I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

This document summarizes the policies and procedures that are described in the agreement between the California Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). It also includes information specific to the College of Engineering. Faculty should consult the MOU (which can be found at http://www.academic-personnel.calpoly.edu/policies.html) for the official contractual agreement.

B. Philosophy

The College of Engineering is recognized nationally and internationally as a leader in undergraduate engineering education and is famous for its hands-on, learn-by-doing, laboratory-based approach to education. Our curricula have been developed by a faculty having a great variety of educational and experiential backgrounds, many of who have cooperated in interdisciplinary approaches in order to solve existing educational challenges. The ability to continue to attract and retain a capable, committed and diverse faculty is a critical factor in preserving the leadership status of this college.

The College of Engineering has developed procedures and criteria for personnel actions to maintain the quality faculty necessary for accredited curricula. The evaluative criteria emphasize teaching performance, but also include scholarly and professional growth achievements, contributions to the community, contributions to the institution, and possession of appropriate academic credentials. Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion, it alone is not sufficient for appointment, retention, tenure and promotion. The intensity of the evaluation process will vary in accordance with the academic position of the faculty member. Thus, granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than reappointment; promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor, etc.

This document describes eligibility standards and criteria for evaluation, consistent with the MOU between the CSU and the CFA. In cases of conflict the MOU prevails.
C. General Principles

1. This document is applicable to all personnel actions for tenure track positions.

2. Performance evaluations of all academic employees are made annually for promotion, tenure, or reappointment. Periodic evaluations occur for merit step increases and at least every five years for post tenure review.

3. Recommendations and decisions will be based on educational background, experience, professional competence, and performance as outlined within each personnel section that follows.

4. Statements of evaluation must be validated with specific evidence such as results of student evaluation of faculty, class visitation, measurement of student achievement, course outlines, tests, committee work, college and industry support, publications, statements of peers, statement of students, and statements of the individual faculty member.

5. Recommendations of the various reviewing levels on appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion must include supporting evidence to substantiate their recommendation.

6. The department chair and the college dean will confer prior to any personnel action so that the dean's recommendations and decisions will fully consider the recommendations of the department chair.

7. The department chair will meet with the faculty member to discuss any recommendation, which is being forwarded to the dean.

8. The total available full-time faculty, including the department chair and probationary faculty unit employees, will meet and develop any special procedures to be used in the department for making recommendations on appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion in their department. Probationary and tenured faculty unit employees of the department will elect a department peer review committee of tenured full-time faculty unit employees for the purpose of reviewing and recommending employees who are being considered for retention, tenure and promotion.

9. **Terminal Degree:** Possession of the Ph.D., Doctor of Engineering, or Doctor of Science in a discipline of teaching service area is required for tenure-track appointment. Exceptions may be made in those instances where the faculty member is uniquely qualified, has received recognition for outstanding professional accomplishment in the academic community, or possesses other special qualifications.

II. THE CONSULTATIVE PROCESS

A. Full and meaningful consultation will be involved in each procedure relating to personnel matters.
B. Only tenured faculty elected to the Peer Review Committee, department chairs, and academic administrators may participate in deliberations, voting, and formal recommendations on individual cases. (When the number of tenured faculty within a department is inadequate [normally fewer than three] to provide consultation, the probationary and tenured faculty unit employees will elect persons from related academic discipline/s). Student evaluation of faculty must be considered. Information from faculty members and other sources may be considered by those making recommendations.

C. The consultative procedure requires a consultative evaluation developed and signed by all the committee members. This group will give a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons to the faculty member being considered, who will be given seven calendar days following receipt of the recommendation to respond in writing and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation. A copy of any response must accompany the Working Personnel Action File to subsequent levels of review and must also be sent to all previous levels of review (MOU 15.5). After this has been done, the committee will forward its evaluation and detailed recommendations to the department chair for consideration, using form the AP 109 Faculty Evaluation Form (Attachment 1) or an equivalent form approved by the department faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Minority reports may be submitted, and must include reasons in support of those minority recommendations using the AP 109 Faculty Evaluation Form or an equivalent form approved by the department faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the department chair deems the information or evidence is insufficient, it will be returned to the consultative group for additional consultation or clarification.

D. The department chair will prepare his/her recommendations using Faculty Evaluation Form AP 109. All recommendations prepared and submitted will first be given with the written reasons, to the faculty member being considered. The faculty member will be given seven calendar days following receipt of the recommendation to respond in writing and/or request a meeting to discuss the recommendation. A copy of any response must accompany the Working Personnel Action File to subsequent levels of review, and must also be sent to previous levels of review. After this has been done, the recommendations of the faculty and the department chair will then be forwarded by the department chair to the dean. If adequate information is not provided, the recommendation may be returned to the department chair by the dean for additional consultation and clarification.

E. All persons making evaluations and recommendations should be made aware that their evaluation and recommendations are subject to review by the person evaluated, administrators with personnel evaluation responsibilities, and a Grievance Committee if the recommended action is appealed.

F. The dean will review the qualifications and study the recommendations of the evaluated faculty member and will make a separate recommendation to the President. In the event the dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department chair, the dean will invite the department chair to meet to review reasons for the non-agreement.
III. POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON RECRUITMENT AND APPOINTMENT

A. The department chair is responsible for recruiting qualified faculty for the department, seeking a consensus of an elected peer review committee of tenured faculty unit employees through consultation, and recommending candidates to the dean.

When the initial appointment is made, a candidate’s potential to meet the evaluation criteria for tenure and promotion must be taken into consideration.

B. Every effort should be made to obtain sufficient information and thoroughly evaluate the background of applicants through letters of reference, telephone checks and personal interviews.

Normally, the candidate must visit the campus, make an appropriate presentation on an academic subject directly related to the program and meet with the departmental faculty before an offer of a faculty position to the candidate can be made.

C. Every tenured faculty member on the elected peer review committee shall be informed of every candidate's qualifications for a faculty position and the proposed rank. The opportunity should be given to express the preference for the candidates of their choice prior to the time that the department chair’s list of recommended candidates is finalized.

D. Every elected tenured faculty member of the peer review committee of the department will have the opportunity to vote on the department chair’s final recommendation. Each such expression, with reasons, will be recorded on an attachment to the department chair's letter of recommendation to the college dean.

E. When the appointment of a candidate to a faculty position is made, the established rules and regulations relating to later considerations for reappointment, tenure and promotion must be included in (or attached to) the initial appointment letter. If an appointment is made with certain specific stipulations in addition to established rules and regulations, those stipulations should be made known to the appointed candidate in writing prior to their acceptance of the appointment.

F. The dean will review the qualifications of the recommended candidate(s) and if the dean concurs a letter of offer of appointment will be initiated. In the event the dean does not concur, the dean will state the reasons in writing to the department chair.

G. A candidate may be appointed to a lecturer position, which is used to cover a non-permanent or part-time academic assignment. The candidates do not have to possess qualifications for normal tenure track requirements. Lecturer appointments are considered to be short term, and there is no commitment on the part of the university for re-employment.

H. Appointment and academic rank will be determined by the eligibility standards as described:
1. **Assistant Professor**

   a. Possession of the doctorate or other normal terminal degree from an accredited institution unless a specific exclusion is made in writing by the college dean.

   b. Significant teaching, research and/or industrial experience in a discipline closely related to the teaching assignment.

2. **Associate Professor**

   a. Possession of the doctorate or other normal terminal degree from an accredited institution unless a specific exclusion is made in writing by the college dean.

   b. Obvious professional growth in teaching, research and/or industrial experience beyond the Assistant Professor level.

3. **Professor**

   Such appointment will be rare and be limited to those individuals who present outstanding credentials, including all of those specified for promotion to this rank.

   The typical background expected includes all of the following:

   a. The terminal degree.

   b. Registered Professional Engineer, when applicable.

   c. Extensive academic/industrial experience in closely related discipline.

   d. Evidence of extensive professional development and intellectual independence appropriate to their discipline.

I. Candidates for appointment with tenure will normally be tenured professors at other universities; exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. Although the president may award tenure to any individual, including one whose assignment is an administrative position at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure will be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by the appropriate department (See CAM Section 344.B.8).

IV. **POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON REAPPOINTMENT**

   A. Faculty members who are not likely to meet the criteria for tenure should not be reappointed.

   B. The normal probationary period for all full-time academic employees is six years. Those appointed may be considered for tenure at any time during their probationary period.
C. It is the responsibility of the department chair to recommend the reappointment of departmental faculty members to the dean. These recommendations are made after consultation with the elected tenured faculty of the peer review committee as determined by university policy. (See CAM 343.1 A-K). The Department chair should counsel a candidate in ways to improve performance relating to evaluations and reappointment.

D. Each elected tenured member of the department peer review committee will have the opportunity to accept, reject or abstain from the final recommendation to the department chair. The results of the expressions by the tenured faculty will be shown as an attachment to the department chair's recommendation to the college dean.

E. The college dean will review the qualifications of the evaluated faculty member and make a separate recommendation to the President. In the event the college dean does not concur with the recommendation of the department chair the dean will invite the department chair to meet and review the reasons for non-agreement.

F. At each level of review (consultative peer review committee, department chair, dean), before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, the affected faculty member will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons thereof. The faculty member may submit a response in writing and/or request a meeting to be held to discuss the recommendation within seven (7) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of any response shall accompany the Working Personnel Action File to subsequent levels of review, and shall also be sent to previous levels of review.

V. POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON TENURE

A. Eligibility Standards

1. A full-time academic employee may be considered for tenure at any time during the probationary period. However, the normal period of assessment is six successive academic years.

2. It is University policy to award tenure only to those who have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor or beyond. (See CAM Section 341.1.B.3).

3. Early promotion to Associate Professor without a concomitant award of tenure, however, is not in itself a guarantee of future award of tenure. (See CAM Section 344.B.1)

4. A tenure award is considered "early" if the award is made prior to the candidate's having six (6) academic years of full time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment). An applicant for early tenure must provide evidence of outstanding performance in teaching, professional growth and achievement, and service to the university and community, and must receive a favorable majority vote from the departmental peer review committee. (See CAM Section 344.B.7)
B. Criteria for Tenure

1. Faculty members who do not have the potential for promotion to associate or full professor rank should not be accorded tenure. (See CAM Section 341.1 B.3).

2. Factors to be considered for tenure are the same as those for promotion in rank. (See CAM Section 342.2.B). However, tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than reappointment. (See CAM Section 341.1.B.3).

3. High quality, effective teaching is a requirement that is to be documented and attested to at the department level. Student evaluations are to be considered in making this assessment.

C. It is the responsibility of the department chair to recommend tenure of departmental faculty members to the dean. These recommendations are made after consultation with the elected members of the tenured faculty peer review committee.

D. Each tenured peer review committee member of the department will have the opportunity to accept, reject or abstain from the final recommendation to the department chair. The results of the expressions by the tenured faculty will be shown as an attachment to the department chair’s recommendation to the college dean.

E. The college dean will review the qualifications of the evaluated faculty member. The college dean will make a separate recommendation to the President. If not in agreement with the department chair's recommendation, the college dean will offer to meet with the department chair in order to explain the reasons for non-agreement.

F. At each level of review (consultative committee, department chair, dean), before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, the affected faculty member will be given a copy of the recommendation and the written reasons thereof. The faculty member may submit a response in writing and/or request a meeting to be held to discuss the recommendation within seven (7) calendar days following receipt of the recommendation. A copy of any response will accompany the Working Personnel Action File to subsequent levels of review, and must also be sent to previous levels of review.

VI. POLICY AND PROCEDURES ON PROMOTION

A. Eligibility Standards

1. An academic employee must have tenure or have been awarded tenure before promotion to the Professor rank.

2. Possession of the doctorate or other normal terminal degree from an accredited institution is prerequisite for promotion beyond the rank of Assistant Professor. Exceptions may be made where the candidate is uniquely qualified according to approved college and department criteria.
3. An application for promotion is considered “early” if the applicant is eligible and has not yet reached the maximum service salary increase in rank, or has not yet reached the maximum salary for that rank, or if the applicant is a probationary faculty member who is not also applying for tenure. Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases: merely meeting normal criteria does not in itself constitute an exceptional case; the circumstances and record must be demonstrably superior and must be fully documented. (See CAM Section 342.2.B.8)

4. Service salary increases are increases within a salary range and are not considered to be promotions. Exceptions to this policy may be authorized only by the University President or a designee.

B. Criteria for Promotion

Promotion in rank is not automatic, but is granted only in recognition of competence, professional performance, and meritorious service during the period in rank. A probationary faculty member will not normally be promoted during probation. Promotion of a tenured faculty member will normally be effective the beginning of the sixth (6th) year after appointment to their current academic rank/classification; notwithstanding these guidelines, however, the faculty member may request in writing that he/she be considered for Promotion.

Recommendations are based on prior achievement, teaching performance, professional growth and achievement, and service to university and community. These criteria are the same for promotion to Associate Professor as for promotion to Professor; however, the promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

These criteria in a more expanded format are listed as follows:

1. Prior Achievement. Examples of prior achievement, includes possession of degrees beyond eligibility standard, certifications, licenses, awards, publications, patents and/or professional experience.

2. Teaching Performance. Examples of teaching performance include:

   a. Input from the candidate under consideration such as course outlines, class preparation material developed by the candidates, textbooks used, list of courses taught, etc.

   b. Input from peer evaluation such as class visitations, opinions on course content and organization, competence in the discipline, teaching techniques and relationship with students.

   c. Input from students must include results of standardized student evaluation procedures.

3. Professional Growth and Achievements. This differs from item (1) in that item (1) evidence represents background preparation where, item (3) represents evidence of professional growth since hired or last promoted. Examples may include:
a. Publications, patents, awards, papers presented
b. Keeping abreast of field as evidenced by course content and new materials or courses introduced
c. Active participation in pertinent professional conferences
d. Professional society activities
e. Consulting and professional employment outside the University
f. Research completed or in progress, i.e., as evidenced by progress or contract reports

Professional courses attended

4. Service to University and Community.
   a. Service to University. Examples may include:
      (1) Service to department, college, and university committees, chair of such committees and special assignments.
      (2) Contracts, grants, donations, services or equipment obtained.
      (3) Concern for students and participation in appropriate student extra-curricular activities.
   b. Service to Community. Such services considered will be limited to community affairs related to teaching service area.

C. Procedure for Promotion

I. General. CAM has also provided guidelines for establishing criteria for promotion. The college procedures are further defined to the extent that any such procedure developed must adhere to the following:

a. The Dean will notify all faculty who are eligible for promotion consideration and forward a policy statement (CAM 341.1.A.2) and a copy of the faculty resume worksheet which outlines evidence desired for the committee and Dean's review.

b. Only tenured faculty elected to the peer review committee, department chairs, and other academic administrators may participate in deliberations.

c. All relevant information from other faculty members, students and any other sources must be considered at the department level.

2. Department Level. The department level peer review committee will consist of all elected tenured faculty or a committee of the same who are above the level of the faculty member being evaluated. The department committee will elect its own chair. A majority written report from the committee will be submitted. Minority reports may be submitted
by any member of the committee or tenured faculty. The department chair will make a separate recommendation. As previously noted, recommendations and the written reasons must be given to the candidate first, who then has seven calendar days to respond before they are forwarded (with his/her response, if any) to the next level of review.

3. College Committee

a. The secondary level of evaluation is the college. The secondary level committee will consist of one tenured member of full professor rank from each department, elected by each department's tenured faculty. In the event a department does not have a tenured member of full professor rank, or elects to designate one of a lower rank, a member of associate professor rank may be elected, but without eligibility to vote on candidates being considered for promotion to full professor. Members will serve for two-year staggered terms. This committee will be advisory to the Dean; however, its recommendations must be forwarded, along with the Dean's, through appropriate administrative channels, to the President. As previously noted, recommendations and the written reasons must be given to the candidate first, who then has seven calendar days to respond before they are forwarded (with his/her response, if any) to the next level of review. This committee will be concerned with promotion recommendations on all academic rank full-time faculty members. It will not be concerned with lecturers, either full or part-time. All materials forwarded to the College Dean for promotion consideration, whether favorable or unfavorable, from the department (from the individual under consideration, from the tenured faculty, and from the department chair) will be reviewed by the members of this committee. The material will be made available in the Dean's office for such review.

b. All evaluative judgments and decisions will be based on the material contained in the Personnel Action File, which includes the working personnel action file submitted and indexed by the candidate, and which is incorporated by reference (along with any candidate responses to previous recommendations). The college committee will review the written evaluation reports and other data supplied by the department to insure there is sufficient evidence to justify promotion. Where such evidence is lacking or inadequate, the college committee will request amplification and/or reconsideration. If the college committee disagrees with the department peer review committee or department chair's recommendation, the department committee will be so notified within five (5) working days. Any response by the departmental committee must be communicated to the college committee within an additional five (5) working days.

c. Recommendations to the Dean will be by a simple majority vote of the committee. The committee report on each candidate will include a numerical result of the vote and explanations for its actions including a written statement assessing the candidate's strengths and weaknesses. Tie votes will be resolved by the College Dean. Substantive evaluations and final recommendations will require the participation of all elected committee members or duly elected alternates. This recommendation must first be sent to the candidate, who then has seven calendar days to respond, as detailed elsewhere in this document.
d. When required, a priority ranking of those recommended for promotion will be by a simple majority vote of the committee. In event of a tie vote, two or more candidates may occupy a single rank. The candidate is entitled to know his/her position in ranking but not the ranking as a whole.

e. The College Dean will assess all department chair, department committee and college committee evaluations and recommendations and provide an independent evaluation, including a rank order for promotion. Where such evaluation or ranking differs from department and/or college committee evaluations faculty member and department chair are invited to meet with the Dean to review reasons for non-agreement.

f. The complete file including all evaluation reports, recommendations and supporting evidence will be forwarded to the next evaluation level.

g. All deliberations by the committee are, as a matter of personnel policy, to be held confidential. All meetings are closed meetings, open only to the membership. Results of the deliberations will be forwarded to the appropriate administrative authority as stated in the paragraphs on "The Consultative Process" in Section II.

VII. ADDENDA
Each department in the college may initiate an addendum to this document for their use. The total available full time faculty, including the department chair (this is redundant with total available full time faculty), will meet and develop any special procedures to be used in the department for making recommendations on personnel policies and procedures within their department. Such policies and procedures must be consistent with the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and this document and must be approved by the dean of the college and the University President, or his/her designee, prior to implementation.

VIII. REVISIONS

The Dean is responsible of making appropriate revisions to this document to keep it consistent with the Campus Administrative Manual (CAM) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Any revisions must be communicated to the faculty and must be approved by the University President or his/her designee prior to implementation.
State of California  
Memorandum

To: Peter Y. Lee, Dean  
    College of Engineering

From: Robert C. Detweiler, Interim Provost 
      and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: October 8, 2004

Copies: Michael Suess

File:

Subject: College of Engineering Personnel Policies and Procedures

Thank you for your memorandum of September 20, 2004 and for transmitting the personnel procedures that have been used by the College since 2002. The purpose of this memorandum to provide an official record that the College of Engineering Personnel Policies and Procedures have been approved for implementation.

Please ensure that during the first year of employment in a tenure track position, new faculty members are encouraged to work with their department chair to formulate a professional development plan. Special attention should be paid to describing the objectives and goals to be pursued in the area of professional growth and achievement by the time the candidate is considered for tenure and how these endeavors will keep their teaching current and dynamic. A copy of the professional development plan should be included in the Working Personnel Action File by the second year of employment. Evaluators should review the plan to determine whether it is consistent with the College criteria and expectations for tenure. The plan can be refined, as necessary, during the course of the probationary period.

In closing, I wish to express my appreciation to those faculty members who participated in revising these departmental policies and procedures.
MEMORANDUM

To: Mike Suess  
   Associated Vice President  
   Academic Personnel

Date: September 20, 2004

From: Peter Y. Lee, Dean  
       College of Engineering

Subject: College of Engineering Personnel Policies and Procedures

Attached please find the College of Engineering Personnel Policies and Procedures document. We have checked our files and cannot locate a copy of Paul Zingg’s memo, but we have been using the CENG Personnel Policies and Procedures since March 12, 2002. This document was updated at the request of the Provost’s Office. The department chair/faculty committee editing the document did not make major revisions, but updated old references (for instance, changing “School of Engineering” to “College of Engineering” and eliminating the “Engineering Technology” related materials from the document). The committee submitted their recommendations to the department chairs for review who in turn shared the updates with their faculty and approved the updates.