State of California  
Memorandum

To: Erling Smith, Acting Dean  
    College of Engineering

From: Robert D. Koob  
      Provost

Subject: Civil and Environmental Engineering  
         Department Policies and Procedures Documents

Date: August 19, 2011

Copies: Debra Larson  
        Rakesh Goel  
        Al Liddicoat

The two documents listed below, approved by the department tenured faculty on October 12, 2010, are approved for immediate implementation:

- Assessment Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure
- Recruiting Procedures for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty within the Civil and  
  Environmental Engineering (CEENVE) Department

Please provide the departmental faculty access to the document as soon as possible.
MEMORANDUM

TO: 
Bob Koob Provost
Provost

Via: 
Al Liddicoat
Associate Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

Via: 
Erling Smith
Acting Dean, College of Engineering

FROM: 
Rakesh K. Goel
Chair, CE & ENVE

SUBJECT: 
CEENVE Department Policies and Procedures

DATE: October 12, 2010

In response to feedback from Academic Personnel, (1) Assessment Criteria for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure, and (2) Recruitment Procedures for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty have been revised and approved by the department faculty. For your reference, I am including a marked-up version and a clean version of these documents for your review and approval. Please send it to the next level after your approval. Please feel free to get in touch with me if you need further clarification.
Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Assessment Criteria

Civil and Environment Engineering (CEENVE) Department

It is expected that any member of the Department faculty who is seeking reappointment, advancement in rank, and/or tenure will, through his or her Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), demonstrate levels of participation and achievement in the areas of (1) teaching, and course and curriculum development, (2) professional development, and (3) academic and/or community service that bring honor to the individual, the Department, the College, the University, and the Profession. The faculty’s collegiality, initiative, cooperativeness, and dependability will also be factored into the assessment.

Evidence of achievement in the area of teaching, and course and curriculum development shall address such areas as (1) in-class effectiveness, as measured by the quality of one’s student-based teaching evaluations and class observation by senior faculty, (2) advising student projects and theses, as well as other non-course related educational innovation (3) the substantial redesign of existing courses, (4) the introduction of new courses, (5) the number and variety of courses taught, and (6) teaching awards received. The Department expects that each faculty will engage in continuous improvement through regular review of his or her student evaluations, participation in teaching effectiveness workshops and peer course review.

Evidence of achievement in the area of professional development shall address such areas as (1) proposals written and funding received (particularly external), (2) scholarly publications in the form of reference books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and/or conference papers, (3) professional licensure, (4) consulting activities, (5) short course administration and/or attendance, (6) professional society involvement, and (7) patents and/or awards received. The Department recognizes that the strength of its undergraduate degree programs is derived from the practical, application-oriented nature of its instruction. Hence, the Department recognizes the value of both research and consulting and believes that each individual faculty member should be free to select a blend (as long as this blend is consistent with the specific expectations that were expressed in that individual’s initial offer of appointment authored by the College Dean) and as approved in the candidate’s Professional Development Plan. The Department strongly encourages its faculty to seek professional licensure and/or appropriate certification.

Evidence of achievement in the area of service shall address such areas as (1) membership on Department, College, and/or University committees, (2) faculty advisorship to student organizations and/or ad hoc project teams, (3) positions held on professional boards and in professional organizations, (4) service of a professional nature, to community organizations, and (5) awards received.

The Department expects faculty to demonstrate accomplishments in all three areas, while recognizing that they are synergistic. The balance between these areas may differ for individual faculty. The Department does not employ specific numerical or quantitative standards for assessing performance. However, the Department does believe that performance should be commensurate with experience and rank. In addition, one’s achievements in the three broad focus areas should be viewed in the context of any assigned and/or released time that was awarded for the purpose of completing such activities.

The Department criteria set forth above are intended to be consistent with the University Personnel Action Procedures and Criteria, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the College of Engineering Personnel Policies and Procedures document, and the specific initial offer of appointment authored by the College Dean. In the event that a Department criterion conflicts with any of these documents, the higher-level document(s) will prevail.

This document was approved by majority vote of the Department’s tenured faculty on October 12, 2010.
Recruiting Procedures for Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty within the
Civil and Environment Engineering (CEENVE) Department

I. Procedures Regarding Tenured/Tenure Track Faculty Recruiting

A) Civil and Environmental Engineering Department procedures on recruiting are intended to supplement and add detail to established College of Engineering procedures on recruiting, as documented in the latest Personnel Policies and Procedures. In the event that the department procedure is in conflict with established college or campus level procedure, the higher level procedure shall prevail.

B) Per the College of Engineering Policy and Procedures, the purpose of the Faculty Recruitment committee is to review pertinent information, advise the chair regarding their preferred ranking of candidates, and vote on and, if desired, provide supplemental comments to the chair's final recommendation.

C) The Faculty Recruitment Committee shall consist of tenured - faculty members excluding the department chair. Tenure-track faculty may serve on the recruitment committee with the approval of the dean.

D) The tenured and tenure-track faculty who compose the Committee will volunteer for this service and must be able to participate in meetings of the Committee and be able to inform themselves of the candidates’ qualifications.

E) Letters of Recommendation for the candidates must be on file and available for review prior to the formal vote by the department.

F) Eligible faculty may participate in the formal vote on the final recommendations to the Dean. It is expected all voting faculty will pursue due diligence in personally determining the relative qualification of candidates.

G) Eligible faculty may vote absentee but voting proxy is not permitted.

II. Recommendations regarding recruitment logistics and procedures.

A) On Campus Interviews
   1. One 30 min block should be set aside to meet with scheduled student leaders.
   2. One to two 20 min blocks should be set aside to meet with HR (benefits, etc.) and Grants Development (external funding).
   3. Off site activities should be organized or offered to introduce the location and lifestyle associated with Cal Poly and San Luis Obispo.

B) Presentations
   1. Presentation should be scheduled on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 11-12 to provide as much opportunity as possible for faculty and students to attend.
2. No more than one candidate shall be scheduled for an on-site visit per day.
3. The candidate must be notified that he/she will be presenting to a diverse group of faculty as well as graduate and undergraduate students. The presentation should target 40 minutes plus questions.

C) Recruitment Time-Line
1. For Spring recruitment the advertisement should be placed by Nov 30.
2. Typically, review of the applications should commence by Feb 1, and applications received by then will receive full consideration.
3. March 1 is the target date for phone interviews.
4. March 15 is the target date for campus interviews.

D) Voting Procedures
To ensure the fairest possible voting outcome a recursive modified Borda Method will be used. This is a single round method that seems most appropriate for our type of voting, includes absentee votes, and minimizes “tactical voting” maneuvers. The procedure is:

1. Each candidate gets 1 point for each last place vote received, 2 points for each next-to-last place vote, all the way up to N points for each first place vote (where N is the number of candidates). If a voter does not rank all the candidates then the total number of candidates on their ballot is reduced, and therefore the maximum number allotted to the favorite candidate is reduced (i.e., a voter who ranked 3 of 5 candidates would use the points 1, 2, and 3 to express their preferences).

2. The candidate with the lowest total is ranked in last place. That candidate is then removed from the running.

3. The remaining candidates are re-ranked based on their position on the revised number of candidates (N-1). This is done by a recount of the existing ballots, not a re-vote.

4. The candidate with the lowest total is now ranked second to last and the procedure is repeated until all candidates have been ranked.

5. The candidate with the highest total on the final ranking is first and is the consensus-based winner.

This document was approved by majority vote of the Department’s faculty on October 12, 2010.