The Materials Engineering Program Guidelines for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP) is to enable us (you and the Materials Engineering program) to flourish together throughout the duration of your career.

You were hired by the university to serve the institutional mandates\(^1\).

The RTP process is a formal communication process through which we reflectively and collaboratively consider how your contributions are meeting institutional mandates\(^2\).

In short, we request that you select and provide evidence that:
1. Demonstrates how your work meets the minimum thresholds for your situation\(^*\) (quantitative);
2. Explains how your work is contributing to the institutional aims set forth in our vision & mission (qualitative).

There are thresholds in each of three criteria: citizenship, scholarship and teaching. This document provides guidance on these criteria and the standards that we feel are appropriate to Cal Poly. Progressing requires meeting thresholds (1) and contributing to institutional imperatives (2).

We express our standards in the form of our commitments as teacher-scholars.

Citizenship:
We behave in collegial ways that are consistent with the faculty handbook. Throughout our careers, we contribute to the university and our professions through service and exemplary character.

Teaching:
We collect evidence from multiple sources that we are effective educators and that students are learning under our guidance. We practice intellectual honesty, fairness, open mindedness and critical judgment\(^3\) when reflecting on this evidence, with the goal of continuous improvement.

Scholarship:
We, ourselves, are learning, growing professionally, making significant contributions to Cal Poly's strategic imperatives, and are making evidence of these contributions transparent to the public.

We seek validation outside of Cal Poly that our contributions are valuable to society.

\(^*\)See tables of thresholds for the various levels of expectation.

---

\(^1\) *The mandates can be found in the faculty handbook, college and university strategic plan.*

\(^2\) *The College and University provide the procedures and timelines; please request these items separately.*

\(^3\) *The meaning of these critical thinking tenets can be found in Appendix IV.*
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This set of guidelines is meant for faculty members at all stages in their career at Cal Poly.

The research on optimal performance (LePine et al., 2005) shows that you are likely to thrive if you have a combination of:

1. Clarity around minimum expectations for your role and;
2. Flexibility and personal challenge in the process of fulfilling your self-identified professional contributions.

**Your Charge in Summary**

Therefore, we ask you to complete two primary tasks that are consistent with these two attributes:

1. *Quantitative*: Achieve the minimum thresholds associated with your role (below);
2. *Qualitative*: Make the evidence-based case that your contributions are enriching the quality of Cal Poly’s community and its movement toward our shared strategic imperatives. We ask that you do this through a narrative that explains how you see your contributions aligning within our program’s vision and mission.

*Meeting the thresholds (task 1) is necessary, but insufficient for progressing. Candidates must also enrich Cal Poly’s community and contribute to its institutional imperatives through the quality of their contributions (task 2).*

**Preparation information**

The process of Retention, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) is described in the California State University Collective Bargaining Agreement and will not be repeated here. The associated calendar (Timetable) of deadlines is published annually by Academic Personnel. Your MATE chair will provide you with the URL to download relevant documents from the Academic Personnel website.

The College of Engineering recommended practice for preparing and organizing your materials for submission can be found in the PolyLearn site: The Engineering Communicator>Human Resources/Personnel>Retention, Promotion, and Tenure>WPAF Guidelines for CENG.pdf

You were chosen as a faculty member because we believe in your ability to succeed. We are committed to creating the environment together where all can thrive and fully expect to collaborate with you in the RPT process for a successful outcome. As a point of reference, most of the people who came before you in recent years were successful in their efforts toward RPT (see Appendix I for data), however past performance does not guarantee future results.

**Context:**

Our program vision and mission reflect the complexity of our interconnected, twenty-first century reality, which has created calls for a radical rethinking of the role and education of the engineer (Bransford, 2006; King, 2012; Tryggvason & Apelian, 2012).

**Vision** (20+ year time horizon): To collaboratively overcome the intertwined grand challenges of sustainability and transformative learning through our materials engineering program.

**Mission** (everyday): To be a vibrant, creative and effectual learning community that cultivates the unique capabilities of each individual to thrive in a complex, interconnected and ever-changing world.
1. Quantitative: Minimum Thresholds

We imagine that in all things that we do, we are embodying the qualities of a teacher-scholar* in support of our organizational aspirations embodied in our vision and mission. We also recognize that there are a wide range of activities that reflect scholarship, all of which have the following general overlapping attributes whose origin is described in Appendix II: Providing value to society; Expanding human understanding; Enriching a learning community of practice, Contributing to the well-being of the university community. We formally adopt the UNISCOPE model (Hyman et al., 2001) as a tool to assist and encourage candidates in creatively exploring their interests in ways that satisfy scholarly criteria. This model facilitates a diversity of contributions through a framework that distinguishes the form, the function, type, media and audience of the scholarship. (Please see Appendix III for more information).

*Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL), defines scholarship as “a public account of some or all of the full act of teaching—vision, design, enactment, outcomes, and analysis—in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher’s professional peers and amenable to productive employment in future work by members of the same community” (Shulman, 1998, p. 6).

Citizenship: Conduct

As members of the academic community, we recognize the special place we have in society. We seek to live in ways that honor the societal investment in the enterprise of higher education and support the flourishing of our learning community. The following expectations are taken directly from the Cal Poly faculty handbook, in recognition that how we conduct ourselves creates the foundation for our success. We’ve included them to underscore our department’s commitment to exemplary character and citizenship.

Examples of evidence that a candidate may provide include, but are not limited to: letters from colleagues with whom you have collaborated, unsolicited letters from students or comments in course evaluations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards for Citizenship: Conduct (from the Cal Poly faculty handbook)</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure/Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Promotion to Full Professor</th>
<th>Post-Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate welcomes differences in points of view; respects, supports and defends the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas, candidate shows due respect for the opinions of others.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate engages in critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge; practices intellectual honesty, intellectual fairness (See Appendix IV for definitions of terms)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be aware of and make explicit their own biases in their professional judgment of colleagues.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes strategic &amp; effective actions to redress any known need to improve performance in any of the above standards.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D=Developing, M=Mastery
Citizenship: Service
Each candidate in our university system of shared governance plays a vital role in the life of the community. We expect the sphere of influence and service of our contributions to grow over the career of the candidate; those in latter stages of their career are expected to hold more responsibility for serving the community.

Standards for Citizenship: Service (annual basis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement¹ in department-level service</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure/Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Promotion to Full</th>
<th>Post-Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement¹ in a single college-level area of service or a single substantive² contribution to department-level service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement¹ in a single university-level area of service or a single substantive² contribution to college-level service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement¹ in a single professional society-level area of service or a single substantive² contribution to university-level service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹In this context, involvement means: attending, participating, and contributing in task forces, clubs, committees, events, initiatives, or projects.
²In this context, substantive means: serving in a leadership role for any kind of involvement; Any combination is okay

Teaching
As a learning community, effective teaching is central to our mission and each candidate is expected to contribute. We also recognize that trying new things includes the need to learn from failure. So Effective teaching is defined as that which enables students’ holistic well-being and development, which includes achievement of programmatic outcomes. It is also assessed “on the whole”, rather than required in every effort.

In order to facilitate reasoned judgment of teaching effectiveness, candidates are asked to use the current best practice known as triangulation. This method consists of using at least three differing sources of evidence to support a conclusion. As part of our department’s commitment to continuous improvement, we will provide two sources (student evaluations and peer reviews). See Appendix V for examples of other sources and work with your colleagues to plan and collect other evidence. As the candidate matures as a teacher-scholar, they are expected to expand their practice to include innovations, which could be at any level, such as substantive changes in course content, process of teaching, or something else.

Standards for Teaching (over period of review)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflective self-assessment of teaching effectiveness, grounded evidence¹² and strategic efforts toward improvement</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure/Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Promotion to Full</th>
<th>Post-Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-derived evidence of effectiveness, Peer Review evidence of effectiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of an effective teaching innovation³ implemented by the candidate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Examples of sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness: university-created classroom evaluations, teaching effectiveness survey results from educational research instruments, student ratings, peer ratings, reflective self-evaluations, videos, student interviews, teaching awards, learning outcomes, teaching portfolio.
³In this context, innovation means “new to the candidate” and represents an improvement in the candidate’s teaching practice.
## Scholarship
The journey of scholarship is naturally one that results in individual mastery. We expect the mastery to be validated within the external community of professional peers. Within the career progression, we expect the value of the contributions of the candidate to be recognized as socially relevant, since serving society is the basis of our engineering profession (National Society of Professional Engineers, 1957) and a core part of our vision and mission.

The standards for each level refer to artifacts produced over the period of review. These standards assume an instructional workload of 80% (12 WTUs) per quarter. For those with university-provided assigned or release time for scholarship, thresholds will be higher in proportion to the decrease in instructional workload.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards for Scholarship (over the period of review)</th>
<th>Retention</th>
<th>Tenure/Promotion to Associate</th>
<th>Promotion to Full</th>
<th>Post-Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of reflective self-assessment and viable plan for scholarly activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total of X externally-validated scholarly contributions, where X equals</td>
<td>IP 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that scholarly contributions benefit students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evidence of the societal merit of a scholarly contribution</td>
<td>IP IP</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In this context, external means outside of Cal Poly.
2. Examples include, but are not limited to: projects funded through a process involving peer-review; projects contracted by a client; peer-reviewed publications; a blog that allows & contains professional peer critique; patents.
3. Proxies for societal merit can include: Your contributions are cited as valuable; Your contributions are downloaded; projects that are contracted by a client; assessment of merit by a disciplinary expert; professional awards; activities that clearly advance the institutional strategic imperatives; projects that are funded through a process that uses societal merit as a criterion.
IP=In Progress

### 2. Qualitative: Narrative of enriching the community
The quantitative thresholds represent minimum thresholds of performance for those with an instructional workload of 80% (12 WTUs) per quarter.

However, most of what we find valuable is not the quantity of things, but their quality. In this section, to address this question of quality, we are asking you write a narrative that describes how your contributions are enriching our community. The evidence that you cite can be the things that satisfy the above quantitative thresholds. Here, we are looking to understand how you see your work aligning with and enriching our shared community aspirations, expressed in our department vision and mission statements.

Please check the current college guidelines for the suggested format for preparing your Working Personnel Action File.
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Appendix II: Origin of the four attributes that we identified for the teacher-scholar

The four attributes that we identified for a teacher-scholar (Providing value to society; Expanding human understanding; Contributing to the well-being of the university community; Enriching a learning community of practice) were derived from a synthesis of text. Below are some excerpts from relevant texts.

From Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered (1991):
The scholarship of discovery, at its best, contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a university or college. 
...responding both to new intellectual questions and to pressing human problems. (p ; 21)

The third element, the application of knowledge, moves toward engagement as the scholar asks “How can knowledge be responsibly applied to consequential problems?”

Such a view of scholarly service---one that both applies and contributes to human knowledge--is particularly needed in a world in which huge, almost intractable problems call for the skills and insights only the academy can provide. (p. 23)

The scholarship of teaching...
As a scholarly enterprise, teaching begins with what the teacher knows...Educator Parker Palmer strikes precisely the right note when he says knowing and learning are communal acts...Further, good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners. (p. 24)

From National Society of Professional Engineers Engineering Ethics Statement:
As a Professional Engineer, I dedicate my professional knowledge and skill to the advancement and betterment of human welfare.

From http://www.aaup.org/issues/academic-freedom
As the AAUP’s core policy statement argues, “institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interest of either the individual teacher or the institution as a whole. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition” (1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure).

From Cal Poly faculty handbook (Code of Ethics): Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and state the truth as they see it. To this end, professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.

As teachers, professors encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline.
### Table 1 UniSCOPE Matrix of the FORMS and FUNCTIONS of Scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UniSCOPE</th>
<th>DISCOVERY of Knowledge</th>
<th>INTEGRATION of Knowledge</th>
<th>APPLICATION of Knowledge</th>
<th>EDUCATION Transmission of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td>• course innovation • course improvement • conceptual insights from course preparation or discussion • faculty insights from supervision of theses and dissertations</td>
<td>• cross-disciplinary teaching • multidisciplinary teaching • integrative courses • capstone courses, e.g., Astrobiology; Science, Technology, and Society (STS); Community and Economic Development</td>
<td>• technical courses • clinical courses • studio courses • supervision of theses, dissertations, and student projects • professional courses, i.e., teaching where the primary impact is that people do things differently as a result</td>
<td>• theoretical courses • conceptual courses • problem solving • critical thinking, i.e., teaching where the primary impact is on the knowledge and learning skills of the student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESEARCH SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td>• basic research • original works • evaluation research</td>
<td>• multidisciplinary and integrative research • cross-disciplinary teams • integration of creative works from several fields</td>
<td>• applied research • policy research • performances of original works • demonstrations • technical assistance</td>
<td>• student laboratories • thesis and dissertation research (the objective is educating students about the research process and methods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERVICE SCHOLARSHIP</strong></td>
<td>• participation in task forces, think tanks, and other problem-solving activities • creative, theoretical, or conceptual insights as a result of service to society</td>
<td>• academic governance • assistance to corporations, government and communities that involves integration across disciplines • assistance in one’s field to groups, corporations, organizations, government and communities • academic administration</td>
<td>• leadership in professional societies • peer-review activities • editorship of journals and professional publications</td>
<td>• student advising and career counseling • advising student activities and organizations • mentoring students • internships • service learning • expert testimony and consultation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© UniSCOPE 2000
Appendix IV: Critical Thinking Tenets from the Institute for Critical Thinking
The Miniature Guide To Critical Thinking Concepts and Tools

Intellectual Humility vs Intellectual Arrogance
Having a consciousness of the limits of one’s knowledge, including a sensitivity to circumstances in which one’s native egocentrism is likely to function self-deceptively; sensitivity to bias, prejudice and limitations of one’s viewpoint. Intellectual humility depends on recognizing that one should not claim more than one actually knows. It does not imply spinelessness or submissiveness. It implies the lack of intellectual pretentiousness, boastfulness, or conceit, combined with insight into the logical foundations, or lack of such foundations, of one’s beliefs.

Intellectual Courage vs Intellectual Cowardice
Having a consciousness of the need to face and fairly address ideas, beliefs or viewpoints toward which we have strong negative emotions to which we have not given a serious hearing. This courage is connected with the recognition that ideas considered dangerous or absurd are sometimes rationally justified (in whole or in part) and that conclusions and beliefs inculcated in us are sometimes false or misleading. To determine for ourselves which is which, we must not passively and uncritically “accept” what we have “learned”. Intellectual courage comes into play here, because inevitably we will come to see some truth in some ideas considered dangerous and absurd, and distortion or falsity in some ideas strongly held in our social group. We need courage to be true to our own thinking in such circumstances. The penalties for nonconformity can be severe.

Intellectual Empathy vs Intellectual Narrow-mindedness
Having a consciousness of the need to imaginatively put oneself in the place of others in order to genuinely understand them, which requires the consciousness of our egocentric tendency to identify truth with our immediate perceptions of long-standing thought or belief. This trait correlates with the ability to reconstruct accurately the viewpoints and reason of others and to reason from premises, assumptions and ideas other than our own. This trait also correlated with the willingness to remember occasions when we were wrong in the past despite an intense conviction that we were right, and with the ability to imagine our being similarly deceived in a case-at-hand.

Intellectual Autonomy vs Intellectual Conformity
Having rational control of one’s beliefs, values and inferences. The ideal of critical thinking is to learn to think for oneself, to gain command over one’s thought processes. It entails a commitment to analyzing and evaluating beliefs on the basis of reason and evidence, to question when it is rational to question, to believe when it is rational to believe, and to conform when it is rational to conform.

Intellectual Integrity vs Intellectual Hypocrisy
Recognition of the need to be true to one’s own thinking; to be consistent in the intellectual standards one applies; to hold one’s self to the same rigorous standards of evidence and proof to which one holds one’s antagonists; to practice what one advocates for others; and to honestly admit discrepancies and inconsistencies in one’s own thought and action.

Intellectual Perseverance vs Intellectual Laziness
Having a consciousness of the need to use intellectual insights and truth in spite of difficulties, obstacles, and frustrations; firm adherence to rational principals desire the irrational opposition of others; a sense of the need to struggle with confusion and unsettled questions over an extended period of time to achieve deeper understanding or insight.

Confidence In Reason vs Distrust of Reason and Evidence
Confidence that, in the long run, one’s own higher interests and those of humankind at large will be best served by giving the freest play to reason, be encouraging people to come to their own conclusions by developing their own rational faculties; faith that, with proper encouragement and cultivation, people can learn to think for themselves, to persuade each other by reason and become reasonable persons, despite the deep-seated obstacles in the native character of the human mind and in society as we know it.

Fairmindedness vs Intellectual Unfairness
Having consciousness of the need to treat all viewpoints alike, without reference to one’s own feelings or vested interests, or the feelings or vested interests of one’s friends, community or nation; implies adherence to intellectual standards without reference to one’s advantage or the advantage of one’s group.
Appendix V: Sources for Evidence for Teaching Effectiveness

The following table is a summary of the different sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness, the type of measure that each represents, who provides the evidence, who uses the evidence and whether the type of evidence is suitable for formative decisions about the effectiveness, summative decisions or programmatic decision. These are provided as an aid. Some of these may not be relevant to your situation. We encourage you to work with your department colleagues early in the process to identify the evidence that you will use. Normally, the department will provide two sources: student ratings, and peer ratings (through the RPT process).

Formative decisions refers to decisions about the on-going process of improvement. By analogy to the evaluation that you use as a teacher, mid-term exams are theoretically a type of formative feedback that supposedly helps students understand their current level of understanding of the course content. Summative decisions refer to conclusions about the quality against some standard. Final exams are analogous to summative metrics. Programmatic decisions are usually those about the aggregate of a curriculum of study, not about a single course or instructor.


Table 1 Salient characteristics of 12 sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness (Berk, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Evidence</th>
<th>Type of Measure(s)</th>
<th>Who Provides Evidence</th>
<th>Who Uses Evidence</th>
<th>Type of Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Ratings</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Instructors/Administrators</td>
<td>F/S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Ratings</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>F/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Instructors/Administrators</td>
<td>F/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Instructors/Peers</td>
<td>Instructors/Peers</td>
<td>F/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interviews</td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Instructors/Administrators</td>
<td>F/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Ratings</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>Instructors/Administrators</td>
<td>F/S/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Ratings</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Graduates’ Employers</td>
<td>Instructors/Administrators</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator Ratings</td>
<td>Rating Scale</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Scholarship</td>
<td>Judgemental Review</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Awards</td>
<td>Judgemental Review</td>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>Faculty Committees/Admin.</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Tests, Projects, Simulations</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Instructors/Curriculum Comm.</td>
<td>F/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Portfolio</td>
<td>Most of the above</td>
<td>Instructors, Students, Peers</td>
<td>Promotions Committees</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1F= formative, S= summative, P= program
MEMORANDUM

TO: Kathleen Enz-Finken, Provost

VIA: Debra Larson, Dean, College of Engineering

FROM: Materials Engineering Department tenured faculty (Katherine Chen, Trevor Harding, Blair London, Linda Vanasupa)

COPIES: A. Liddicoat

SUBJECT: Adoption of New RPT Guidelines - Requesting approval as policy

DATE: February 11, 2014

The tenured faculty of the Materials Engineering Department, through a collaborative process, have developed the attached guidelines for the RPT process in response to your charge to the faculty to revise RPT documents to reflect a commitment to the teacher-scholar model.

In doing so, we focused on clarifying the meaning of the teacher-scholar model as we see relevant to our discipline and institutional commitments. It was also our intent to function as teacher-scholars ourselves, in the process of drafting of these guidelines, so we have endeavored to include, where possible, the source of our points of view, drawing on the body of knowledge from the relevant community of scholars.

By forwarding these documents to you, we are requesting that they be formally approved as our department policy.

Because we are in the process of recruiting two new faculty, we would like to have these clarified expectations formally adopted prior to making offers to faculty candidates. We expect that to take place in March, 2014.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter. Please feel free to contact us if there is need for any clarification.
The subject document, approved by the Materials Engineering Department faculty in February 2014, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the Materials Engineering faculty access to the document as soon as possible.