



Office of the Chair
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: gayle.binion@ucop.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 17, 2003

**C. JUDSON KING
PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Re: Proposed Revised Academic Personnel Policy 740 on Sabbatical Leave

Dear Jud:

In response to your October 28, 2002 letter, the Academic Senate has undertaken and completed a formal review of the proposed revised Academic Personnel Policy 740 on Sabbatical Leave. As is our standard practice, the Academic Council reviewed the reports from its constituent committees and divisions and reached the following conclusions with respect to the three major revisions to the policy on which we focused our attention:

▪ **“Topping-up” sabbatical pay—APM 740-18-c**

The Academic Senate strongly supports the proposed revision that would permit faculty who take sabbatical leave at less than 100% pay to “top-up” to (no more than) their full salary via a research grant from another institution. Because the purpose of sabbatical leave is to facilitate research productivity, this proposal is an excellent way to further that goal. However, there was equally strong concern that the proposal does not effectively accomplish the same goal for faculty in fields where such research grants are not commonplace, especially the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences. We do, therefore, recommend that the policy on *sabbatical leave in residence* be revised to permit faculty to “top up” to full sabbatical pay by appropriate teaching activities at another institution. This would allow a faculty member from any discipline who wishes to conduct his or her research at another institution, while on partial-pay sabbatical leave, to have the financial ability to do so. Unlike the current policy on *sabbatical leave in residence* under which teaching a course at UC allows one to “top up” to full pay during the sabbatical period, *sabbatical leave in residence at another institution* would be of no cost to UC and would be especially beneficial to faculty who wish to utilize collections, or to collaborate with colleagues, at another institution. In sum, not only would the policy establish greater equity among scholars in different fields, it would also serve UC’s interest in promoting its research mission. The Academic Council requests that this revision be included in the APM.

- **Sabbatical in residence, *significant University service* 740-8-b**

While the Academic Senate favors the provision in that it would allow “significant University service” to substitute for the teaching required during a sabbatical in residence, it recommends that the “such as” clause be deleted. We do so because it is believed that the examples cited, Divisional Chair or member of CAP, not only set an excessively high standard, but are also forms of service that generally carry a reduced instructional load that may be greater than one course. We are confident that without the “such as” clause, the academic administrators on each campus, who already have an understanding of what constitutes *service* activity that roughly parallels the time and effort equivalent to teaching a course, will be able to implement the policy fairly.

- **Administrative rate of pay 740-18-a(3)**

The Academic Senate opposes “codifying” that the rate of pay for sabbaticals at the end of five or more years of administrative service would be at a faculty member’s administrative salary. We do so because we believe that it is not in conformity with the APM guidelines concerning sabbatical leaves. Not intended to “enrich the faculty,” sabbatical leaves are available for *only* the purpose of conducting research, and are available to only those faculty for whom research is an expected activity. The Academic Council concluded that because these are the foundations in the APM for sabbatical, and because there is no provision for an *administrative* sabbatical, it would be contrary to the purposes of APM 740 to make this change.

We take this position not with any critical spirit toward our administrative colleagues. Members of the Academic Senate, many of whom have themselves served as administrators, respect the hard work and valuable contributions of administrators and were this a question of granting an appropriate additional remuneration to these colleagues at the conclusion of their administrative service the Council may well have reached a very different conclusion. But the Council does not see the justification for altering the principles that underlay *sabbatical leaves* and in effect thereby creating an *administrative* sabbatical.

It should be noted that the justification that was offered for the proposed change was discussed at length in some of the Senate’s committees and at the Academic Council and we do not agree with the premise on which it seems to rest. As we understand the matter, this amendment to sabbatical leave policy is proposed to create equity between the (rare) administrator who takes sabbatical leave *during* his or her term in administration and those who do so at the conclusion of this service. Similarly, we understand that it is also meant to ensure equity between administrators who take sabbaticals at the end of their administrative service and are granted *an exception to policy* with respect to salary level during sabbatical and those who are not. While we believe that equity among such administrators is a very worthy goal, the Academic Council does not understand APM 740 as supporting sabbatical leaves at other than faculty rates of pay for even those taking sabbaticals within their terms of service as academic administrators. Given the very clearly limited purposes of and eligibility for sabbatical leaves, it may be more accurate to view the academic administrator who takes a leave within his or her term of service as having taken a “leave of absence” from administrative duties. With this as the understanding, those taking sabbaticals when leaving administrative positions would not be treated inequitably when paid at their faculty rate of pay during the term of the sabbatical.

As noted above, we have been advised that sabbaticals taken within administrative years of service are exceedingly rare and that perhaps the problem being addressed by the proposed change to APM 740 is with respect to equity among those taking sabbaticals when leaving administrative positions. The Senate would support pursuing other methods of effecting that goal but because we do not read the principles we see as embodied in APM 740 as the source of that problem, we do not support a revision to this section of the APM.

For your additional information, I have attached the letters from each of the Senate Committees that reviewed these proposals.

Cordially,

Gayle Binion, Chair
Academic Council

Encl.: 6
cc: Academic Council