PROCEDURES & CRITERIA
College of Engineering Professional Leave Committee

V 3.3 APPROVED May, 2013 - IMPLEMENTED October, 2013

The following are the procedures for forming and conducting the College of Engineering Professional Leave Committee (CPLC), and the criteria for evaluation of the Sabbatical and Difference-In-Pay (DIP) applications. The CPLC will serve as the designated committee under CAM 386.5C, which was updated by the Academic Senate Resolution on Sabbatical Leaves (AS-140-82/PPC), regarding faculty leaves with pay and will function in accordance with University and College policies and with any applicable provisions of the faculty collective bargaining agreement.

FORMATION OF THE COMMITTEE:
Each department will be represented by one elected tenured faculty member, who will serve a two year term. Individuals who are elected may not be Department Chairs or current year leave applicants. The expectation is that all departments are represented each year, whether they have any active leave with pay applications, or not.

COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES & PROCEDURES:
- Elect a chair;
- Agree on a schedule for the subsequent meetings and interviews of applicants;
- Review college leave with pay procedures and criteria document. For alignment and consistency, review the current university leave with pay procedures and criteria (along with the Provost memo and Articles 27 and 28 in the faculty unit contract);
- Review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications, previous post-leave reports from the candidates (if applicable), and department and/or Chair recommendations on leave applications. These department-level recommendations, in the form of a cover memo from the Chair to the Dean, must address the possible effect on the curriculum and the operation of the department should the employee be granted a leave with pay, as well as the quality of the leave for any difference-in-pay applications;
- Participate in a 10 minute interview of each sabbatical (not required for DIPs) leave applicant as soon as practical after the application deadline. During the interview, the candidate gives a brief overview of their project (no PowerPoint) and the committee members ask specific questions;
- CPLC will discuss strengths and weaknesses of proposals before committee members finalize their rankings;
- Recommend to the Dean approval or denial of sabbatical and DIP leave applications based on university and college procedures and criteria, using the rubric found in Appendix A. Leave applications that do not meet established university and college guidelines should be given a negative recommendation;
- For all sabbatical leave applications (including 3-quarter), that are being recommended for approval, provide the Dean a rank-ordered list for sabbaticals. The ranking should be based on meeting the criteria stated below, and the overall quality and presentation of the application (number of quarters requested should not be a factor). The overall ranking is determined by a summation of rankings from each committee member;
- The CPLC must clearly state in its summary report to the Dean, the reasons for its recommendation – whether the proposal is recommended or not recommended for approval. This is especially important if a discrepancy is discovered between the written proposal and the verbal interview. The CPLC chair shall

---

1 All sabbaticals are ranked within one list, which does include the three-quarter (full) and partial year leaves. This accommodates the potential of a faculty member wishing to change from a full year sabbatical to a partial year sabbatical without reconstituting the committee to reconsider and re-rank the sabbaticals.
present their report with recommendations to the Dean not only by paper transmittal, but also by way of a face-to-face meeting. Scheduling of such meeting shall occur after the Dean has had the opportunity to conduct an independent review of the applications.

- The CPLC Chair will meet with the dean to discuss findings from interviews, and provide a summary report that includes the following information for each applicant:
  - Name
  - Academic rank
  - Department
  - Recommendations of the department and CPLC
  - A 2-3 sentence summary of the committee's findings, supporting the committee’s recommendation for approval or for denial
  - One paragraph abstract or summary taken directly from the proposal
  - Relative ranking of recommended candidates

GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF APPLICATIONS:
A sabbatical or difference-in-pay leave shall be for purposes that provide a benefit to the CSU, generally, and Cal Poly, specifically, such as research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement or faculty retraining (MOU 27.1 & 28.1). Service activities with a scholarly component may qualify as well.

The highest priority in evaluation of applications shall be the excellence of the proposal and the qualification of the applicant as related to the proposal. The proposal should be no more than 4 pages and have clear goals that speak to the benefits of the activities to Cal Poly, our students, the candidate’s profession, and/or society. The proposal should be of an appropriate scope in relation to the amount of time requested. It is the applicant's responsibility to present their case as clearly and concisely as possible (remember that the Dean and Provost will not be present for the interview), since the overall quality and presentation of applications will be considered. Candidates are encouraged to include written documents (e.g. letters or emails of invitation, applications to external programs, external support of proposed work, background literature search, etc.) that provide evidence to support reviewer's judgment on the potential success of the intended plans or the value of those plans. All forms of employment planned or anticipated while on sabbatical or DIP leave, including work for Cal Poly Corporation and Extended Education, must be disclosed on the application form and detailed in the proposal.

A rubric will be utilized (see page 3) that assigns a point value, up to 24 possible, for up to 4 points for each of the following areas:
- Single paragraph abstract or summary of the proposal;
- Perceived value to Cal Poly stakeholders;
- Supporting documentation from universities, employers, or institutions that might be sponsoring the project;
- Proposal planning (including overall quality and presentation of the application);
- Perceived probability of completion of proposal goals;
- Interview.

POST LEAVE REPORT: Faculty who are awarded a leave with pay will be requested to submit a post leave report to the department chair and dean within two months of their return from leave. Applications from faculty members who have previously completed a leave with pay at Cal Poly, during or since the 2011-12 academic year, but did not comply with the post-leave reporting requirements, will not be considered.

(NOTE: These procedures and criteria were approved by the faculty with a vote of Yes-56; No-17; Abstain-5)
# COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
College Professional Leave Committee Application Matrix v. 1.3

## Applicant Name & Department:

### Type of activity planned (circle one):
- Study
- Research
- Scholarly
- Creative

### Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Assigned Value</th>
<th>Superior (4)</th>
<th>Average (3)</th>
<th>Adequate (1)</th>
<th>Not Present/Inadequate (0)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single paragraph abstract or summary of the proposal.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Comprehensive summary of the proposal addressing goals, activities, planned outcomes, value and urgency to Cal Poly constituents.</td>
<td>Summary of the proposal, partially addressing goals, activities, outcomes, value and urgency.</td>
<td>Summary of the proposal.</td>
<td>No summary present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value of professional development for faculty member.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceptional professional development value for faculty member.</td>
<td>Strong professional development value for faculty member.</td>
<td>Minimal professional development value for faculty member.</td>
<td>No professional development value for faculty member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived value to Cal Poly stakeholders.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceptional benefit to large number of Cal Poly stakeholders.</td>
<td>Strong benefit to moderate number of Cal Poly stakeholders.</td>
<td>Benefit to a small number of Cal Poly stakeholders or strong benefit to a few stakeholders.</td>
<td>No value to Cal Poly stakeholders communicated in proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting documentation from universities, employers, or institutions that might be sponsoring the project.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Explicitly documented support. Could include annotated literature search, statement of benefit to Cal Poly community, applicant's profession and/or students.</td>
<td>Some supporting documentation.</td>
<td>Implied support, but no supporting documentation.</td>
<td>No implied nor documented support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal Planning (including overall quality and presentation of the application).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A detailed outline of the proposed plan, with activities, milestones, outcomes and deliverables identified.</td>
<td>Outline of the proposed plan with some activities, milestones, outcomes and deliverables identified.</td>
<td>Outline of the proposed plan.</td>
<td>No proposal planning included in proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived probability of completion of proposal goals.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exceptional clarity of proposal, detailed planning, documented support and achievable objectives suggests high probability of achieving proposal goals.</td>
<td>Moderate probability of achieving proposal goals.</td>
<td>Adequate probability of achieving proposal goals.</td>
<td>No perceived probability of completing proposal goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clearly articulated overall plan for the sabbatical and answered all of committees concerns.</td>
<td>Well articulated plan, answered most of the committee's concerns.</td>
<td>Articulated plan, answered some of the committee's concerns.</td>
<td>Did not articulate a clear plan for the sabbatical and was not able to answer many of the committee's concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 0

**Points Possible:** 28