capabilities.

5. The cost to faculty relations

As we all know, faculty morale is at an all-time low in these difficult economic times. An alteration of the traditional one-semester sabbatical may well be taken by them as an arbitrary lifting of a well-deserved perquisite, further undermining positive faculty attitudes toward the University's administration and their commitment to the institution's core mission and goals.

College Recommendation

Given the preponderance of weaknesses to strengths, the College of Arts & Sciences recommends that the proposal not be implemented. In particular, the probable negative impact on faculty morale far outweighs the savings that would be gained from the policy, especially if our assumption is correct, that the savings are significantly less than the model assumes.

Paper on Sabbatical Leave

This chapter focuses on the role of the sabbatical leave in the development, satisfaction, and productivity of faculty in postsecondary institutions. An examination of the origin, definition, purposes, and outcomes of sabbatical leaves reviewed in the literature clarifies the role and benefits of the sabbatical leave.

The Role and Benefits of the Sabbatical Leave in Faculty Development and Satisfaction

Celina M. Sima

The very first sabbatical leave was offered at Harvard University by President Charles Elliot in 1880 (Eells and Hollins, 1962). Elliot made this first sabbatical offer of every seventh year off in an attempt to lure a scholar away from Johns Hopkins University. Since that time, sabbatical leaves have continued as a cherished part of academic life. Since the mid-1990s, the discussion of faculty productivity has become commonplace and a considerable portion of the debate has been focused on sabbatical policy. College and university trustees, state legislators, and the public have questioned the role and benefit of the sabbatical leave. Within the context of this tension between academic culture and public concern for accountability, this chapter reviews the relationship between the roles and benefits of sabbatical leave and the development and satisfaction of the members of college and university faculty.

Understanding the Tension

The controversy surrounding sabbatical leaves begins with the historical roots of the term *sabbatical*. Bruce A. Kimball (1978) has traced the origin of the sabbatical to the ancient Hebrew Sabbath and the sabbatical year. In an article entitled "The Origin of the Sabbath and Its Legacy to the Modern Sabbatical," Kimball explains in some detail the connection between the biblical reference to the day of rest and the practice of sabbatical leave within academe.

Many articles and books on the topic of sabbatical leaves include a discussion of the connection between the biblical reference and current sabbatical policy and practice (Kimball, 1978; Tiedje and Collins, 1996; Zahorski, 1994). These references to the day of rest or the year to allow the fields to lie fallow shed some light on the popular belief that the sabbatical leave provides only the opportunity for faculty to rest and relax. This type of popular public perception was manifested in a 1994 sabbatical decision in Colorado that ultimately led to a serious threat to sabbatical leaves in the entire state. Kit Lively (1994) reported that a powerful legislator introduced a bill to regulate faculty sabbaticals and abolish administrative leaves. This action arose from news that a leave was granted to a highly paid administrator who was stepping down from his position. He used the leave time to retool by reading Aristotle and Shakespeare in order to reactivate his sense of scholarship. James E. Sultan Jr., the senior academic officer for the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, stated that while this sabbatical request would not be interpreted as a vacation to those in academe, it read like that to the general public. Lively reported that the public reaction to this report was swift and indignant. Consequently, the chancellor of the Colorado Springs campus withdrew his approval of the sabbatical leave. That 1994 incident ultimately tightened the sabbatical leave policy and procedures in Colorado and sparked further discussion and review across the country.

Not only the public and their legislative representatives but also the college or university granting the sabbatical leave expect the sabbatical to be a productive endeavor. Thus, faculty members shoulder the burden of proving that their sabbatical leave will bring benefits to the college, their discipline, or the population in general. A 1962 (Eells and Hollins) examination of sabbatical policy revealed that within academe this type of leave carries an expectation that the time away from the campus will yield significant benefits to the campus in research productivity, improved teaching, or to a lesser degree, increased service to the campus. These findings are supported by a number of researchers who have reported on sabbatical policy and practice since that early study was conducted (Boening and Miller, 1997; Sima and Denton, 1995; Tiedje and Collins, 1996; Zahorski, 1994). It is clear that the goals of the public, academic institutions, and faculty members are far more similar than the controversy would imply. It is equally obvious that those in academe must inform the public about the definitions, purposes, and the expected and actual outcomes of the faculty sabbatical leave.

The Definition and Purpose of the Sabbatical Leave

In *The Sabbatical Mentor*, Zahorski (1994) provides both a traditional definition of the sabbatical leave as well as suggestions for additional characteristics to make it more contemporary. He begins with Carter Good's (1959) definition: "[The sabbatical leave is] a plan for providing teachers with an opportunity for self-improvement through a leave of absence with full or partial compensation following a designated number of years of consecutive service (originally after six years)" (p. 424). Zahorski adds that faculty must be required to return to service after the leave and must file a sabbatical report. Although specific university policies may differ, the definitions found in literature of the last decade generally conform to the hybrid definition set forth by Good and Zahorski. Together, Good and Zahorski provide a definition that conveys the serious nature of the sabbatical leave. During the leave, some sort of faculty development is expected. Such compensation is only granted after a number of years of service to the institution. A report of activities must be filed after the sabbatical leave is complete to address productivity concerns. Further, the faculty member is expected to return to service after completing the sabbatical leave.

Despite the high degree of agreement on the definition of sabbatical leaves, there is less agreement regarding its purposes. Zahorski identified four purposes drawn from institutional policy statements: to provide opportunity for scholarly enrichment, to improve teaching, to promote course and curriculum development, and to enhance artistic performance and creative growth. Overall he stated that the "function of sabbatical leave is to stimulate a faculty member's professional, personal, and creative growth" (1994, p. 8).

A recent study (Sima and Denton, 1995) reported eight purposes for which sabbatical leave might be granted: to conduct research, to engage in uninterrupted study, to write journal articles or a book, to enhance artistic performance and creative growth, to improve teaching, to promote course and curriculum development, for refreshment, to provide new experiences and travel, and to complete graduate work (Bowen and Schuster, 1986; Daugherty, 1979; Ingraham and Kingt, 1965; Rudolph, 1990; Zahorski, 1994).

A pilot test using this list of sabbatical purposes conducted with responses from faculty who had written their sabbatical plans revealed even further specificity in their purpose statements. Their primary anticipated

activities included the following: to learn a new technique, to develop their research, to conduct research, to study, to write, to conduct reviews or create art work, and to develop courses or curricula.

In a study of the sabbatical leave among nursing faculty, Tiedje and Collins (1996) connected the discussion of the purpose and the process of sabbatical indicating that the obsolescence of people and ideas is a constant threat. They viewed the sabbatical leave as an opportunity for faculty to study at other institutions or to focus on self-study closer to home. They also reported on the sabbatical as providing a chance to learn something new, whether in a scientific laboratory or a more practitioner-oriented survey research center. Finally, they suggested that the opportunity for new collaborative grant-writing efforts or less tangible consultations with others in related fields might lead to new perspectives or ideas.

Sarason (1990) focused on another purpose of the sabbatical leave: a shift in the balance of faculty responsibilities. He reported that the purpose of the sabbatical is to “free the person from all teaching and administrative responsibilities and to encourage him or her to review past accomplishments, or to take stock, or to move in new directions. or to go somewhere to learn something new. . . . The sabbatical is not a gift from the university. It is recognition that there has to be a time when you can take distance from your accustomed routine so that when you return there will be an infusion of new energy and new ideas” (p. 138).

While the purposes for sabbatical leaves may differ from one campus to another and from one individual faculty member to another, it appears that university administrators and faculty members agree that the leave period should have a clear purpose and should result in outcomes that are of long-range benefit to the university. Moreover, the sabbatical leave should be productive and important from the faculty member’s own viewpoint.

Who Is Eligible, and How Many Faculty Take Sabbatical Leaves?

Eligibility for a sabbatical leave differs from one institution to another, but generally a faculty member is eligible after six years of uninterrupted service to the university. Sabbatical leaves are most often granted after the faculty member has attained tenure. Zahorski (1994) points out an emerging trend of sabbatical leaves being granted to junior faculty after only two to three years of service. This policy may prove to support the successful attainment of tenure, particularly in institutions where the attainment of strong records specifically of research is highly desirable.

In a recent edition of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Robin Wilson (1999) reported that while “the number of professors on sabbatical in a given year varies from campus to campus, at public universities the proportion typically hovers around 5 percent,” while it is much larger at private elite institutions. Wilson illustrated this point by using Swarthmore College as an example. At Swarthmore, as many as 20 percent of the 160 full-time faculty members may be on sabbatical leaves each year. Wilson’s findings are also consistent with the Sima and Denton (1995) study of a public research university which found that on average, over a given three-year period, 3.8 percent of the faculty go on sabbatical leaves each year. Approximately half of the faculty in the study indicated that some proportion of their sabbatical would involve travel outside of the state or outside of the country.

Why Is the Sabbatical Leave Particularly Important in the Academic Setting?

What unique characteristics of academe make a sabbatical leave an important element of college and university life? While no empirical data is available regarding the relative importance of sabbatical leaves in academe versus other settings, there is much anecdotal discussion. The typical faculty member begins to prepare for research, teaching, and service responsibilities during graduate school. The subject matter that is studied in the graduate program provides the base for research and teaching assistantships. The newly minted Ph.D. enters the job market with a cutting-edge understanding of the literature and the scholarly discourse surrounding that literature. That information provides the foundation for course development and for research projects and grants. As the years pass, faculty must work hard to keep up with the emerging literature as they carry out the duties and responsibilities of their positions. This leaves little time to respond to significant shifts in the discipline, their program of research, or the curriculum. In part because of the success of academe in pushing forward on research frontiers, research programs can shift dramatically. Promising findings, while highly desirable, can result in a particular line of research drying up. Grant support is not likely to be forthcoming in areas of research where the perception may be that most of the important questions have been addressed. In

such cases as these, the sabbatical leave may play a critical role. It may provide a valuable space in the academic career to explore new lines of research; to respond to shifting research agendas through fresh familiarity with a new literature or the development of new research techniques; to write grant proposals; or to publish recent research findings (Ciampa, 1978; Sima and Denton, 1995; Tiedje and Collins, 1996; Zahorski, 1994).

Although faculty are freed of teaching and service responsibilities during the leave, sabbatical leaves may also be used to focus on these aspects of faculty life. The intensity of the regular teaching schedule leaves little time for substantive changes in present course offerings, the development of new courses, or the development of new programs. The sabbatical leave provides the significant time commitment needed to update a course to introduce technology enhancements, to develop a new course that introduces students to emerging theories or methods, or to develop a new program that may be more responsive to professional communities (Kang and Miller, 1998; Sima and Denton, 1995; Zahorski, 1994).

The service component of academic life also requires periodic renewal. Campus-level service responsibilities such as committee work or campus governance are not an emphasis during the sabbatical leave. However, there are other forms of service—to the discipline, to the profession, or to other university stakeholders—that arise as a focus of the sabbatical leave. Leave time can allow for the development of an editorship, professional organization leadership, the establishment of a center or institute, or leadership in a community-based planning effort. These types of service activities are often of as much benefit to the academic institution as they are to the individual faculty member.

The periodic opportunity to retool and redirect efforts may well benefit each role that a faculty member performs. This demand for continuous cutting-edge knowledge acquisition, development, and dissemination is not typical of the vast majority of careers. However, it is interesting to note that the sabbatical leave is used in other professions where multiple and similar demands exist. Increasingly, the business world is using the sabbatical leave rather than letting go of midcareer researchers or managers who merely require a period for retooling (Toomey and Connor, 1988).

Benefits of a Sabbatical Leave

The present section substantiates the importance of the sabbatical leave in academe by reviewing the evidence of benefits of the sabbatical. Zahorski's (1994) review of six benefits of the sabbatical for faculty provides the framework for this discussion.

The first benefit of the sabbatical is that it serves as an agent of rejuvenation and renewal. According to Zahorski, faculty members report that the opportunity to break away from the usual routine "has enormous restorative potential, renewing faculty not only physically, but mentally and spiritually as well" (p. 116). The direct reference to renewal and regeneration as a positive outcome was made in two other reports. Jarecky and Sandifer (1986) referred to the spirit of renewal that was apparent in the generally enthusiastic descriptions written by the medical school faculty who had taken sabbaticals. Avakian (1986–87) reported that even in a sabbatical report in which faculty members reported not being as productive as anticipated, the sabbatical activities appeared to be "just as uplifting, recreative, and regenerative as those cited in the reports of other leave recipients" (p. 28).

The second benefit is that a sabbatical leave provides a time for reflection. Without the usual time constraints, faculty members have an opportunity to reflect on their careers and the direction of their work. This reflection may help faculty to redirect their teaching, research, and service goals.

Third, a sabbatical leave furnishes a fresh perspective. Zahorski (1994) identified a few ways in which this perspective is manifested. Increased time for reflection helps in creating a fresh view of ideas and movements in the field. Time away from campus can also increase appreciation for the academic community and the colleagues within that community. Travel raises awareness of different customs or traditions that may be highly desirable to incorporate into one's routine in the future. Zahorski also reported that some faculty members realize some of the limits of their productivity and get more in tune with their own strengths and weaknesses.

Fourth, the sabbatical leave provides an opportunity to build new professional relationships. Faculty have reported that their visits with colleagues at other institutions often resulted in long-term collegial relationships.

Thus, time away from a faculty member's home institution may broaden opportunities for collaboration in future research, service, or teaching projects.

Fifth, a sabbatical leave provides opportunities to become or to stay current in the discipline. Zahorski reminds readers that in some fields it is very difficult to maintain cutting-edge knowledge. In fact, in some areas, specifically those that are more technologically oriented, it may not even be possible to remain current by relying solely on the reading of the latest journals and texts. A sabbatical leave provides the flexibility and time to visit labs or field sites where the most recent information is in the making. Sorcinelli (1986) also notes the importance of learning new things and taking on new challenges; these activities help faculty "to enhance unique strengths and interests, or to rethink what to do in a career" (p. 15).

Sixth, Zahorski (1994) asserts that the sabbatical enhances teaching. The focus on improved scholarship brings relevance to the classroom; the infusion of new findings into classroom curricula brings new energy and confidence. Zahorski also reminds us that many faculty members take classes during their sabbatical leave. This experience exposes faculty to the pedagogy of peers and gives faculty a heightened awareness of the perspective of students. While Boice (1987) warns that released time from teaching responsibility may convey a negative message about teaching, most researchers have found that an important benefit of a sabbatical leave is the enhancement of teaching (Boening and Miller, 1997; Kang and Miller, 1998; Russell, 1984; Sima and Denton, 1995; Zahorski, 1994).

As for benefits to the institution, Zahorski identifies eight: increased faculty efficiency, versatility, and productivity; strengthened institutional programs; enhanced learning environment, improved morale; enhanced loyalty to the institution; enhanced faculty recruitment and retention; enhanced intellectual climate; and enhanced academic reputation. While he has identified a list of benefits to individuals and to the institution, it is clear that the benefits can reach from the individual to the institution and to society at large.

In a study by Sima and Denton (1995), a rather impressive list of tangible products of sabbatical were found through an examination of the postsabbatical reports of 125 faculty members. For the three-year period examined, faculty produced forty-two books or manuscripts, twenty-six book chapters, and four monographs; published ninety-one articles; submitted sixty-five papers for publication; secured \$1,315,000 in research grants; submitted thirty-six grant proposals; gave ninety-four talks, presentations, or invited lectures; developed thirteen new or revised courses; and prepared two music compositions, one conference, and one analytical report. It appears that the beneficiaries of this work extended beyond the faculty.

Faculty Development and Satisfaction

Clearly, the literature points to the sabbatical as a unique and important factor in faculty development and satisfaction. In fact, in only one study was a sabbatical leave found to be of no benefit in improving faculty scholarly productivity (Boice, 1987).

As for satisfaction in particular, the literature reveals faculty have very positive reports regarding their experiences during and after the sabbatical leave. Only one study actually focused on faculty satisfaction. Jarecky and Sandifer (1986) interviewed seventy medical school faculty members at seven institutions. They reported that 80 percent of the participants viewed the sabbatical experience as very favorable; the authors judged that three out of every four had accomplished something substantial such as writing research papers or books or reorganizing teaching programs. The authors further reported that a spirit of renewal was apparent in the generally enthusiastic descriptions provided by those who had taken a sabbatical leave. Many emphasized increased self-confidence in their professional abilities.

Conclusion

To date, the research regarding the sabbatical leave reveals that in general faculty members benefit from and are satisfied with their sabbatical leave experiences. These studies provide some insight about the ways in which the sabbatical leave facilitates faculty development and productivity. The findings also reveal the benefits of sabbatical leave that accrue to the home institution—increased productivity, improved programs, strengthened intellectual climate, and enhanced academic reputation.

In the future, research should continue to examine the role and benefits of sabbatical leaves. However, in order to ensure that sabbatical policies continue to be offered by postsecondary institutions, the academic com-

munity must now examine and report the relationship between the sabbatical leave and the benefits that accrue to the community and society. In addition, academe must find effective means of communicating these benefits to legislators and other stakeholders who may influence the sabbatical policies of the future.

References

- Avakian, A. N. "Planning for Innovative Leave Opportunities." *Planning for Higher Education*, 1986–1987, 15, 23–28.
- Boening, C., and Miller, M. "Research and Literature on the Sabbatical Leave: A Review." 1997. Available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (800) 443-ERIC. (ED 414 777)
- Boice, Robert. "Is Released Time an Effective Component of Faculty Development Programs?" *Research in Higher Education*, 1987, 26, 311–326.
- Bowen, H., and Schuster, J. *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Ciampa, B. J. "Faculty Development: The 'Haves' and 'Have-Nots.'" *Research in Education*, Feb. 1978, pp. 1–18.
- Daugherty, H., Jr. "Sabbatical Leaves in Higher Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1979.
- Eells, W., and Hollins, E. "Sabbatical Leave in American Higher Education." *U.S. Office of Education Bulletin*, Bulletin no. 17, 1962.
- Good, C. (ed.). *Dictionary of Education*. (3rd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Ingraham, M., and King, F. *The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1965.
- Jarecky, R. K., and Sandifer, M. G. "Faculty Members' Evaluations of Sabbaticals." *Journal of Medical Education*, 1986, 61, 803–807.
- Kang, B., and Miller, M. T. "Sabbatical as a Form of Faculty Renewal in the Community College: Green Pastures or Fallow Fields?" Research report, 1998. Available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. (800) 443-ERIC. (ED 417 778)
- Kimball, B. A. "The Origin of the Sabbath and Its Legacy to the Modern Sabbatical." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1978, 49, 303–315.
- Lively, K. "Sabbaticals Under Fire." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 23, 1994, p. A16.
- Rudolph, F. *The American College and University*. Athens: University of Georgia, 1990.
- Russell, T. "The Teaching Connection." *Academic Therapy*, 1984, 19(4), 437–441.
- Sarason, S. B. *The Predictable Failure of School Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.
- Sima, C. M., and Denton, W. E. "Reasons for and Products of Faculty Sabbatical Leaves." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Orlando, Fla., Nov. 1995.
- Sorcinielli, M. D. "Sabbaticals and Leaves: Critical Events in the Careers of Faculty." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, Apr. 1986.
- Tiedje, L. B., and Collins, C. "The Sabbatical Year: Letting the Fields Lay Fallow." *Nursing Outlook*, 1996, 44, 235–238.
- Toomey, E. L., and Connor, J. M. "Employee Sabbaticals: Who Benefits and Why." *Personnel*, 1988, 65, 81–84.
- Wilson, R. "The Stay-at-Home Sabbatical Increases in Popularity." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 23, 1999, p. A16.
- Zahorski, K. J. *The Sabbatical Mentor: A Practical Guide to Successful Sabbaticals*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker, 1994.

CELINA M. SIMA is associate dean for academic affairs and courtesy associate professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago.