College of Engineering

College Faculty Personnel Policies (CFPP)

Ratified by vote of the college faculty on June 9, 2023
Revised to Rev. 2 on 9/5/2023

Contents

Table of Acronyms

ABD   All But Dissertation
AP   Academic Personnel
CBA   Collective Bargaining Agreement
CENG   College of Engineering
CFA   California Faculty Association
CPLC   College Professional Leave Committee
CFPP   College Faculty Personnel Policies
CPRC   College Peer Review Committee
CSU   California State University
CV   Curriculum Vitae
DPLC   Department Professional Leave Committee
DPRC   Department Peer Review Committee
EEF   Employee Equity Facilitator
FERP   Faculty Early Retirement Program
JEDI   Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
MOU   Memorandum of Understanding
MPP   Management Personnel Program
PAF   Personnel Action File
PDP   Professional Development Plan
UFPP   University Faculty Personnel Policies
WPAF   Working Personnel Action File
WTU   Weighted Teaching Unit

1 Overview

1.1 Summary and Background

1.1.1 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 approach. Our curricula have been developed by a faculty having a wide variety of educational and experiential backgrounds, many of whom 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.

1.1.2 This College Faculty Personnel Policies (CFPP) document describes eligibility standards and criteria for evaluation, consistent with both the University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA). In cases of conflicts the CBA takes precedence, followed by the UFPP, followed by the CFPP.

1.2 College Mission Statement

1.2.1 To provide an excellent Learn by Doing engineering and computer science education that empowers all of our students to innovate, design and create sustainable solution to real world challenges.

1.3 College Commitment to Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (JEDI)

1.3.1 Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Statement

1.3.2 The College of Engineering fosters an environment based in love, empathy, and respect where all are supported, energized, and empowered. Opportunities to contribute exist for all, and a broad range of voices and experiences are necessary as we co-create our future. We are developing an inclusive community where everyone can be their own unique selves.

1.3.3 Commitment

1.3.4 The College of Engineering is dedicated to diversity and inclusion and strives to understand the unique perspectives of all students, faculty, and staff in order to enhance their overall achievement and of the continued success of the college within generally accepted academic standards of professionalism.

1.3.5 While all faculty share the commonality of being a member of the College of Engineering, everyone's path is unique. The differences in these paths include all aspects of the experiences that make each faculty member unique including physical, mental, emotional, intellectual, socioeconomic, and spiritual characteristics. The college strives to continually acknowledge the individuality of each faculty member and the distinctiveness of their contributions to the college in order to increase their growth and overall effectiveness as faculty members. It is thus the College of Engineering's responsibility to treat all faculty members in a fair and professional manner as they navigate their own paths as faculty members.

1.4 Philosophy and Scope of the Policies

1.4.1 The College of Engineering implements procedures and criteria for personnel actions to maintain high-quality faculty. The evaluative criteria, which will be included in Chapter 7, emphasize teaching performance, but also include scholarly and professional growth achievements (see Section 1.5: Teacher-Scholar Model), service (see Section 1.6: Service), and possession of

appropriate academic credentials. All faculty are also expected to support the college's commitment to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion.

1.4.2   Although teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion for all faculty, it alone is not sufficient for appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion of tenure-line faculty. The College of Engineering recognizes that the criteria for appointment, retention, and promotion are multifaceted, and acknowledges and honors faculty who exhibit a practical and effective balance of the criteria. All faculty are expected to show professionalism and demonstrate effectiveness, and strive for excellence, in teaching, professional development and scholarship, and service, as relevant to their appointment.

1.5   The Teacher-Scholar Model

1.5.1   The College of Engineering follows the Teacher-Scholar Model previously adopted by the University (AS-725-11). The Teacher-Scholar Model outlines faculty participation in both teaching and scholarship, typically including meaningful student engagement in faculty scholarly activity and inclusion of scholarship in teaching to create vibrant learning experiences for students. This model defines scholarship in general terms as the scholarships of discovery, application, integration, and teaching/learning, implemented in a discipline-specific manner while mindful of Cal Poly's mission.

1.5.2   The Teacher-Scholar Model allows for individual variations in the balance between teaching and scholarly activities (CBA 20.3). The intent of the personnel policies in this document is to guide and promote the development of teacher/scholars in an efficient, equitable, and supportive manner, while the faculty fulfill their designated functions and responsibilities.

1.6   Service

1.6.1   The College of Engineering recognizes that service by faculty members is vital to creating an excellent education for students within an environment that supports the college's mission and philosophy. Forms of service include service to students, departments, colleges, the university, and professional, local, and global communities. Service is expected from tenure-line faculty and appreciated from all faculty. Performing service empowers faculty members to directly apply their professionalism to positively influence their personal growth, the growth of the college, and of the world in which they work.

1.7   Professionalism

1.7.1   The College of Engineering recognizes that the professionalism of every faculty member provides the foundation that contributes to the overall success of the college. Professionalism is understood to mean following the technical and ethical standards of the engineering profession, as well as exhibiting a courteous, conscientious, and generally businesslike manner in the workplace (Merriam-Webster). At Cal Poly, professionalism also includes following Cal Poly's Faculty Code of Ethics (on the Academic Personnel website). The College of Engineering acknowledges that faculty members acting within their duties are the primary representatives of the college and university and thus requires that faculty hold themselves to high professional standards.

1.8   Procedure for Updating the College of Engineering Faculty Personnel Policies (CFPP)

1.8.1   There are two classifications of changes possible for this document: Changes to remain consistent with university policies (section 1.8.2), and changes that expand upon university policies (while remaining consistent with those policies) (section 1.8.3). The university documents include the

Campus Administrative Policies (CAP), the University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP), the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), and any applicable Memoranda of Understanding (MOU).

1.8.2   Changes to the CFPP to remain consistent with university policies are the responsibility of the dean. The dean can make this type of revision without faculty input but must notify all faculty of the revisions. These revisions become official upon approval by the provost.

1.8.3   Changes to the CFPP that expand upon university policies (while remaining consistent with those policies) can be proposed by the dean or by written request from three or more faculty in a minimum of three departments. The dean will share a written copy of these proposed revisions for faculty review and voting. These changes become official upon approval by the dean, the departments, and the provost. The department approval process is described below.

- Each department will follow their documented voting procedures. The voting threshold for approval should be >50%.
- Each department must ensure that all full-time faculty members (tenured, tenure track, lecturers) have the opportunity to review, provide feedback, and vote on proposed revisions.
- Faculty with multiple appointments shall vote in only one department.
- Changes to the CFPP are approved by departments when both of these conditions are met: 1) at least 51% of all departments approve the revisions, and 2) the weighted approval is at least 66%. The weighted approval is the sum of the full-time equivalent (FTE) faculty in each approving department divided by the total FTE faculty in the college. The dean's office will provide required department FTE faculty data.

1.9   Department Level Faculty Personnel Policies

1.9.1   Departments are strongly encouraged to have their own departmental personnel policy documents. Department level personnel policies extend and complement college level policies in ways that are suited to the disciplines of the department. In the case of any conflict between a department's policies and college or university policies, the college or university policies shall govern.

1.9.2   Departments drafting their own personnel policies shall define the process for composing and approving their departmental personnel policies. Departments are strongly encouraged to include all full-time faculty in the process. Department level personnel policies shall be approved by the dean and the provost.

1.9.3   The College of Engineering encourages departments to include the expectation that faculty will exemplify the professional and ethical standards accepted by individual department disciplines. Department standards provide valuable guidelines to faculty that are actively supporting the college's overall mission but are outside the scope of this document.

1.9.4   Current department faculty personnel policies shall be made available on the Academic Personnel website.

2   Faculty Appointments

2.1   Summary

2.1.1   The College of Engineering recruits qualified faculty from diverse backgrounds who share our commitment to student learning and success. Faculty are also expected to contribute to an inclusive, equitable, and diverse university community. Policies in this chapter refer to, but do not include, the detailed recruitment procedures provided by Academic Personnel, which all College of Engineering recruitments must follow.

2.1.2   After recruitment, the college and the departments should have professional development programs for each new faculty member that include mentoring, assistance in starting a program of scholarship, and assignment of teaching schedules to promote development as an excellent teacher-scholar. Support of newer faculty development is an important service activity for all tenured faculty.

2.2   Tenure-Track Recruitment

2.2.1   Candidates for tenure-track positions should show the potential to be excellent educators, maintain scholarly expertise, and make substantive service contributions to the department, college, university, and the greater community. Selected candidates should have the potential of attaining tenure and promotion in a timely manner.

2.2.2   University tenure-track faculty recruitment policies are in Section 2.2 of the *University Faculty Personnel Policies* and detailed recruitment procedures are in the *Procedure for Recruiting Tenure-Track Faculty* document on the Academic Personnel website. Additionally, all tenure-track faculty recruitments should follow the current *College of Engineering Tenure-Track Inclusive Hiring Guidelines*. Policies listed below are intended to clarify and expand on these documents. In the event of any conflict, the university documents shall govern.

- A search committee shall be elected to screen applicants and manage the recruitment process. The search committee and the department chair are responsible for recruiting and recommending finalists for the position, acting on behalf of the entire department.
- The search committee shall consist of at least three full-time tenured or probationary faculty, with preference given to faculty within the department. Probationary faculty or Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty require the approval of the dean to serve.
- The search committee must include one trained Employee Equity Facilitator (EEF) who may not be the chair of the search committee or the department chair.
- Any eligible faculty member shall have the opportunity to self-nominate to serve on the search committee. Each committee member shall be individually elected to the search committee by the department faculty following department voting procedures.
- The department chair may not serve on the search committee but may participate in the screening process and finalist interviews.
- All search committee members are expected to review all application materials, participate in committee meetings, evaluate candidates, and participate in screening and on-campus interviews.

2.2.3   The search committee members shall give careful consideration to all qualified lecturers who have applied for the position. Search committee members (or screening sub-committee members) and the department chair shall review the Personnel Action File (PAF) for these candidates.

2.2.4   Applications for tenure-track faculty positions must be submitted to the university's applicant tracking system. At a minimum, application packages must include:

- Current Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- Cover Letter
- **Diversity and Inclusivity Statement**
- Names and contact information for at least three references

In addition, all departments shall request that applicants include:

- Unofficial Transcripts (official transcripts are required for appointment)
- Statement of Teaching Philosophy
- Statement of Scholarship Goals & Activities

2.2.5   Although confidentiality is necessary during the screening process, once on-campus interviews are scheduled, the search committee should try to include all department members in the remainder of the selection process. On-campus activities should be arranged to enable all faculty to meet all candidates. Application, letters of reference, summaries of telephone reference checks, transcripts, and evidence of teaching performance are to be made available only to tenured and probationary faculty in the department. A candidate's CV/resume may be shared with others. There should be multiple opportunities for all faculty to provide feedback to the committee before the hiring recommendation is sent to the dean. All faculty and staff are reminded to keep discussions and documents related to the hiring process confidential.

2.2.6   Normally, before an offer of appointment can be made, the finalist must visit the campus in person, if possible, and make a presentation on an academic subject closely related to the program. During the visit, all tenure-line faculty shall be given an opportunity to meet with the candidate.

2.2.7   The search committee chair, with the approval of the department according to department procedures, shall submit a hiring recommendation memo to the department chair and the dean that divides the finalists into "recommended" and "not recommended" categories and analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of all finalists. Per the campus recruiting procedure, if the committee has a strong first choice candidate, or if they viewed only one candidate as acceptable, this should be conveyed in the memo to the department chair and dean. The department faculty's preferences may also be included in the memo.

2.2.8   The department chair shall submit a separate hiring recommendation to the dean. If the department chair's preference(s) differs from the search committee recommendation, then the department chair should justify their opinion in a confidential manner to all department faculty.

2.2.9   The dean will review the qualifications of the recommended finalist(s) and initiate letter(s) of appointment. The dean shall consult with the search committee and the department chair before extending an offer. The dean shall only extend an offer to a finalist that is recommended by the search committee.

2.3   Tenure-Track Qualifications

2.3.1   Possession of a doctorate in a relevant discipline is normally required for tenure-track appointments. Rare exceptions can be made when an applicant is uniquely qualified and is recommended in writing by the search committee and the department chair to the dean. Written justification for hiring a candidate without a doctoral degree, including potential effects on accreditation and a statement discussing the candidate's potential for success in the teacher-scholar model, must be shared with all engineering department chairs. In the areas where a doctorate is required, candidates who have completed all doctoral requirements but the

dissertation (ABD) may also be considered during the recruitment process. However, all minimum degree requirements must be completed prior to the appointment start date.

2.3.2   Offers of appointment to specific academic ranks will be determined by the eligibility standards as described.

Assistant Professor
- Possession of teaching, research, and/or industrial experience in a discipline closely related to the work assignment.
- Evidence of potential for excellence in university-level teaching, scholarship, and service.

Associate Professor
- Professional experience in teaching, research and/or industrial positions beyond the Assistant Professor level.
- Evidence of excellence in university-level teaching, scholarship and service, or significant industry experience.

Professor
- Extensive academic or industrial experience and scholarly accomplishments closely related to their discipline.
- Evidence of excellence in university-level teaching, scholarship, and service.
- Eligible to be granted tenure.

2.3.3   For faculty granted service credit towards tenure by the president, such credit shall be documented in the employee's letter of appointment.

2.3.4   Candidates for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors at other universities. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department (CBA 13.17).

2.4   Lecturer Recruitment

2.4.1   New full-time lecturer appointments require a search process similar to tenure-track searches, including a faculty search committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members elected by the department faculty according to department voting procedures. Probationary faculty or Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty require the approval of the dean to serve. Departments are encouraged to engage all department stakeholders in the process.

2.4.2   The dean's office and departments shall work together to determine the appropriate interview format for full-time lecturer positions. Search committees are encouraged to share the CV/resume with all department faculty.

2.4.3   Advertisements for full-time lecturers need to be posted and the requisition must be open for a minimum of 30 days before review of the applicants can begin.

2.4.4   Department chairs make the hiring recommendation to the dean or their designate, who is the appointing authority in the college responsible for approving and hiring lecturers. Involvement of department faculty is encouraged in evaluating applicants for part-time lecturer positions.

2.4.5   Applications for lecturer positions must be submitted to the university's applicant tracking system. Applicants must submit the following:
- Employment Application
- Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- Cover letter

- List of college and university courses taught (if applicable). Candidates are strongly encouraged to highlight any experiences in the areas of diversity and inclusivity in their teaching work.
- Unofficial transcripts at the time of application (Official transcripts required for appointment)
- Names and contact information of at least three references

2.4.6 For new full-time lecturer appointments, departments are encouraged to develop criteria to select candidates. An applicant appointed to a lecturer position does not need to possess the qualifications normally required for tenure track appointments. The criteria should include the potential for excellence in teaching and at the minimum one of the following:

- Bachelor's degree with industry experience in a related field
- Master's degree or doctorate

2.4.7 Initial appointment for full-time lecturers is for one or two academic years with a possible one-year extension. Full-time lecturer appointments are not conditional (as defined by the CBA) and their work assignment cannot be reduced once these appointments are made. The department must meet the entitlements of other lecturers listed in the order of assignment in article 12.29 of the CBA.

2.4.8 A department may create a part-time lecturer pool that allows candidates to apply for consideration for appointments throughout the academic year as needed to fill positions. Those desiring to be part-time lecturers must re-apply to the part-time lecturer pool each academic year. Applications must be submitted in a timely manner, according to instructions in the job requisition. Department chairs may review qualifications of the applicants and make quarter-by-quarter appointments following the order of assignment in accordance with article 12.29 of the CBA. Applicants who have worked for the department and have been previously evaluated should be given careful consideration according to article 12.7 of the CBA. Those who have had a part-time assignment for all three quarters of an academic year and are appointed to teach in the fall quarter of the following academic year shall be appointed with a one-year part-time entitlement per article 12.3 of the CBA.

2.4.9 Advertisements for part-time lecturer openings must be posted, and the lecturer pool must be open for a minimum of 14 days before review of candidates can begin. Part-time lecturer pools are re-set annually.

2.4.10 Criteria for appointment and level of appointment are determined by the dean's office in consultation with the applicable departments. Initial appointments for part-time pool lecturers can be for 1, 2, or 3 quarters over one academic year. Initial appointment for 3 quarters part-time lecturers should be for less than 45 WTUs.

2.4.11 Emergency part-time lecturer appointments may occur for urgent and unplanned needs when no qualified candidates are available in the part-time lecturer pool and there is not time to run a part-time lecturer pool recruitment. Such urgent and unplanned needs to appoint a lecturer may arise from another faculty member's unplanned leave of absence or a last-minute course section being opened. If this need is expected to continue, the department should plan ahead for future terms and either run a recruitment or advertise to increase the part-time pool to meet the anticipated needs of the department.

3 Personnel Files

3.1 Summary

3.1.1 This chapter defines the college-wide requirements and policies for the Personnel Action File (PAF) and Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). Departments may augment these college-level requirements to address their discipline-specific needs.

3.2 Personnel Action File (PAF)

3.2.1 The PAF is the one official personnel file for employment information and information that may be relevant to personnel recommendations or personnel actions regarding a faculty unit employee. (CBA 11.1)

3.2.2 The College of Engineering dean or equivalent supervising administrator is the custodian of the PAF. Contents of the PAF stored in electronic format and/or within a folder shall be stored securely, and access to the file shall be limited to those individuals authorized to view the file under the terms of the CBA. (CBA 11.1)

3.2.3 Contents of the PAF include:

- Hiring materials/letters of appointment
- CV retained from WPAF
- Index retained from WPAF
- Professional Development Plan retained from WPAF
- Performance and periodic evaluation reports (AP 109, dean, and provost letters)
- Leaves/grants/awards reports
- Results of student evaluations of faculty
- Institutional data about teaching assignments
- Other personnel related material as determined by the dean's office

3.3 Purpose of Working Personnel Action File (WPAF)

3.3.1 During the time of periodic evaluation and performance evaluation of a faculty unit employee, the WPAF, which includes all information, materials, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, shall be incorporated by reference into the PAF (CBA 11.8).

3.3.2 The WPAF is compiled by the applicant to support consideration for a periodic or performance evaluation. Contents of the WPAF stored in electronic format shall be stored securely, and access to the file shall be limited to those individuals authorized by Academic Personnel to view the file. All supporting materials in the WPAF should be referenced and clearly explained.

3.3.3 The time period covered by the WPAF varies depending on the evaluation, as shown in Table 3.1. Periodic and retention WPAFs should highlight accomplishments since the last evaluation.

3.3.4 The provost establishes the deadlines for submission and review of the WPAF. Insertion of materials after the due date must have the approval of the College Peer Review Committee (CPRC) and is limited to items that became accessible after the deadline (CBA 15.12b). The table of contents or index should be updated to reflect any material added to the file during the evaluation cycle.

Table 3.1

	Tenure Evaluation	**Promotion/Range Elevation Evaluation**	**Retention Evaluation**	**Periodic Evaluation**
Tenure-track Professor	Cumulative since date of hire	Cumulative since date of hire	Cumulative since date of hire	Cumulative since date of hire
Tenured Professor	N/A	Cumulative since most recent promotion	N/A	Cumulative since most recent evaluation
Lecturer	N/A	Cumulative since most recent range elevation or date of hire (if no range elevation)	N/A	Cumulative since most recent evaluation

3.4   Contents of the WPAF

3.4.1   The WPAF shall contain the following sections:

- Index
- Executive Summary (optional, but recommended)
- Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- Professional Development Plan (PDP) (optional for lecturers)
- Teaching Related Activities
    – Teaching Listing, Narrative, and Reflection on student comments (with a plan for improvement). Include a description of course innovations and a listing of any assigned/release time.
    – Sample Teaching Materials from all courses taught (e.g., syllabi, assignments, exams/assessments, project descriptions)
- Professional Development and Scholarship Activities (optional for lecturers)
    – Professional Development and Scholarship Narrative and Listing
    – Sample Professional Development and Scholarship Materials (e.g., conference papers, posters, journal articles, grant proposals)
- Service Activities (optional for lecturers)
    – Service Narrative and Listing
    – Other Service Materials (optional)
- Student Evaluations of Faculty (added to WPAF by Academic Personnel)
- Summary of activities in teaching, professional development, and/or service that relate to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (optional but strongly encouraged).

3.4.2   Candidates are encouraged to keep all sections clear and succinct. Candidates should select the most effective materials to support their case for retention, promotion, and/or tenure.

3.4.3   The Professional Development Plan (PDP) should be a written narrative to help evaluators understand the candidate's goals and values as a teacher-scholar. It should include specific and measurable goals for a short-term period of 1-2 years and a long-term period of 3-5 years with goals clearly delineated in teaching, scholarship, and service. For pre-tenure periodic evaluations,

retention evaluations, and tenure evaluations, the PDP should highlight progress made since the previous evaluation. The PDP should also include any new or modified goals.

3.4.4 The "summary of activities in teaching, professional development, and/or service that relate to justice, equity, diversity and inclusion" should provide a list of completed activities. A list of example JEDI-related activities is shown below.

- Organizing or participating in JEDI-related courses, workshops or conferences.
- Development or implementation of inclusive educational modules.
- Pedagogical activities altering prior teaching methods towards inclusive teaching practices.
- Mentoring students, faculty, and/or staff from underrepresented populations.
- Outreach towards and advocacy for underrepresented populations.
- Participation in events designed to increase engagement with underrepresented populations.
- The application of research skills or expertise to investigating diversity, equity, and inclusion.
- Service on JEDI-related committees.
- Demonstrated efforts to attract and/or hire faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented populations.
- Engaging underrepresented students, faculty, and/or staff in research activities.

3.4.5 Post-tenure periodic evaluation faculty may submit the following instead of a full WPAF. Associate Professors considering promotion to Full Professor may wish to submit a full WPAF for better feedback.

- CV
- Summary of accomplishments in teaching (including a summary and reflection on student evaluation comments, with a plan for improvement), professional development and scholarship, and service since the last evaluation with any significant future plans when applicable.
- Student evaluations of faculty (added to WPAF by Academic Personnel)
- Summary of activities in teaching, professional development, and/or service that relate to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion (optional, but strongly encouraged).

3.4.6 Any student communications or evaluations provided outside of the regular student evaluation process must be identified by name to be included in a PAF or WPAF (CBA 15.17).

4   Responsibilities in Faculty Evaluation Processes

4.1   Summary

4.1.1   The purpose of the faculty evaluation process is to develop and maintain a college faculty that is highly qualified and effective in meeting the college's teaching, scholarship, and service expectations with professionalism and integrity. This chapter defines the responsibilities of the candidates, department peer review committees (DPRC) members, department chairs, college peer review committee (CPRC) members, and the dean in the faculty evaluation process.

4.1.2   A goal of the evaluation process is to assist candidates in their efforts in becoming capable, committed, and inclusive faculty members, which is critical for preserving the high-quality education, scholarship, and service offered by the college. Because this is an on-going process, the evaluation cycles serve to provide documented feedback from more experienced faculty to the candidates being evaluated. Evaluators should strive to provide professional and constructive evaluations to candidates that include indications of where the candidate is performing well in addition to areas for improvement. Improvement suggestions should be such that candidates can reasonably be expected to achieve the expected improvement before their next major evaluation.

4.1.3   Each candidate should be evaluated on their own merits. The evaluation process must focus solely on the candidate's accomplishments in teaching, professional development and scholarship, and service, as well as the professionalism of the candidate. The information used in evaluating candidates may only come from the candidate's PAF and WPAF and from direct observation of the candidate by individual evaluators that is independently verifiable. The viability of the evaluating process depends on evaluators excluding factors not related to their job performance, such as personal mannerisms or physical characteristics. Evaluations should not include material obtained via rumor or stereotyping.

4.1.4   DPRC members have equal voice and vote. In areas of disagreement among DPRC members regarding a candidate's evaluation, the DPRC should pay special attention to the input of DPRC member(s) with knowledge and/or experience in the areas of disagreement, including knowledge of any circumstances or context that may impact the candidate's performance.

4.1.5   Student input permitted in the faculty evaluation process shall be contained in the candidate's WPAF and is limited to: (a) evaluations collected as part of the regular student evaluation process and (b) any written student communication that identifies students by name and states whether or not the communication was solicited.

4.2   Candidates

4.2.1   Faculty subject to evaluation are candidates in the evaluation process. Candidates shall provide a complete set of materials that includes evidence appropriate for the nature of the evaluation process and narrative reports pertinent to the purpose of the evaluation. (CBA 15.12)

4.2.2   While faculty scheduled for normal cycle review will be notified by the college, faculty intending to be considered for early promotion to associate professor or professor or early tenure must notify the dean in writing (email is acceptable) within 14 calendar days after the first day of instruction of the academic year. This notification shall also be copied to the department chair. Faculty are encouraged to consult with their department chair and the dean before requesting early promotion.

4.2.3   Candidates must review their own Personnel Action File (PAF) to check for any errors prior to the commencement of an evaluation.

4.2.4   Candidates shall assemble and submit a Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) by the university-established deadline for their evaluation process.

4.2.5   The ten days following the receipt of an evaluation report from any level of review comprises a rebuttal period during which the candidates may submit a written rebuttal or request to meet with the evaluator(s) to discuss the evaluation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the WPAF and be sent to all previous levels of review. (CBA 15.5)

4.3   Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC)

4.3.1   For evaluation processes using a Department Peer Review Committee (DPRC), the initial level of review of the candidate is conducted by the DPRC. Evaluation of tenure-track faculty shall commence with a DPRC level of review. Lecturer faculty evaluation may commence with a DPRC level of review, according to Chapter 5 of this document.

4.3.2   The department's tenure-line faculty shall elect members of the tenured faculty from the department to serve on the DPRC, provided there are enough faculty qualified to serve. The election process shall allow the tenure-line faculty to conduct confidential individual voting for each potential DPRC member. The DPRC shall elect a chair from DPRC members independent of outside influence from non-DPRC members.

4.3.3   If there are not enough department faculty qualified to serve on the DPRC, departments may elect tenured faculty from closely related departments. Any tenure-line member of the department may nominate potential external DPRC members. Faculty members from external departments accepting a nomination to serve shall submit their CV at least five (5) days prior to voting on DPRC membership. DPRC members should have technical expertise in the candidates' areas of teaching and/or scholarship so that a knowledgeable and meaningful evaluation can be provided to the candidate. Approval shall be obtained from the dean if a department elects a DPRC with no members from the department.

4.3.4   The DPRC shall consist of at least three members of the tenured faculty. DPRC members must have a higher rank/classification than those being considered for promotion. At the request of a department, the president may agree that a faculty unit employee participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may also engage in deliberations and make recommendations regarding the evaluation of a faculty unit employee. However, the DPRC may not be comprised solely of faculty participating in FERP (CBA 15.2).

4.3.5   Faculty may serve on only one level of review (DPRC, department chair, or CPRC) for a given personnel action. Faculty being considered for promotion themselves are ineligible for service on promotion or tenure peer review committees (CBA 15.43).

4.3.6   If a conflict of interest exists between the candidate and a member of the DPRC, such as close relationship, prejudice, bias, etc., that DPRC member should recuse themselves from the evaluation. If any member of the department feels that the elected DPRC has a conflict of interest, they should notify the dean of their concerns and request a review of the DPRC. The dean shall send a written summary of their review to the department.

4.3.7   All DPRC members shall review both the candidate's PAF and WPAF. At least one DPRC member from the candidate's department shall observe classroom instruction, though observations by multiple DPRC members is strongly encouraged. DPRC members shall consult with the candidate regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of the visits and provide the candidate with notice of at least five (5) working days that a classroom visit is to take place (CBA 15.14). Each DPRC member should be consistent in the frequency and amount of time spent observing the teaching of each candidate. Usually, a DPRC member will observe one class session, but this can

vary based on consultation between the candidate and DPRC member. Evaluators should share feedback with candidates within one week of a classroom observation.

4.3.8   The DPRC shall review the candidate's professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion.

4.3.9   All deliberations of the DPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).

4.3.10 The DPRC shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence of teaching, professional development and scholarship, service, and professionalism, as required for the appointment, and offer any suggestions for improvement. The report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence.

4.3.11 DPRC evaluation recommendations shall be approved by a simple majority of the committee (CBA 15.45). Abstentions should be rare and require a written explanation. If the vote is not unanimous, then the report should reflect the relevant perspectives of the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.

4.3.12 The DPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least ten (10) days before sending the evaluation to the department chair. For post-tenure reviews, the DPRC chair or mutually agreed upon designee shall meet with the candidate (CBA 15.36) to discuss their strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for their improvement. In addition, the DPRC chair is encouraged to meet with all candidates.

4.3.13 If the candidate requests a meeting with any member(s) of the DPRC within the ten-day rebuttal period, then such a meeting should occur within five (5) days. The meeting request should be in writing and sent to at least the DPRC chair.

4.3.14 The DPRC shall review any written rebuttal, correct factual errors, and, if appropriate, revise the recommendation. The DPRC shall acknowledge receiving the rebuttal and provide a written response to the candidate that addresses key points in the rebuttal within ten (10) days. The evaluation, rebuttal, and the written response will become part of the WPAF.

4.4   Department Chair

4.4.1   Department chairs shall conduct their own separate level of review. For evaluation processes using a DPRC, the department chair review shall take place after the DPRC review. For evaluation processes not using a DPRC, the department chair level of review initiates the review process.

4.4.2   The department chair shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, signing the logs in each file. The department chair shall review any DPRC evaluation and any rebuttal to the DPRC evaluation from the candidate. The department chair shall review any professional development plan and offer guidance to the candidate for any needed modifications to that plan. This feedback on the professional development plan is especially important in helping faculty develop a compelling record for eventual promotion when applicable.

4.4.3   Department chairs shall use forms provided by Academic Personnel for their evaluation report. This report shall critically analyze the evidence on each performance dimension (teaching, professional development, service, and professionalism, where appropriate), and offer any suggestions for improvement. The department chair's report shall comment on the DPRC's review. Their report shall clearly establish the basis for the conclusions of the report and how any

recommendations resulted from the assessment of the evidence. The report from the chair shall be provided to the candidate at least ten (10) days before sending the evaluation to the dean.

4.4.4   For post-tenure reviews, the department chair shall meet with the candidate to discuss their strengths and weaknesses along with suggestions, if any, for their improvement. In addition, the department chair is encouraged to meet with all candidates. If a candidate requests a meeting concerning a rebuttal to the department chair's report, the department chair shall meet with the candidate within the 10-day rebuttal period. The department chair shall acknowledge receiving the rebuttal and provide a written response to the candidate that addresses key points in the rebuttal within ten (10) days. The department chair shall review any written rebuttal with the option of revising the recommendation in the original report. All errors of fact shall be corrected. The evaluation, rebuttal, and the written response will become part of the WPAF.

4.5   College Peer Review Committee (CPRC)

4.5.1   The CPRC provides an additional level of evaluation for candidates undergoing a performance evaluation for reviews including promotion and tenure. The CPRC shall consist of up to one full professor from each department. Approval shall be obtained from the dean if a department will not have a representative. Each member of the CPRC shall be elected by their department's tenured and probationary faculty for appointment to the CPRC. Each CPRC member shall review both the PAF and the WPAF, prior levels of evaluation (DPRC and department chair), and any rebuttals and written responses submitted. All deliberations of the CPRC shall be confidential (CBA 15.10).

4.5.2   The CPRC shall produce an evaluation report for each candidate under review. This report will critically analyze the evidence from each dimension of performance (teaching, professional development and scholarship, service, and professionalism), both favorable and unfavorable, and produce a narrative clarifying how the evidence was weighed and the conclusions and recommended actions derived. In cases of disagreement, the report should reflect the relevant perspectives of the committee and the rationale for the majority decision. In rare instances, when agreement cannot be reached on the content of the committee report, the minority committee member(s) may submit a signed minority report.

4.5.3   Based on the review of the PAF, WPAF, and prior levels of evaluation, CPRC members shall vote for or against the proposed promotion and/or tenure, or, under rare circumstances, abstain. Any member who chooses to abstain shall provide a written explanation. A simple majority of the voting members constitutes the recommendation of the CPRC.

4.5.4   The CPRC report shall be provided to the candidate at least ten (10) days before sending the evaluation to the dean (CBA 15.5). Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the CPRC report within the 10-day rebuttal period. If the candidate requests a meeting, then the CPRC shall meet with the candidate. The CPRC shall review any rebuttal material to correct all errors of fact. In addition, the CPRC may choose to revise the recommended action. The CPRC shall acknowledge receiving the rebuttal and provide a written response to the candidate that addresses key points in the rebuttal within ten (10) days. The evaluation, rebuttal, and the written response will become part of the WPAF.

4.6   Administrative Evaluators

4.6.1   For tenure-track faculty, the administrative evaluator is the dean. For lecturer faculty, the dean may designate an associate dean to serve as the final level of administrative evaluation.

4.6.2 Administrative evaluators shall review both the PAF and WPAF, as well as all previous levels of evaluation and any rebuttals submitted. The administrative evaluator shall provide a separate written evaluation, which shall be provided to the candidate at least ten (10) days before placing the evaluation in the candidate's WPAF.

4.6.3 Candidates may request a meeting and/or submit a rebuttal to the administrative evaluator within the 10-day rebuttal period. The administrative evaluator shall review any rebuttal material to correct all errors of fact. In addition, the administrative evaluator may choose to revise the recommended action. The administrative evaluator shall acknowledge receiving the rebuttal and provide a written response to the candidate that addresses key points in the rebuttal within ten (10) days. The evaluation, rebuttal, and the written response will become part of the WPAF.

4.7 Provost

4.7.1 The provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for evaluation processes that conclude with the personnel actions of retention, promotion, and/or tenure.

4.7.2 The provost's letter to the candidate constitutes the final decision on retention, promotion and/or tenure.

5 Evaluation Processes

5.1 Summary

5.1.1 This chapter defines the sequences for faculty evaluation in the College of Engineering. These processes define part-time and full-time lecturer evaluations; the periodic, retention, promotion, and tenure evaluations of tenure-track faculty; and the periodic and promotion evaluations for tenured faculty.

5.2 Faculty Evaluation Processes

5.2.1 Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation

- Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the candidate.
- Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
    1) Department Chair
    2) Dean
- Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of Part-Time Lecturers who are neither Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible. The use of Two-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation will be determined in conjunction with the part-time lecturer, the department chair, and the DPRC at least one week before the due date for the WPAF. In the case of disagreement, the dean will make the final decision.

5.2.2 Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation

- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation provides feedback and guidance to the candidate in support of future personnel actions.
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
    1) DPRC
    2) Department Chair
    3) Dean
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for full-time lecturer evaluation.
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for evaluation of part-time lecturers who are eligible for CBA 12.12 or 12.13 appointments.
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for review of tenure-track faculty who are not subject to retention, promotion, or tenure evaluation in the current review cycle.
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for post-tenure review.
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is PERMISSIBLE for periodic evaluation of Part-Time Lecturers who are neither Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) 12.12 nor 12.13 eligible. The use of Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation will be determined in conjunction with the part-time lecturer, the department chair, and the DPRC at least one week before the due date for the WPAF. In the case of disagreement, the dean will make the final decision.
- Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation is REQUIRED for lecturer range elevation.

5.2.3 Four-Stage Performance Evaluation

- Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the retention decision of a tenure-track faculty member.
- Four-Stage Performance Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:
    1) DPRC
    2) Department Chair

    3) Dean

    4) Provost

- Four-Stage Performance Evaluation is REQUIRED for evaluation of tenure-track faculty who are subject to retention evaluation in the current review cycle.

5.2.4 Five-Stage Tenure/Promotion Evaluation

- Five-Stage Tenure/Promotion Evaluation is a performance evaluation that results in the tenure and/or promotion decision for tenure-track faculty, and includes a CPRC evaluation as an additional level of review between the department and the dean.
- Five-Stage Tenure/Promotion Evaluation consists of the following levels of evaluation:

    1) DPRC

    2) Department Chair

    3) CPRC

    4) Dean

    5) Provost

- Five-Stage Tenure/Promotion Evaluation is REQUIRED for promotion and/or tenure of tenure-track faculty.

5.3 Exceptions

5.3.1 If the department chair is not a tenured faculty member, then this level of evaluation is skipped, and the evaluation will move to the next level of review. (CBA 15.43)

5.3.2 If the department chair does not hold a higher rank than the current rank of the candidate for promotion, then this level of evaluation is skipped, and the evaluation will move to the CPRC. (CBA 15.43)

5.3.3 If a conflict of interest exists between the candidate and their department chair, such as close relationship, prejudice, bias, etc., the chair should withdraw from this level of evaluation and provide a written rationale for the withdrawal. If any member of the department feels that the department chair has a conflict of interest, they should notify the dean of their concerns and request a review.

5.3.4 In the rare instance that the dean must withdraw from their level of evaluation (e.g., conflict of interest), the dean may designate an associate dean in the college to perform the duties of the dean's level of evaluation. In these instances, the dean shall provide written justification for withdrawing and include that justification in the candidate's PAF.

5.4 University Evaluation Process Calendar

5.4.1 The office of Academic Personnel will publish the annual evaluation process calendar. This process calendar will provide the dates by which levels of review should be concluded.

6   Evaluation Cycle Patterns

6.1   Summary

6.1.1   The purpose of evaluations is to review and provide constructive feedback and guidance to faculty. Evaluation cycle patterns are multi-year sequences of annual evaluation processes leading to personnel actions. For instance, the sequence of annual evaluations that lead to retention, promotion, and tenure decisions for tenure-line faculty comprise an evaluation cycle pattern, as does the sequence of lecturer evaluations that lead towards a decision to award a three-year contract or range elevation. The College of Engineering follows a Two-Year Retention Evaluation Pattern with alternating interim Periodic Evaluations.

6.2   Probationary Faculty Evaluation Patterns

6.2.1   Evaluation patterns for probationary faculty consist of a sequence of periodic and performance evaluations. The periodic evaluations are three-stage evaluations. The performance evaluations for retention are four-stage evaluations. Tenure and/or promotion require a five-stage performance evaluation.

6.2.2   The two-year retention pattern starts with a periodic evaluation in the first year of appointment. In the second year of appointment, a performance evaluation results in a decision of whether to retain the candidate for a third and fourth year of appointment. Candidates retained to a third and fourth year undergo a periodic evaluation in the third year followed in the fourth year by another performance evaluation for retention to a fifth and sixth year of appointment. Candidates retained to a fifth and sixth year undergo periodic review in the fifth year, followed by a promotion and tenure evaluation in the sixth year.

6.2.3   The two-year retention pattern proceeds as follows for each year of appointment:

- Year 1: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2: Performance Evaluation for Retention to third and fourth years
- Year 3: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 4: Performance Evaluation for Retention to fifth and sixth years
- Year 5: Periodic Evaluation
- Year 6: Performance Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure

6.2.4   Faculty hired with one year of credit towards tenure follow this retention pattern:

- Year 1 (Probationary year 2): Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2 (Probationary year 3): Performance Evaluation for Retention to 4th and 5th Probationary year
- Year 3 (Probationary year 4): Periodic Evaluation
- Year 4 (Probationary year 5): Performance Evaluation for Retention to 6th Probationary year
- Year 5 (Probationary year 6): Performance Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure

6.2.5   Faculty hired with two years of credit towards tenure follow this retention pattern:

- Year 1 (Probationary year 3): Periodic Evaluation
- Year 2 (Probationary year 4): Performance Evaluation for Retention to fifth and sixth probationary years
- Year 3 (Probationary year 5): Periodic Evaluation
- Year 4 (Probationary year 6): Performance Evaluation for Promotion and Tenure

6.2.6   Applying for early promotion and/or tenure results in Performance Evaluation for Promotion/and or Tenure in that year.

6.3   Post-Tenure Faculty Evaluation Pattern

6.3.1   A Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation of tenured faculty employees at any rank shall be conducted at least once every five years after promotion or appointment to their respective academic rank. Performance evaluations for promotion can serve in lieu of periodic evaluations.

6.3.2   More frequent periodic evaluation of a tenured faculty employee may be conducted by request of the candidate, the department chair or dean. After such a request, the periodic evaluation shall be conducted as soon as possible.

6.3.3   Participants in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) shall not be required to undergo a periodic evaluation unless an evaluation is requested by either the FERP participant or the appropriate administrator (CBA 15.35).

6.3.4   Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor requires a Five-Stage Performance Evaluation.

6.4   Lecturer Evaluation Patterns

6.4.1   Full-time lecturers appointed for the entire academic year who do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by a Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation:
- Years 1–5: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
- Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

6.4.2   Part-time instructional lecturers appointed for the entire academic year who do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated each year by a Two-Stage or Three-Stage Part-Time Lecturer Evaluation. Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24). Evaluation by a DPRC is optional.
- Years 1–5: Two-Stage or Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Annual)
- Year 6: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (6 year cumulative)

6.4.3   Full-time or part-time instructional lecturers appointed for one or two academic quarters who do not hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement may be evaluated at the request of the lecturer, department chair, or dean (CBA 15.25). These evaluations must include the department chair and dean levels of review and may include a DPRC. Tenured faculty members not participating on the DPRC should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24).

6.4.4   Full-time and part-time instructional lecturers who hold a three-year appointment with a 12.12 or 12.13 entitlement must be evaluated at minimum in the third year of their three-year appointment. The lecturer may be evaluated more frequently at the request of the lecturer or dean (CBA 15.26). Tenured faculty members should be given the opportunity to provide evaluative statements and such statements shall be written and signed (CBA 15.24).
- Year 3: Three-Stage Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative)

7   Personnel Action Eligibility and Criteria

7.1   Summary

7.1.1   This chapter covers the eligibility for faculty personnel actions, which consist of retention, promotion, and tenure for tenure-track faculty, and range elevation for lecturer faculty. This chapter includes general principles according to which the colleges, library, and departments would specify the criteria warranting personnel actions. These criteria also guide the processes of periodic evaluations, including cumulative evaluations of lecturers for reappointment.

7.2   Retention, Promotion and Tenure of Tenure-Track Faculty

7.2.1   The quality of faculty performance is the most important element to consider in evaluating individual achievement. The degree of evidence will vary in accordance with the academic position being sought by the applicant.

7.2.2   Recommendations for retention, promotion, and tenure of instructional faculty are based on the exhibition of merit and ability in each of the following areas:

- Teaching performance
- Professional development
- Service
- Other factors of consideration

7.2.2.1   Teaching effectiveness is the primary and essential criterion for the evaluation of tenure-line instructional faculty, however it alone is not sufficient for retention, promotion, and tenure.

7.2.2.2   The granting of tenure requires stronger evidence of worthiness than retention, and promotion to Professor requires a more rigorous application of criteria than promotion to Associate Professor.

7.2.3   Teaching Performance of Instructional Faculty

7.2.3.1   In formulating recommendations for the retention, promotion, and tenure of teaching faculty, evaluators will place primary emphasis on success in instruction.

7.2.3.2   Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant's competence in the discipline, ability to communicate ideas effectively, versatility and appropriateness of teaching techniques, organization of courses, relevance of instruction to course objectives, methods of evaluating student achievement, relationship with students in class, effectiveness of student advising, and other factors relating to performance as an instructor.

7.2.3.3   Evaluators shall consider results of the formal student evaluation in formulating recommendations based on teaching performance.

7.2.3.4   [future use: CENG specific criteria/factors for evaluation of teaching shall go here.]

7.2.4   Professional Growth and Scholarly Achievement

7.2.4.1   In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the professional growth and scholarly achievement of the applicant.

7.2.4.2   Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant's educational background and further academic training, related work experience and consulting practices, scholarly and creative achievements, participation in professional societies, publications, presentation of papers at professional and   scholarly meetings, external validation, and peer review of scholarly and creative activities.

7.2.4.3   [future use: CENG specific criteria for evaluation of professional growth and scholarship shall go here.]

7.2.5   Service

7.2.5.1   In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on the service the applicant performs in relation to the university and the community.

7.2.5.2   Evaluators shall consider such factors as the applicant's participation in academic advisement; placement follow-up; co-curricular activities; membership of department, college, the Academic Senate and its committees, and University committees; individual assignments; systemwide assignments; and service in community affairs directly related to the applicant's teaching and/or research areas as distinguished from those contributions to more generalized community activities.

7.2.5.3   [future use: CENG specific criteria/factors for evaluation of service shall go here.]

7.2.6   Other factors of consideration

7.2.6.1   In formulating recommendations on the retention, promotion, and tenure of faculty, evaluators shall place emphasis on collegiality (working collaboratively and productively with colleagues and participation in traditional academic functions); initiative; cooperativeness; and dependability.

7.2.6.2   [future use: CENG specific criteria/factors for evaluation of other factors shall go here.]

7.3   Retention Eligibility

7.3.1   Performance reviews for the purpose of retention shall be in accordance with Articles 13 and 15 of the CBA.

7.3.2   It is the responsibility of applicants to provide sufficient evidence that they have fulfilled the criteria for retention.

7.3.3   The normal probationary period is six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.3.4   Evaluation of probationary faculty involves a comprehensive assessment of performance during the entire probationary period with retention seen as leading to tenure.

7.3.5   Faculty who have not demonstrated the potential to achieve tenure should not be retained.

7.3.6   In the event of a non-retention decision, a probationary faculty employee who has served a minimum of three years of probation (including any credit for prior service) will be extended a terminal year of employment with no further appointment rights.

7.4   Promotion Eligibility

7.4.1   Promotion eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 14 of the CBA.

7.4.2   Promotion in rank is not automatic and is granted only in recognition of teaching competency, professional growth and scholarly achievement, and meritorious service during the period in rank. The application of criteria will be more rigorous for promotion to Professor than to Associate Professor.

7.4.3   Applicants for promotion to the academic rank of Professor must be tenured or concurrently be granted tenure.

7.4.4   An application for promotion to Associate Professor is considered normal if the applicant is eligible and both of the following conditions hold:

- The applicant is tenured or the applicant is also eligible for and applying for normal tenure.

- The applicant has completed at least the equivalent of four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.5   An application for promotion to Associate Professor is considered "early" if one of the following conditions holds:

- The applicant is a probationary faculty employee who is not in their sixth probationary year and is not eligible for normal tenure.
- The applicant is a tenured faculty employee and has not satisfied the equivalent service requirements of at least four years in their academic rank at Cal Poly.

7.4.6   Early promotion will be granted only in exceptional cases. The circumstances and record of performance which make the case exceptional shall be fully documented by the applicant and validated by evaluators.

7.4.7   The fact that an applicant has reached the maximum salary in their academic rank or meets the performance criteria for promotion does not in itself constitute an exceptional case for early promotion.

7.5   Tenure Eligibility

7.5.1   Tenure eligibility shall be governed by the terms of Article 13 of the CBA.

7.5.2   Applicants for appointment with tenure shall normally be tenured professors or tenured librarians at other universities. Exceptions to this provision must be carefully documented. The President may award tenure to any individual, including one whose appointment and assignment is in a management position, at the time of appointment. Appointments with tenure shall be made only after an evaluation and recommendation by tenured faculty in the appropriate department. Possession of a doctorate or other designated terminal degree from an accredited institution is required for tenure.

7.5.3   Normal tenure is for applicants who have accrued credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.5.4   Early tenure is for applicants who have not yet achieved credit for six academic years of full-time probationary service (including any credit for prior service granted at the time of appointment).

7.6   Tenure Criteria

7.6.1   Tenure represents the University's long-term commitment to a faculty employee and is only granted when there is strong evidence that the individual who, by reason   of their excellent performance and promise of long-range contribution as a teacher- scholar to the educational purpose of the institution, is deemed worthy of this important commitment. Tenure means the right of a faculty employee to continue at Cal Poly unless voluntarily terminated, terminated for cause, or laid off by factors governed by CBA 38.

7.6.2   Tenure decisions are considered more critical to the University than promotion decisions.

7.6.3   An applicant who does not have the potential for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor should not be granted tenure.

7.6.4   Retention is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.5   Tenure is not a guarantee of promotion.

7.6.6   Early promotion is not a guarantee of tenure.

7.6.7   An applicant for tenure must at least fully meet the requirements of their assignment and be making a valuable contribution to the university according to department and college criteria for

tenure in each of the following performance areas: Teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

7.6.8   An applicant for early tenure must meet department and college criteria for normal tenure and provide evidence of exceptional performance in each of the following performance areas: Teaching, professional growth and scholarship, service, and other factors of consideration.

7.6.9   An applicant for early tenure should, at a minimum, receive a favorable majority vote from the department peer review committee.

7.7   Lecturer Range Elevation Eligibility and Criteria

7.7.1   Policies for lecturer range elevation are governed by CBA 12 and the memo "Amendments to the Range Elevation Procedures 2016." Cal Poly requirements about colleges and faculty units establishing their own lecturer range elevation criteria were established by AS-538-00/FAC, which is superseded by UFPP.

7.7.2   [future use: CENG specific criteria for lecturer range elevation shall go here.]

7.7.3   The university shall notify lecturer faculty in a timely manner of their eligibility to be considered for range elevation.

7.7.4   Lecturer faculty members shall submit requests to be elevated to a higher range according to the university timeline accompanying the notification of eligibility. Faculty members shall document the reasons for which they believe that they should be elevated in the materials submitted in their WPAF according to their college or faculty unit criteria for lecturer range elevation.

8   Evaluation of Teaching

8.1   Summary

8.1.1   The goal of evaluating teaching is to provide supportive and constructive feedback and guidance to faculty. This chapter includes general requirements and guiding principles for how the evaluation of teaching for instructional faculty should be conducted. Student evaluation of instruction is conducted according to university-level policies.

8.2   Observation of instruction

8.2.1   As part of faculty evaluation processes, faculty subject to evaluation shall have their instruction of students observed by evaluators including department peer review committee (DPRC) members and/or department chairs. For DPRC evaluations, at least one committee member should complete observation of instruction as described in Section 4.3.7.

8.2.2   Observation of classes shall be conducted in a manner unobtrusive to the instructional environment for the class. The type of observation should be consistent with the primary mode of instruction. Examples of observations may include:

- Visiting classrooms, laboratories, studios, or any location where classes are normally scheduled,
- Viewing online meetings of the class or recordings of such meetings, or
- Viewing an online instructional environment as students would encounter it.

8.2.3   Upon request, candidates shall provide the following materials for the class being observed to evaluators before the classroom visit (if not already included in the WPAF):

- Course Syllabus, including outline of topics covered,
- Any handouts or context for the observed class period (unless distributed during class)
- Any relevant safety instructions provided to students.

8.2.4   Evaluators and candidates should consult on the class(es) to be observed and the scheduling of such observations at least five (5) calendar days before the classroom visit, online observation, and/or review of online content is to take place, as described in Section 4.3.7. (CBA 15.14)

8.2.5   Observation of Asynchronous Online Instruction

8.2.5.1   The evaluator should observe the current instructional environment as students would see it. Evaluators should be granted access to the instructional environment in a mode equivalent to the way students encounter the class and not as the instructor encounters the instructional environment.

8.2.5.2   The instructor may provide the evaluator a guided tour of the instructional environment, and this guided tour may be pre-recorded and made available to multiple evaluators.

8.2.5.3   Other reasonable means of observing the online instructional environment may be negotiated between the instructor and evaluator.

8.2.6   Observation of classes taught in hybrid modalities may include observation of any number of the modalities of instruction.

8.2.7   Feedback from observations should be shared with the candidate within one week of a classroom observation, as described in Section 4.3.7.

8.2.8   The written evaluation of the candidate shall include the key points from each teaching observer. This may take the form of a separate narrative from each observer and/or a summary.

8.3   [Reserved] Guidance for Evaluation of Instruction

8.4   Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.1   Student evaluations consist of numeric (quantitative) and open-ended (qualitative) feedback. Student perceptions regarding effective instruction are shaped by individual expectations, which can have different components (gender, race, national origin, socioeconomic status, etc.), thereby creating inequities in faculty evaluation. Evaluators who use data collected from student evaluations should consider the context in which these evaluations are administered and interpret them accordingly. Evaluators should take an intersectional, equity-minded approach to analyzing all quantitative and qualitative data from student evaluations.

8.4.2   Given the nature of student evaluations, it is important for all evaluators to:

- Consider student evaluations as part of a broader set of information about a candidate's teaching skills.
- Recognize that the evaluations may not be a representative sample. For example, students with strong opinions may be more likely to submit evaluations.
- Evaluate the student feedback holistically. Consider the number/percent of student comments that highlight similar feedback.

8.4.3   Student Evaluation Instruments

8.4.3.1   All student evaluation instruments must include the following prompts with responses on a numeric scale:

- "The instructor was organized and prepared for class."
- "The instructor created a learning environment where I felt valued and respected."
- "The instructor was helpful during office hours (if unknown, leave blank)."
- "The instructor responded to questions in a clear and relevant manner."
- "Overall, this instructor was educationally effective." (per UFPP)
- "Overall, this course was educationally effective." (per UFPP)

8.4.3.2   All student evaluation instruments must include this open-ended prompt for students to provide narrative comments:

- "Please provide some specific examples of what you found to be educationally effective or ineffective during this course (e.g., organization, helpfulness, overall teaching ability, assessments)."

8.4.3.3   Student evaluation instruments may include additional prompts and opportunities for comments at the discretion of departments. All student evaluation instruments must be proposed by the department and approved by the college and the office of academic personnel.

8.4.4   Student evaluations are required for all classes taught by each faculty unit employee, except as listed in UFPP 8.4.3.

8.4.5   Team-taught classes: In situations when there is more than one instructor of record, then copies of the evaluation results shall be placed in each of the instructor's personnel files with a memo indicating that the course was team-taught. Faculty team-teaching a course will have the opportunity to write narrative descriptions to accompany the student evaluation results for the team-taught course to add context to the results. Faculty who team-teach a course and believe that the results are not representative of their contributions to the course may request that the dean not include the results associated with this team-taught course in their PAF. After reviewing this request, the dean has the discretion to determine if the student evaluation results of the team-taught course shall be placed in the instructor's file.

8.4.6   Procedure for Conducting Student Evaluation of Instruction

8.4.6.1   Student evaluations of instruction occur during the last week of instruction as defined by the official academic calendar. The evaluation period opens the weekend immediately prior to the last week of instruction and closes at the end of the last day of instruction.

8.4.6.2   For courses whose official final assessment is during the last week of instruction according to the academic calendar (e.g. labs or activities with their own final exam or assessment), their evaluation period may be the penultimate week of instruction according to the academic calendar. Requesting the earlier timeline for the evaluation of courses with early final assessments should occur by means of standard procedures of scheduling evaluations as determined by the office of Academic Personnel and communicated to the relevant college and/or program department staff.

8.4.6.3   Evaluation response rates will be available to faculty online during the evaluation period.

8.4.6.4   Faculty are encouraged to announce to their classes that the evaluation period is underway, and to answer questions from students about the nature of the evaluation by clarifying the role of student evaluations in the faculty review process.

8.4.6.5   Faculty may, at their discretion, reserve time in class for students to complete the evaluation. Faculty shall not be present during the completion of evaluations.

8.4.7   Student Evaluation Results

8.4.7.1   Results of student evaluations shall be stored in electronic format and incorporated by extension into the Personnel Action File. The dean is the custodian of the PAF and will provide secure access to this information.

8.4.7.2   Results of student evaluations consist of reports generated for each course evaluated, including a complete accounting of the quantitative responses and all the student comments from a given class section of a course.

8.4.7.3   Results of student evaluations shall only be retained in the PAF for the prior six complete academic years (UFPP 8.4.5).

9   Evaluation of Professional Development
[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

9.1   Summary

9.1.1   This chapter will include general requirements for how evaluation of professional development should be conducted by evaluating bodies. The function of the professional development plan will be the central concern of this chapter, both as constructed by the candidate and as assessed by evaluating bodies so as to guide the candidate towards the next personnel action.

10 Evaluation of Service
[RESERVED FOR FUTURE USE]

10.1 Summary

10.1.1 This chapter will include general requirements for how the evaluation of service should be conducted by evaluating bodies. It will establish expectations about service appropriate to various faculty assignments and ranks.

11 Governance

11.1 Summary

11.1.1 This chapter defines academic department governance in the college of engineering. This chapter will include definitions of department leadership as "chairs". This chapter also includes policies concerning departmental recommendations to the dean for the appointment of department chairs and associate deans. Departments are strongly encouraged to provide more specific policies and procedures in accord with this document. Departments are also strongly encouraged to include in their documents any further policies about their governance, including committees within the department.

11.2 [Reserved] Guiding Principles

11.3 [Reserved] College Governance

11.4 Department Governance

11.4.1 Department Leadership

11.4.1.1 Department chairs are faculty who have administrative functions as part of their assignment. Department chairs serve at the pleasure of the dean. Appointments of chairs are made by the dean after consultation with the faculty, the provost, and the president. Consultation with the faculty includes the departmental selection processes contained in 11.4.2.

11.4.1.2 In exceptional cases Management Personnel Plan (MPP) administrators may be appointed as chairs on an acting or interim basis. Also, department chairs may be appointed to MPP positions on an interim basis. Acting and interim chair appointments are covered further in 11.4.2.

11.4.1.3 Department chairs receive three-year renewable appointments, which allows for a rotation of department leadership to provide fresh ideas, shorter term action plans, and the opportunity for more faculty to rotate through this leadership role.

11.4.1.4 Department chairs may have academic year appointments or 12-month appointments, which are compensated accordingly. The type of appointment depends on the nature of the academic year and summer duties, as determined by the dean.

11.4.1.5 The responsibilities and priorities of department chairs will vary across colleges, departments, and individuals. Departments have varying models of how the responsibilities listed below will be accomplished. Although there are many items listed among responsibilities of department chairs, some of these items may be delegated to other faculty and staff depending on the size of the department, organizational structure, support staff, and the fraction of the assignment of department chairs that is dedicated to administrative duties. The college dean will help the department chairs understand the prioritization of these duties in conjunction with the college and department's vision and goals.

11.4.1.6 Academic Personnel maintains a document describing in detail the responsibilities and priorities of department chairs, including the following areas of management and leadership for the department:

- Administration of department affairs
- Budget development and administration
- Department personnel
- Academic programs and curriculum
- Student engagement and success
- Advocacy for the department's interests
- Community engagement and development activities

11.4.1.7 Department chairs are subject to annual administrative review. This administrative review is wholly distinct from faculty evaluations that are covered in Chapters 4-6. The administrative review of department chairs is conducted by the dean.

11.4.1.8 All tenured and probationary faculty, lecturers who have taught in the department for one year or more, and department staff will be given the opportunity to provide feedback annually for the department chair. This feedback shall be included in the department chair's annual administrative review.

11.4.2 Departmental Role in the Selection Process for Chairs

11.4.2.1 Processes conducted within a department for selection of candidates for department chairs are advisory, providing recommendations from the department faculty to the dean. Departments may recommend to the dean one or more candidates for chair.

11.4.2.2 The departmental practice for selecting candidates for department chairs shall involve voting among the department faculty incorporating the voting requirements outlined below. These voting requirements represent a minimum; departments may modify their department chair recommendation policies through the joint governance process approved by the dean.

- All tenured and tenure-track faculty, including PRTB and FERP faculty, are eligible to vote.
- All CBA 12.12 (3-year) lecturers with an appointment in the academic term of the vote will be eligible to participate in the vote to recommend a department chair, with a full vote in their department voting process. Nothing in the balloting process will differentiate the three-year lecturers' vote from tenured and tenure-track faculty votes for department chair recommendations.
- All other lecturers will be granted an advisory vote. These advisory votes will be differentiated and summarized separately from the votes of the CBA 12.12 (3-year) lecturers, tenured faculty, and tenure-track faculty.
- Lecturers shall be notified regarding the department voting process in the same manner as all tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- Lecturers eligible to cast a vote or an advisory vote shall be afforded the same opportunity as tenured and tenure-track faculty to attend regularly scheduled department meetings when the department chair recommendation voting is scheduled.

11.4.2.3 The faculty member administering the chair election shall send a memo to the dean that includes voting results and recommendations.

11.4.2.4 An acting chair may be appointed from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the department, or from administrators. Acting chairs are normally appointed to serve for short periods (less than one year) when the current chair is unable to serve but is expected to return. Since appointments of acting chairs can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with department faculty in the appointment of an acting chair.

11.4.2.5 An interim chair may be appointed from faculty within the department, from faculty not in the department, or from administrators. Interim chairs are intended to serve until the dean makes a standard appointment of a department chair (as covered in 11.4.1). The initial appointment of an interim chair shall be for a defined period no longer than one year and renewed as needed. Since initial appointments of interim chairs can be time sensitive and may occur on occasions when it is not feasible to consult with the affected department ahead of the appointment, deans may use their discretion about whether or not to consult with department faculty in the initial appointment of an interim chair. When an extension of an interim appointment is necessary, the dean shall solicit feedback from all department faculty, including all lecturers with an

appointment in the academic term when the feedback is collected, for use in the dean's decision about the interim chair reappointment.

11.4.2.6 In exceptional cases the college may undergo a standard faculty recruitment to hire a department chair. In addition to all the normal aspects of a faculty recruitment, the chair of the search committee shall solicit feedback from all lecturers with an appointment in the academic term of the search; these lecturers will be granted a full advisory vote, which will be presented to the faculty search committee. This advisory vote shall be included in the basis for recommendations of suitable candidates from the search committee to the dean. The result of a successful search for a new faculty member to serve as chair shall be a standard chair appointment as covered in 11.4.1.

11.5   Associate Dean Appointments

11.5.1   When creating or modifying associate dean positions, the dean is encouraged to consult with all college faculty as a matter of best practice.

11.5.2   When an associate dean position becomes available, the dean will announce the opening to the college and request that each applicant (internal and/or external) submit a CV and a statement of interest in the position.

11.5.3   External searches shall be governed by university policies regarding MPP search processes (AS-659-07 - Resolution on Searches for Academic Campus Administrators).

11.5.4   Internal searches will use a consultative committee formed by:

- Each department may nominate one tenured faculty member to serve on the committee. The dean shall select four faculty representatives from these nominees. If fewer than four departments submit nominations, the dean shall select other tenured college faculty so that there are four faculty from different departments on the committee.
- The dean may appoint up to two additional committee members selected from college staff and MPPs, providing no more than one MPP is on the committee.
- The consultative committee will review CVs and statements of interest, then provide a list of acceptable candidates to the dean.
- The dean will select a candidate from the list of acceptable candidates or re-start the search to solicit additional candidates.

12 Workload

12.1 Summary

12.1.1 This chapter includes policies covering various aspects of faculty workload, including office hours, assigned time for exceptional service to students, and sabbatical and difference in pay leaves.

12.2 Office Hours

12.2.1 Each faculty member must schedule and conduct office hours each week of the term (including finals week) for consultation with students. Scheduled faculty office hours are intended to provide personal engagement between students and their instructors. Faculty should not schedule other activities during their office hours.

12.2.2 Asynchronous communication (e.g. email) with students and ad hoc appointments to meet with students are distinct from scheduled office hours.

12.2.3 An office hour is one credit hour (i.e. 50 minutes) of regularly scheduled time for faculty to be available to meet on regularly scheduled days and times.

12.2.4 Scheduled office hours should be held during the days and times when classes are normally scheduled, distributed across days and at times suited to the needs of students.

12.2.5 During final exam week, instructors may reschedule their office hours to best meet the needs of their students.

12.2.6 Scheduled instructional office hours

12.2.6.1 Minimum weekly office hour scheduling, including finals week, shall be scaled to instructional assignments as follows:

Instructional WTU	Lecturer	Tenure-Line
> 0 up to and including 4	1 office hour	2 office hours
> 4 up to and including 8	2 office hours	3 office hours
> 8 up to and including 12	3 office hours	4 office hours
> 12	4 office hours	

12.2.6.2 Faculty receiving assigned time for teaching large format classes shall schedule office hours according to the total WTU for the instructional assignment and assigned time related to that course.

12.2.6.3 Tenure-line faculty whose instructional assignments have been reduced to zero WTUs are advised to consult UFPP 12.2 about office hours.

12.2.7 Scheduled advising office hours

12.2.7.1 Assigned time for advising duties may have an amount of office hours defined as part of the advising function. Any advising office hours attached to assigned time shall be determined by the instructional unit that issues the assigned time and specified in the assignment. Office hours for advising duties earning assigned time are in addition to the teaching office hour obligation of the faculty member.

12.2.7.2 Department chair responsibilities shall include the requirements for the scheduling of advising office hours required for their chair assignment. The college dean shall determine the minimum office hours required for each department chair considering their assigned time for chair duties.

12.2.8 Mode of Scheduled Office Hours

12.2.8.1 The mode of scheduled office hours should meet the needs of students for the instructional or advising function that requires the scheduling of the office hours. Faculty teaching in person are encouraged to hold at least half of their office hours in-person.

12.2.8.2 Acceptable modes of holding scheduled office hours include office hours held in-person or held synchronously online using technology readily available to the campus community and generally available to the students served by the office hours.

12.2.8.3 Scheduled office hours held in-person should be in the faculty member's office or some other definite and regular location.

12.2.9 Notification

12.2.9.1 Office hours shall be posted by the beginning of the second week of instruction in faculty listings on department websites. Departments are encouraged to determine additional ways for posting office hours that conspicuously and conveniently inform the university community of when and where office hours shall be conducted, such as common boards at department offices, on placards near faculty offices, or other online directories.

12.2.9.2 Faculty should notify students enrolled in their courses and post a notice on their office door of any office hour changes in a timely manner appropriate to the needs of the students served by those office hours.

12.2.10 Exceptions

12.2.10.1 Exceptions to the policies about the scheduling of office hours should consider the needs of the instructor and the affected students.

12.2.10.2 Exceptions require department chair and dean approval.

12.2.10.3 Exceptions should be temporary and specific.

12.3 Assigned Time for Exceptional Levels of Service to Students

12.3.1 See UFPP Section 12.3 for details about this university program.

12.4 Sabbatical and Difference in Pay Leaves

12.4.1 Per the 2022-2024 CBA 27.1: A sabbatical leave is for the purpose of enhancing the University educational environment and facilitating the professional development of eligible faculty unit employees by affording opportunities for sustained focus on research, scholarly, and creative activity, instructional improvement, or professional currency.

12.4.2 Per the 2022-2024 CBA 28.1: A difference in pay leave shall be for purposes that provide a benefit to the CSU, such as research, scholarly and creative activity, instructional improvement, or faculty retraining.

12.4.3 Deans or appropriate administrators are responsible for notifying eligible faculty and advising them of the application deadline.

12.4.4 Sabbatical Leave Eligibility

12.4.4.1 Refer to UFPP 12.4.4.

12.4.5 Difference-in-Pay (DIP) Leave Eligibility

12.4.5.1 Refer to UFPP 12.4.5.

12.4.6 Leave Applications

12.4.6.1 Sabbatical and DIP leave applications must include clearly stated outcomes that benefit the university or CSU.

12.4.6.2 Applicants for professional leave with pay, either sabbatical or DIP leave, should prepare the application using appropriate university forms and with submission by announced deadlines. The core content of their proposals should be concise (typically less than 2000 words or four pages) while clearly presenting the benefit of the proposed leave to Cal Poly, students, and the candidate's professional development.

12.4.7 Department Professional Leave Committee (DPLC)

12.4.7.1 As per CBA 28.7, DIP leaves require review by a Department Professional Leave Committee (DPLC). Faculty members eligible for membership are tenured and not applying for leave with pay. DPLC members shall be elected by tenured and probationary faculty from that department.

12.4.7.2 In the College of Engineering, the DPLC shall review all DIP and sabbatical leave applications. DPLC review for both sabbatical and DIPs shall consider the value to faculty professional development, value to Cal Poly and its students, scope and activities, probability of success and reasonableness of timeline. The recommendation of the DPLC (support or not support) is included in the application sent to the department chair.

12.4.7.3 It is critically important that those involved in reviewing leave applications recommend only those applications that satisfy departmental, college and university criteria and meet the requirements of Articles 27.5-27.7 and 28.7-28.9 of the CBA, which require a review related to the quality of the proposed leave project.

12.4.7.4 Departments are encouraged to develop a rubric for evaluating leave applications consistent with the College Professional Leave Committee (CPLC) rubric shown in Appendix A. Departments shall make this rubric available to all faculty members in a timely manner.

12.4.8 Department Chair Recommendations

12.4.8.1 Department chairs shall state in a candidate's application whether the department has adequate resources to replace faculty members, and whether such a leave, if approved, would cause undue hardship to offer the department's program(s), and how the department will meet their teaching and other needs. The department chair review does not address the quality of the proposal.

12.4.8.2 If an applicant is the current department chair, the appropriate associate dean shall make the equivalent recommendation.

12.4.9 College Professional Leave Committee (CPLC)

12.4.9.1 As per CBA 27.5, CPLC members shall be composed of tenured faculty who are not applying for a sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.9.2 The CPLC shall consist of up to one tenured professor from each department. Approval shall be obtained from the dean if a department will not have a representative. Each member of the CPLC shall be elected by their department's tenured and probationary faculty for appointment to the CPLC. Departments are encouraged to develop a policy for selecting their CPLC representative. The CPLC shall elect one of its members as chair of the CPLC.

12.4.9.3 The CPLC will 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. This rubric considers the following factors:
- Value to faculty professional development
- Value to Cal Poly and its students
- Scope and activities
- Probability of success
- Tentative timetable (e.g., Gantt chart)

12.4.9.4 The CPLC shall rank order all recommended sabbatical and DIP leave applications in separate lists. The rank order is based on the total score calculated using the aggregation scheme in Appendix B.

12.4.9.5 The CPLC shall not consider the department chair recommendation (which only addresses department resources to cover any awarded leave) nor previous post-leave reports (which only address the outcomes from previous leaves).

12.4.9.6 Interviews for leave applicants will not be conducted as part of the review.

12.4.9.7 The CPLC report shall clearly state to the dean or appropriate administrator the reasons for the recommendation and this report should be forwarded to the dean or appropriate administrator along with the leave applications.

12.4.10 Dean Recommendations

12.4.10.1 The dean shall review all sabbatical and DIP leave applications in their faculty units and make recommendations to the provost.

12.4.10.2 The dean shall consider at least the following points when making recommendations for sabbatical and DIP leaves: benefit of the leave to the university, merit of the proposal, recommendations of the prior levels of review, program needs, and campus budget implications.

12.4.10.3 The dean should be aware that faculty members from small departments should not be disadvantaged from obtaining a sabbatical or DIP leave.

12.4.10.4 The dean shall verify that post-leave reports have been completed for all previous sabbatical and DIP leaves prior to recommending approval.

12.4.10.5 The dean shall rank order all recommended sabbatical leave applications and separately rank order all recommended DIP leave applications. These rankings should be shared with the CPLC.

12.4.11 Provost Decision

12.4.11.1 The provost is the final level of administrative evaluation for sabbatical and DIP leaves, as specified in UFPP 12.4.12.

12.4.12 Leave Recipient Responsibilities

12.4.12.1 Leave recipients should consult UFPP 12.4 for additional details before taking a sabbatical or DIP leave.

Appendix A: Scoring Rubric for Leave Applications

CRITERIA		Excellent (4)	Very Good (3)	Good (2)	Poor (1)
Description & Planning	**Scope & Activities**	Describes nature & purpose with supportive information; connects proposed activities and expected outcomes to applicant's professional training and other college work (when appropriate)	Describes nature & purpose with detailed supportive information.	The nature & purpose are described in a cursory manner.	Does not address the question.
	Tentative Timetable	Timetable includes essential tasks and demonstrates thorough planning and organization to support the success of leave activities.	Timetable demonstrates mostly complete planning and organization to support the success of leave activities.	Timetable demonstrates little planning and organization.	Timetable is missing.
Probability of Completion of Objectives		Strong relevant experience, well-integrated connections between activities & timeline, availability of resources and other documented support.	Some relevant experience, integrated connections between activities & timeline, availability of resources and other documented support.	Proposed activities and requested time do not seem commensurate. Documentation does not clearly demonstrate that the goals will be met.	Proposed activities and requested time are not commensurate. 'Show-stoppers' might exist but impossible to verify due to lack of documentation.
Value to Faculty Professional Development		Provides detailed description for how knowledge & skills gained will be used in faculty position[1]. The description is consistent with the teacher-scholar model[2].	Provides description for how knowledge & skills gained will be used in faculty position. The description is consistent with the teacher-scholar model.	Provides cursory description for how knowledge & skills gained will be used in faculty position; or Same benefit can be achieved through assigned time[3].	Does not address the question. or Provided information suggests that resulting benefit is minimal or inconsistent with Cal-Poly teacher-scholar model.
Value to Cal Poly and its Students		Identifies who benefits, when, and how. Stated benefits are consistent with the mission of the unit[4]; the value is substantial, timely, and relevant to the near-future advancement of engineering.	Identifies who benefits, when, and how. Stated benefits are consistent with the mission of the unit; the value is clear and substantial.	Identifies some stakeholders of the project. Stated benefits are consistent with the mission of the unit but they are not well articulated.	The value to Cal Poly and its students is unclear. or The stated benefits could be accomplished through assigned time.

[1] leave applications aiming at improving faculty currency are permissible; the language in 27.1 of the CBA was updated in 2022 replacing the word 'faculty retraining' (associated with change in job description) with 'professional currency'.
[2] see AS-725-11 "Resolution of Defining and Adopting the Teacher-Scholar Model"
[3] see EP&R76-36 "Faculty Workload: Policies and Procedures" and reflect in recommendation memo to dean of CENG.
[4] unit in this rubric refers to Cal Poly, CENG, department, or other Cal Poly entity (as appropriate); AS-650-06 defines Cal Poly Mission

Appendix B: Total Score Aggregation Table

Applicant's Name:		**Data from Rubrics of Committee Members** Excellent (4), Very Good (3), Good (2), Poor (1)										**Weighted Score (WS)**
Criteria	**Weight** (W)	**#1**	**#2**	**#3**	**#4**	**#5**	**#6**	**#7**	**#8**	**#9**	**Median** (S)	S×W
1. Scope & Activities	20 %											
2. Timetable	10 %											
3. Probability of Success	10 %											
4. Value to Faculty Professional Development	30 %											
5. Value to Cal Poly & Students	30 %											
											Total Score	$= \sum_{i=1}^{5} WS_i$
	Comments: 1. The total score determines the rank-order of the applicants. 2. All nine CENG departments are represented in the CPLC, hence, the 9 columns of data. 3. Median is used to aggregate data because 'excellent', 'very good', 'good', and 'poor' are ordinal data; also, compared to sums and averages, the median is less sensitive to outliers. 4. The higher weight assigned to the value proposition of the proposals (total of 55%) is consistent with the intent of a professional leave as captured by Articles 27 and 28 of the CBA. 5. The timetable receives a lower weight (10%), however, it also factors in the perceived probability of success.												

Appendix C: Revision History

Rev. 1 Approved June 2023 by vote of the faculty. Conducted vote in accordance with policy in section 1.8.3

Rev. 2 – Updated 9/5/2023 per policy in section 1.8.2 to be consistent with university policies. Details as follows:

- Section 2.2.4: Diversity and Inclusion statement added to the bulleted list "At a minimum, application packages must include:" as it is required by university policy.

- Section 2.2.9 Changed "justify their decision in an email to all department faculty" to "justify their decision in confidential manner to all department faculty" per request from Academic Personnel to comply with university practice.

- Section 2.4.2 Updated language to read "New full-time lecturer appointments require a search process similar to tenure-track searches, including a faculty search committee consisting of at least three tenured faculty members elected by the department faculty according to department voting procedures. Probationary faculty or Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty require the approval of the dean to serve." Change made to comply with university policy which requires three tenure-track faculty (rather than two) to serve on full-time lecturer search committees.

- Section 2.4.7 Updated language to read "Initial appointment for full-time lecturers is for one or two academic years." This was changed to reflect new Academic personnel policy that lecturers can initially be appointed for two years.

- Section 6.2.4/6.2.5 Updated language at Academic Personnel's request to refer to "probationary years" rather than "tenure years" to comply with university practice.

- Section 11.4.2.3   The language is changed from "The current department chair shall send a memo to the dean that includes the voting results and recommendations" to "The faculty member administering the chair election shall send a memo to the dean that includes voting results and recommendations." Change made per request from Academic Personnel, as the current department chair should not administer the election in any way including submitting election results if they are a candidate for the chair position.

To: Amy Fleischer, Dean
College of Engineering

Date: September 8, 2023

From: Cynthia Jackson-Elmoore, Ph.D.
Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Copies: Kathryn Rummell

Subject: College of Engineering Faculty Personnel Policies (CFPP) Document

---

The subject document, revised in September 2023, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the College of Engineering faculty access to the document as soon as possible.