



CAL POLY

College of Engineering (CENG)

**Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE)
Department**

Department Faculty Personnel Policies (DFPP)

Contents

Table of Acronyms.....	4
1 Overview.....	5
1.1 Summary and Background.....	5
1.2 Department Mission, Vision, and Values Statement.....	5
1.3 Department Commitment to Universal Student Success.....	6
1.4 Philosophy and Scope of the Policies	6
1.5 The Teacher-Scholar Model.....	6
1.6 Updating the CSSE DFPP Policies	7
1.7 Voting Procedures	7
1.8 Conflict of Interest.....	8
2 Faculty Appointments.....	9
2.1 Summary.....	9
2.2 The Search Committee	9
2.3 Tenure-Line Recruitment Process	10
2.4 Full-time Lecturer Recruitment Process	12
3 Faculty Evaluation Process	14
3.1 Department Peer Review Committees (DPRCs)	14
3.2 DPRC Subcommittees	14
3.3 Writing the Evaluation Form	15
4 Faculty Evaluation Criteria	17
4.1 General Evaluation Criteria.....	17
4.2 Evaluation Criteria for Teaching	17
4.3 Evaluation Criteria for Professional Development	19
4.4 Evaluation Criteria for Service	21
4.5 Evaluation of Other Factors.....	22
4.6 Numeric Evaluation	22
5 Leave of Absence and Difference in Pay (DIP).....	24
5.1 Selection of Department Professional Leave Committee (DPLC).....	24
5.2 Presentation of Leave Applications.	24
5.3 Evaluation Criteria	24
6 CSSE Department Chair and Associate Chair Selection Process.....	25
6.1 CSSE Department Chair Selection Process	25
6.2 CSSE Department Associate Chair Selection	26



7	Selection of Affiliate Members of the Department	27
7.1	Affiliate Members Definitions	27
7.2	Approving Affiliate Members	27
	Appendix A: Example Teaching Preference Form.....	28



Table of Acronyms

ABD	All But Dissertation
ACM	Association for Computing Machinery
AP	Academic Personal
AS	Academic Senate
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement
CENG	College of Engineering
CFA	California Faculty Association
CFPP	College of Engineering Faculty Personnel Policies
CPE	Computer Engineering Department
CPLC	CENG Professional Leave Committee
CSSE	Computer Science and Software Engineering
CSU	California State University
CV	Curriculum Vitae
DFPP	Department Faculty Personnel Policy
DIP	Difference in Pay
DPLC	Department Professional Leave Committee
DPRC	Department Peer Review Committee
EEF	Employee Equity Facilitator
MOU	Memoranda of Understandings
PAF	Personnel Action File
PRC	Peer Review Committee
UFPP	University Faculty Personnel Policy
WPAF	Working Personnel Action File
WTU	Weighted Teaching Unit

1 Overview

1.1 Summary and Background

- 1.1.1 The Computer Science and Software Engineering (CSSE) Department is recognized nationally as a leader in undergraduate computing education and is famous for its hands-on, learn-by-doing, laboratory approach. Our curricula have been developed by a faculty with a wide variety of educational and experiential backgrounds, many of whom have cooperated in interdisciplinary approaches in order to solve educational challenges. The ability to continue to attract and retain capable, committed, and diverse faculty is a critical factor in preserving the leadership status of the department.
- 1.1.2 This Department Faculty Personnel Policies (DFPP) document describes eligibility standards and criteria for evaluation, consistent with the College Faculty Personnel Policies (CFPP), the University Faculty Personnel Policies (UFPP), the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California State University (CSU) and the California Faculty Association (CFA), and Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) the CSSE Department has with other departments and individuals. In cases of a conflict, the CBA takes precedence, followed by the UFPP, followed by the CFPP, followed by the MOUs, followed by the DFPP.

1.2 Department Mission, Vision, and Values Statement

1.2.1 Vision Statement

The CSSE Department strives to provide high-quality computing education and excellent career preparation for our students, embracing diverse backgrounds and lived experiences.

1.2.2 Mission Statement

The Computer Science and Software Engineering Department is committed to the following priorities.

- Close student-faculty interaction in small classes and in developing software for real-world projects, embodying Cal Poly's Learn by Doing philosophy.
- A supportive and welcoming environment that enables students to succeed.
- Fostering a vibrant and inclusive community of students, faculty, and staff with diverse backgrounds and lived experiences.

1.2.3 The CSSE Department faculty are guided by the following **values**.

- **Quality Education** – excellence in teaching, providing a high-quality learning environment through student-faculty interactions that prepare all students to be lifelong learners and that encourage the students' personal and professional growth.
- **Student Well-being** – supporting the emotional, social, ethical, and academic needs of students by promoting a sense of belonging and acknowledging that failure is part of the learning process.
- **Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion** – respecting and drawing upon diverse backgrounds, experiences, and ideas that support student, faculty, and staff success.
- **Collaboration** – engagement in interdisciplinary experiences across the university and with a wide range of partners from industry, K-12 education, academia, government, and non-profit organizations.
- **Social Responsibility** – placing a high value on ethics, global awareness, the environment, and contributing to the improvement of people's lives, especially those that have been historically marginalized.
- **Applied Research and Teaching** – conducting applied research that includes project-based, hands-on learning opportunities with theoretical and practical approaches for successful solutions to real-world problems.

- **Transparent and Open Governance** – consensus-driven governance in which transparency and open communication are valued.

1.3 Department Commitment to Universal Student Success

- 1.3.1 The CSSE Department 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 enhance the continued success of the department within generally accepted academic standards of professionalism, such as the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct.
- 1.3.2 While all faculty share the commonality of being a member of the CSSE Department, 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, cultural, intellectual, socioeconomic, linguistic, and spiritual characteristics. The department strives to continually acknowledge the individuality of each faculty member and the distinctiveness of their experiences and contributions to the department in order to increase their growth and overall effectiveness as faculty members. It is thus the responsibility of all members of the CSSE Department 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 This document governs primarily **tenure-track faculty** (faculty that are on a path to achieve tenure, but are not tenured), **tenured faculty** (faculty that have achieved tenure), and **lecturers** (both full-time and part-time). Throughout the document, the term **tenure-line** faculty is used to refer to both tenured and tenure-track faculty members.
- 1.4.2 The CSSE Department implements procedures and criteria for personnel actions to hire and foster the development of high-quality faculty. Every member of the CSSE Department contributes to the department in a different way, having their own strengths and focus areas. 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.
- 1.4.3 The CSSE Department values all contributions in the general areas of teaching, professional development, and service from all members of the department. Lecturers are not expected to engage in professional development and service activities. The CSSE Department 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 support the department's commitment to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion.

1.5 The Teacher-Scholar Model

- 1.5.1 The CSSE Department follows the teacher-scholar model previously adopted by the university (AS resolution 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, scholarly activities, and service. 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 Updating the CSSE DFPP Policies

- 1.6.1 This document shall be approved by a general vote with a qualified majority, as described in Section 1.7.
- 1.6.2 Changes to this document to remain consistent with university policies are the responsibility of the chair of the CSSE Department and the dean of the CENG. The chair of the CSSE Department and the dean of the CENG, in consultation with Academic Personnel (AP), can make these types of revisions without faculty input but must notify all faculty of the revisions.
- 1.6.3 Changes to this document can be initiated by any group of three or more department faculty and must be approved by a qualified majority general vote, as described in Section 1.7.
- 1.6.4 Changes to this document can only become official at the beginning of the academic year. All changes to this document must be approved by the chair of the CSSE Department, dean of the CENG, AP, and the provost.

1.7 Voting Procedures

- 1.7.1 Whenever possible, the CSSE Department will abide by Robert's rules of order during department and committee meetings. Each member of the department can make a motion, followed by a second, debate, vote, and vote announcement.
- 1.7.2 All votes will be open, unless explicitly specified otherwise in this or superseding documents, or unless there is a motion for the vote to be closed and the motion is approved with a qualified majority of the voting members.
- 1.7.3 Voting members who are not present for a vote can give their proxy to any voting member who is present for the vote. The recipient of the proxy shall announce that they are holding the proxy vote in the name of the person who delegated it to them prior to the vote taking place.
- 1.7.4 Depending on the type of vote, different members of the CSSE Department will be eligible to vote.
 - When a **tenured vote** takes place, only tenured faculty are eligible to vote.
 - When a **tenure-line vote** takes place, only tenure-line faculty are eligible to vote.
 - When a **faculty vote** takes place, all tenure-line faculty, affiliated faculty, and full-time lecturers are eligible to vote.
 - When a **general vote** takes place, all tenure-line faculty, affiliated faculty, lecturers, and support staff in the department are eligible to vote.
 - When a **committee vote** takes place, all members of the committee are eligible to vote.
 - Under certain circumstances, voting members may decide to allow additional members to participate in a vote. Each additional voting member shall be approved with a qualified majority vote by the current voting members.
 - All votes taken by the CSSE Department shall be subject to the conflict-of-interest rules (Section 1.8).
- 1.7.5 Each eligible voting member can vote YES, NO, or ABSTAIN. A vote is considered successful when the following criteria are met.
 - More than half of the eligible tenure-line non-affiliate voting members are present or have given their proxy to someone who is present.
 - The number of YES votes shall be at least twice the number of NO votes for a **qualified majority** vote. Alternatively, the number of YES votes shall be greater than the number of NO votes for a **simple majority** vote.

1.8 Conflict of Interest

- 1.8.1 A conflict of interest exists when an impartial outside observer may conclude that a voting member has a direct personal or financial interest in the outcome of a vote. This conflict of interest is most commonly due to a close personal relationship between the voting member and the person the vote is about.
- 1.8.2 When there is a conflict of interest, the voting member who has a conflict of interest should recuse themselves from participating in the preceding discussions and the vote.

2 Faculty Appointments

2.1 Summary

- 2.1.1 The CSSE Department recruits highly qualified faculty from diverse backgrounds who share our commitment to student learning and success. Faculty are expected to contribute to an inclusive, equitable, and diverse department and university community.

2.2 The Search Committee

- 2.2.1 A search committee shall be elected to screen applicants and manage the recruitment process. The search committee and the chair of the CSSE Department are responsible for recruiting and recommending finalists for the position, acting on behalf of the entire department. For tenure-line searches, the search committee shall follow the recommendation of the voting body of the CSSE Department as described in Section 2.3. For lecturer searches, the search committee shall identify and rank the acceptable candidates as described in Section 2.4.
- 2.2.2 The search committee shall consist of at least three full-time tenure-line faculty, with the majority of the committee being tenure-line members of the CSSE Department. Tenure-track faculty and Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) faculty require the approval of the dean of the CENG to serve on the search committee.
- 2.2.3 It is considered customary for the search committee for tenure-line positions to include at least one member who is a tenure-line faculty member with a home in a different department.
- 2.2.4 The search committee shall include at least one trained Employee Equity Facilitator (EEF) who shall not be the chair of the search committee. It is strongly encouraged that all members of the search committee complete the EEF training.
- 2.2.5 The faculty member designated as the EEF shall ensure that the search committee members become familiar with the State of California Pre-Employment Inquiry Guidelines, and that these guidelines are followed with regard to questions asked of applicants. At the end of each recruitment, the EEF shall submit a written report regarding the search to the Civil Rights and Compliance Office to ensure that any problems that may have compromised the fairness of the search are reported. The EEF shall contact the Civil Rights and Compliance Office immediately if there are issues during the search.
- 2.2.6 It is considered customary for the chair of the CSSE Department to suggest the initial members of the search committee. Any tenure-line faculty of the department shall also have the opportunity to self-nominate to serve on the search committee or nominate another tenure-line member. Each committee member shall be individually elected to the search committee using a tenure-line qualified majority vote.
- 2.2.7 The chair of the CSSE Department should not serve on the search committee for tenure-line recruitments but may participate in the screening process and finalist interviews.
- 2.2.8 It is considered customary for the chair of the CSSE Department to nominate the chair of the search committee. The chair of the search committee shall be elected by a simple majority vote by the members of the search committee. The chair of the search committee will be responsible for organizing the review of the applications in a timely manner, scheduling the interviews, providing hiring recommendation memoranda to the department chair and the dean of the CENG, and following university procedures.
- 2.2.9 All search committee members are required to review all application materials, participate in committee meetings, evaluate candidates, and participate in interviews.
- 2.2.10 The search committee members shall give careful consideration to all qualified Cal Poly lecturers who have applied for the position. Search committee members and the department chair shall review the Personnel Action File (PAF) for these candidates.

2.3 Tenure-Line Recruitment Process

- 2.3.1 A Doctor of Philosophy degree in Computer Science, Software Engineering, Computer Engineering, or another closely related/relevant discipline is normally required for tenure-line appointments. Candidates who have completed all doctoral requirements but 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 Prior to the beginning of the application review cycle, the CSSE Department shall discuss and approve by a qualified tenure-line majority vote the details of the interview process. These details could include, for example, the duration of an on-campus interview for an applicant and the details on how different activities, such as presentations, meetings with faculty, meetings with students, meetings with the broader campus community members, and so on, will be conducted. These decisions shall be consistent with the Cal Poly AP policies.
- 2.3.3 Prior to the beginning of the application review cycle, the CSSE Department shall also discuss the **voting body** for the search. The voting body will normally consist of all tenure-line faculty and lecturers that do not have a conflict of interest plus the members of the search committee plus additional faculty that are approved by a tenure-line qualified majority vote. Note that the voting body only has an advisory vote, where the final vote is done by the tenured faculty as described in Section 2.3.16.
- 2.3.4 Applicants for tenure-line positions shall submit at least the following application materials:
- Cover Letter,
 - CV,
 - Names and contact information of at least three references,
 - Unofficial transcripts,
 - Statement of Teaching Philosophy, and
 - Statement of Scholarship and Professional Development Philosophy.
- 2.3.5 It is customary for the search process to consist of two rounds of interviews: the **screening interviews** and the **on-campus interviews**.
- 2.3.6 The search committee shall select, in a timely fashion, the top candidates that meet and exceed the minimal criteria, as identified in Section 2.3 of the CFPP. These candidates will be invited to participate in screening interviews. The names of these candidates will be shared with the members of the voting body. This is for information purposes only so that members of the voting body can provide feedback to the search committee. The names of the candidates should be kept confidential.
- 2.3.7 For the candidates that are invited to the screening interviews, the search committee will request recommendation letters from the references provided by the applicants. It is customary to also request that these candidates share their teaching preferences and mastery of the material for the different courses offered by the CSSE Department (see Appendix A for an example form).
- 2.3.8 The screening interviews will be conducted by the members of the search committee, where the expectation is that all members of the search committee will be present. All interviews should have the same format and last approximately the same amount of time. For example, it is customary for the screening interviews to be remote using voice or video conferencing. Normally, each candidate will be interviewed for approximately 25 minutes plus five minutes for the candidate to ask questions to the committee. Each candidate will be asked the same questions, although the search committee members may ask follow-up or clarification questions during the screening interviews. It is customary for screening interview questions to focus on the following general topics:
- Candidate's interest in Cal Poly,

- Teaching qualifications,
 - Scholarship and professional development qualifications,
 - Teacher-scholar model,
 - Learn By Doing, and
 - Universal Student Success (required topic).
- 2.3.9 After the screening interviews, the search committee shall share with the voting body the names of the applicants for the on-campus interviews. This information shall be kept confidential.
- 2.3.10 At least three references for an applicant invited for an on-campus interview must be verified through phone calls before the candidate commences their on-campus interview. At least two search committee members should be present on each of the phone calls.
- 2.3.11 Prior to the on-campus interview of an applicant, the search committee shall share the applicant's application materials and additional material, such as recommendation letters and teaching preferences, with all tenure-line members of the CSSE Department who do not have a conflict of interest as identified in Section 1.8. A candidate's CV/resume may be shared with others whose opinions are sought in the hiring process and who will be meeting the candidate during the campus visit, such as lecturers, students, and staff. All shared materials shall be kept confidential.
- 2.3.12 During the on-campus interviews, all department members who do not have a conflict of interest shall be given the opportunity to meet each candidate as part of a group meeting.
- 2.3.13 Whenever possible, during the on-campus interviews at least the following activities should take place.
- Meeting with a selected group of undergraduate and/or graduate students (for example, during lunch).
 - Meeting with faculty at different time slots, preferably not more than four faculty members during each time slot. All such meetings shall include at least one faculty member with active EEF training designated to be the EEF for the meeting.
 - A teaching presentation. If the topic of the presentation is selected by the search committee, then the candidate should be given at least one week's notice about the topic.
 - A research presentation on a topic chosen by the candidate.
 - Both the teaching presentation and the research presentation shall be public events accessible to the members of the CSSE Department, students, as well as the members of the broader campus community except for those with a direct conflict of interest as identified by Section 1.8. These events should be advertised well in advance to ensure good attendance.
 - Meeting with the dean of the CENG or a designee assigned by the dean of the CENG.
 - Meeting with the chair of the CSSE Department. It is customary for this to be the last activity of the on-campus interview so that the chair of the CSSE Department can answer any lingering questions the candidate may have.
- 2.3.14 In the spirit of its welcoming and supportive culture, the CSSE Department shall proactively reach out to each candidate to inquire about possible accommodations that a candidate invited for an on-campus interview may need during their visit. The CSSE Department shall fulfill reasonable requests to the best of its ability.
- 2.3.15 All students and members of the department that interacted with a candidate during their on-campus interview can submit feedback to the search committee. The search committee shall summarize the feedback and share it with the voting body with as much notice as possible in advance of the voting in order to facilitate an open discussion prior to voting.
- 2.3.16 After all (or some, in the case of multiple open positions) of the on-campus interviews have been completed, the chair of the CSSE Department shall call a meeting of the voting body to discuss the candidates. At the beginning of the meeting, the search committee will present the summarized feedback.

In addition, the search committee should present their experience interacting with each candidate and share their opinion about how each candidate fits the position that was advertised. Each member of the voting body will have an opportunity to participate in the discussion of the summarized feedback shared by the search committee. This discussion must focus on substantive evidence of the candidates' qualifications for the position. The voting body shall take a closed qualified majority vote on each applicant interviewed to date to determine whether they are considered acceptable for an offer for the advertised position. Members of the voting body that did not communicate with the candidate nor observed the teaching/research talks are encouraged to abstain from voting. In a second vote, members of the voting body will submit a secret ballot with the ranking of the acceptable candidates. After the vote, the results will be shared with the members of the voting body. After that, a third qualified majority vote of the voting body will approve the ranking of the candidates. If the third vote is not successful, then a new motion can be made until the voting body approves with a qualified majority a ranking of the acceptable candidates. This ranked order of the acceptable candidates shall be put to a fourth tenured faculty simple majority vote.

- 2.3.17 The chair of the search committee shall write a memo to the CSSE Department chair and the CENG dean that conveys the result of the votes.
- 2.3.18 The department chair shall submit a separate hiring recommendation as outlined in Section 2.2 of the CFPP.
- 2.3.19 The tenure-line search will continue until the dean of the CENG has closed the search or all available positions have been filled.
- 2.3.20 If the tenure-line search remains open after the on-campus interviews and department deliberations, then the continuation stage shall be guided by the following principles.
 - Any prior CSSE Department votes pertaining to the faculty search establishing how to proceed with the continuation stage of the search should be considered. For example, the CSSE Department's resolution on the interview process adopted at the beginning of the search process may contain directions for the search committee and the department chair on how to proceed.
 - Applicants who took part in a screening interview but did not receive an invitation for an on-campus interview should be reconsidered for an on-campus interview if their application is considered highly qualified by the search committee.
 - The search committee may, with an advance notification to the CSSE Department, conduct additional screening interviews with applicants that submitted their application after the review end date. If the search committee considers them highly qualified, then it can include them in the pool from which it recommends additional on-campus interviews.
- 2.3.21 As a result of the considerations in Section 2.3.20, the search committee may suggest additional applicants for an on-campus interview. The on-campus scheduling and interview process for any additional applicants is subject to the same rules as the first cohort of on-campus interviews.

2.4 Full-time Lecturer Recruitment Process

- 2.4.1 Possession of a Master of Science degree in Computer Science, Software Engineering, Computer Engineering, or another related/relevant discipline is normally required for lecturer appointments. Candidates who are expected to complete all Master of Science degree requirements before the position's start date should also be considered during the recruitment process. However, all minimum degree requirements must be completed prior to the appointment start date.
- 2.4.2 Applicants for lecturer positions shall submit at least the following application materials:
 - Cover Letter,
 - CV,

- Diversity and Inclusivity Statement,
 - Names and contact information for at least three references,
 - Unofficial transcripts, and
 - Statement of Teaching Philosophy.
- 2.4.3 The search committee shall select, in a timely fashion, the top candidates that meet and exceed the minimal criteria, as identified in Section 2.4 of the CFPP. These candidates will be invited to participate in screening interviews.
- 2.4.4 It is customary for the search committee to reach out to the candidates that are invited to the screening interviews and request that these candidates indicate their teaching preferences and mastery of the material for the different courses offered by the CSSE Department (see Appendix A for an example form).
- 2.4.5 The screening interviews will be conducted by the members of the search committee, where the expectation is that all members of the search committee will be present. It is customary for the screening interviews to be remote using voice or video conferencing. Normally, each candidate will be interviewed for approximately 25 minutes plus five minutes for the candidate to ask questions to the committee. Each candidate will be asked exactly the same questions, although the search committee members may ask follow-up or clarification questions during the screening interviews. Normally, these questions should include the following general topics:
- Candidate's interest in Cal Poly,
 - Teaching qualifications,
 - Other relevant experience,
 - Learn By Doing, and
 - Universal Student Success (required).
- 2.4.6 After the first round of interviews, the search committee shall discuss the candidates that were interviewed and decide on the finalists that should be interviewed again.
- 2.4.7 During the second round of interviews, which could be over voice or video conferencing or in person, at least the following activities should normally take place.
- A teaching presentation followed by a question-and-answer session. It is normal practice for the topic of the teaching demo to be selected by the search committee and shared with each candidate at least one week before the teaching demo.
 - A software coding challenge, where the candidate will be given a simple coding problem. The candidate will be required to not only solve the problem, but also explain their thought process and discuss advantages and possible shortfalls of their solution.
 - A question-and-answer session, where both the search committee members and the candidate can ask questions.
- 2.4.8 After all the interviews are completed, the search committee shall review all available documents, deliberate, and produce a ranked list of acceptable candidates. The chair of the search committee shall write a memo to the chair of the CSSE Department that contains this ranking of the acceptable candidates.
- 2.4.9 Based on the recommendations of the search committee, the chair of the CSSE Department will write a memo to the dean of the CENG with the names of the recommended hires.
- 2.4.10 Before making a hiring recommendation to the dean of CENG, at least two members of the search committee shall conduct telephone reference checks with the candidates' references.

3 Faculty Evaluation Process

3.1 Department Peer Review Committees (DPRCs)

- 3.1.1 Members who can serve on CSSE DPRCs are elected at the beginning of each academic year.
- 3.1.2 All tenured faculty of the CSSE Department are eligible to serve on the CSSE DPRCs, except for the department chair.
- 3.1.3 The members of a CSSE DPRC are elected by the tenure-line faculty of the CSSE Department with a qualified majority vote.
- 3.1.4 The members of each CSSE DPRC shall discuss, nominate, and elect the chair of the DPRC.
- 3.1.5 The chair of each DPRC shall be responsible for:
 - Onboarding and giving guidance and support to new members of the DPRC as needed,
 - Consulting with the candidates before their WPAFs are due,
 - Creating the DPRC subcommittee for each candidate,
 - Organizing timely meetings to review the candidates and to write the reviews,
 - Submitting the final review forms to the department chair and dean of the CENG in a timely fashion,
 - Meeting with the candidates after the reviews to discuss the reviews when warranted,
 - Organizing the discussions and responses to all rebuttals submitted to the DPRCs, and
 - Submitting the rebuttal responses to the department chair and the dean of CENG in a timely fashion, when appropriate.
- 3.1.6 The selection of the members of the DPRC that review an individual candidate is subject to the following rules.
 - Members of the CENG DPRC shall not review any candidate undergoing tenure and/or promotion as part of the DPRC.
 - Only members of the DPRC who are full professors will review cases for promotion to full professor and cases of post-tenure reviews of full professors.
 - Members of the DPRC undergoing promotion review shall not review any candidate undergoing promotion review.
 - Members of the DPRC undergoing post-tenure review shall not review any candidate undergoing post-tenure review.
 - Members of the DPRC with a conflict of interest as identified in Section 1.8 should recuse themselves from review of faculty members with whom they have a conflict of interest.
- 3.1.7 The membership of the DPRC for a faculty member with a non-zero CPE appointment and a home department in CSSE shall be drawn from CSSE DPRC members, as described in Section 3.1.6, and tenured members of the CPE Department. However, the minimum number of DPRC members from each department must meet the threshold established in the MOU for the joint appointment. Each DPRC member from CPE shall be elected by tenure-line faculty vote of the CSSE Department by a qualified majority vote.
- 3.1.8 In some situations, the chair of a CSSE DPRC, in consultation with the members who can serve on the DPRC and the candidate, may invite a tenured faculty member from a different Cal Poly department to review a candidate as part of the DPRC for the candidate. In such cases, the tenure-line faculty shall vote, with qualified majority, to approve the addition of this faculty member to the specific CSSE DPRC.

3.2 DPRC Subcommittees

- 3.2.1 It is customary for the chair of a DPRC, in consultation with the candidate that is being evaluated and the members of the candidate's DPRC, to create a subcommittee that includes some (or all) of the DPRC

committee members for that candidate. Each DPRC subcommittee will have a chair that is appointed by the chair of the DPRC. The following constraints should be observed.

- The subcommittee for tenure and/or promotion case shall consist of at least three members.
- The subcommittee for a review of a tenure-track faculty member shall consist of at least three members.
- The subcommittee for a review of a lecturer (including range elevation cases) shall consist of at least two members.
- The subcommittee for a post-tenure non-promotion review shall consist of at least two members.

3.2.2 In each peer review conducted by a DPRC, the designated subcommittee has the following responsibilities that are above and beyond the responsibilities of the other DPRC members.

- Conduct teaching observations of the candidate's classes.
- Draft the candidate's evaluation form and present it to the DPRC.
- Lead the discussion of the candidate and their evaluation during the DPRC meetings.
- Finalize the candidate's evaluation form following the discussion by considering and adopting the DPRC suggestions.

3.3 Writing the Evaluation Form

3.3.1 The evaluation form is written as part of two readings: the first reading and the second reading. The subcommittee's initial draft of the evaluation form is reviewed and revised during the first reading, and a final version is approved during the second reading.

3.3.2 Before the first reading of the draft of the evaluation form, each member of the subcommittee shall observe at least one lecture of the candidate. If a member of the subcommittee is unable to observe a lecture due to a time conflict, they should arrange to be moved to a different subcommittee.

3.3.3 The reviewer must provide at least five days' notice before a classroom observation occurs. The observation of the class shall be conducted in a manner that is not obtrusive and the reviewer should meet with the candidate within one week of the classroom observation to share feedback.

3.3.4 The reviewer can request course syllabus and more information about how the lecture that was observed fits in the general organization of the class in order to evaluate the class.

3.3.5 Each member of the subcommittee shall write down their peer-review observations and share them with the DPRC of the candidate. As much as possible, reviewers should not be influenced by bias and should write their review based on their observations.

3.3.6 The chair of the subcommittee shall distribute the work of writing the evaluation form among the members of the subcommittee, where the first draft of the evaluation form should be ready before the first reading.

3.3.7 All text in the evaluation form should be traceable back to existing documentation, such as student and peer teaching reviews and the documentation that is provided in the WPAF. Opinions of the reviewers that are not substantiated by existing evidence should not be included in the evaluation form.

3.3.8 During the first reading, the first draft of the evaluation form will be discussed, where the discussion will be led by the DPRC subcommittee. Depending on the DPRC's workload, the chair of the DPRC may decide that either:

- All members of the candidate's DPRC will be given the opportunity during a DPRC meeting to participate in the discussion of the first reading and suggest additions or edits to the document, or
- Only the members of the subcommittee will participate in the first reading, where the feedback document will be shared with all members of the candidate's DPRC, and all members of the

candidate's DPRC shall be given the opportunity to share feedback with the candidate's DPRC subcommittee.

- 3.3.9 Between the first and second reading of the evaluation form, the DPRC subcommittee should carefully consider the feedback from the candidate's DPRC committee and make the appropriate edits.
- 3.3.10 During the second reading, the evaluation form of the candidate will be finalized, where the discussion will be again led by the DPRC subcommittee. All members of the candidate's DPRC will be given the opportunity to participate in the discussion and suggest additions or edits to the document.
- 3.3.11 Upon completion of the second reading, the DPRC committee shall vote Yes/No on promotion, retention, and tenure as applicable and on the numeric evaluation score. It is customary for the members of the subcommittee to share their opinions on the vote beforehand. The vote should be a simple majority open vote of the committee members.
- 3.3.12 It is the responsibility of the chair of each DPRC to finalize the evaluation form, collect the signatures of the DPRC members who voted on the evaluation, and submit the evaluation form to the CSSE Department chair and the CENG dean.

4 Faculty Evaluation Criteria

4.1 General Evaluation Criteria

- 4.1.1 Per university policies, the evaluation of each faculty member is broken down into four components: teaching, professional development, service, and other factors.
- 4.1.2 All faculty members are expected to demonstrate their support of the department's mission and vision statement through their efforts in each of the four evaluation components as appropriate to their rank and position. Thus, support of the mission and vision statement of the department will feed into the evaluation of faculty candidates across all four components.
- 4.1.3 Every member of the CSSE Department contributes to the department in a different way, having their own strengths and focus areas. 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 CSSE Department values all contributions in the general areas of teaching, professional development, and service from tenure-line faculty. The CSSE Department recognizes that the criteria for appointment, retention, and promotion are multifaceted, and acknowledges and honors faculty who exhibit a practical and effective balance in their accomplishments. All faculty are also expected to support the department's commitment to justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion.
- 4.1.4 Although lecturers are not required or expected to perform professional development or service activities based on their appointments, lecturers that do perform such activities should make note of these activities so that they can be commended for this valuable work by their DPRC.
- 4.1.5 This chapter explains the different ways in which a candidate can document their accomplishments and how these accomplishments will be evaluated by their DPRC. Each DPRC should value all contributions to the CSSE Department. However, contributions of lecturers outside teaching should be evaluated in terms of how these contributions enhance their teaching.
- 4.1.6 The members of the DPRC are only required to evaluate the evidence that is presented by the candidate and the evidence that appears in their PAF and therefore it is the responsibility of each candidate to present a compelling case.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria for Teaching

- 4.2.1 All faculty are expected to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, participate as needed in teaching improvement activities, and to have a teaching philosophy that fosters student success with considerations for continuous improvement.
- 4.2.2 Tenure-line faculty are additionally evaluated on their student advising.
- 4.2.3 **Teaching effectiveness** is one's ability to be an effective and student-centric educator within the confines of one's teaching assignments. Teaching effectiveness is primarily measured using the following components.
 - Peer observations of class visits are the primary tool to assess the teaching effectiveness of a candidate. DPRC reviews should include observations from multiple committee members and preferably over different lectures.
 - 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. The DPRC should consider the context in which these evaluations are administered and interpret them accordingly. The DPRC should take an intersectional, equity-minded approach to analyzing all quantitative and qualitative data from student evaluations. 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, and evaluate the student feedback holistically. The DPRC should consider the number/percent of student comments that highlight similar feedback.

- The candidate's teaching narrative and reflections on student comments, as submitted as part of their WPAF, is an important part of the self-reflection of the candidate. The DPRC will evaluate the candidate's progress as an educator through their narrative, and their reflections and actions based on student feedback.
- The appropriateness of material that is taught in class is assessed via teaching observations and by examining the teaching materials submitted by the candidate.
- The depth and currency of domain-specific knowledge of the candidate is assessed through peer observations, student comments on the course content, and materials submitted by the candidate.
- The continuous improvement of course content, materials, assignments, and exams is important because it demonstrates the candidate's willingness to revise existing courses to better reflect industry trends and to better prepare the students to join the workforce.
- Additional evidence, such as letters of support from students that are not anonymous, can also be used in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of a candidate.

4.2.4 **Curriculum development** is the continuous improvement of curriculum and course offerings. Note that curriculum development is expected only from tenure-line faculty, but lecturers that participate in such activities should include them in their WPAF so that they can be recognized. Moreover, there is no expectation that every tenure-line candidate will engage with curriculum development over every period of evaluation. Curriculum development can be evaluated via the following activities.

- Development of new courses, as evidenced by submission of course proposals, their approval, and teaching the courses for the first time.
- Development of new programs/sub-programs, as evidenced by submission of program/sub-program proposals, and their eventual approval.
- Redesign of existing courses, programs, and subprograms, as evidenced by submission of appropriate revision documents and teaching redesigned courses for the first time.
- Participation in external to the department curriculum initiatives instigated by Cal Poly, as evidenced by preparation and submission of materials appropriate for those initiatives.
- Any peer-reviewed publications documenting curriculum development efforts and lessons learned. Note that teaching-related publications should *also* be described in the Professional Development section of the WPAF.

4.2.5 **Student advising** relates to the advising of independent studies, senior project advising, M.S. thesis advising, serving on M.S. committees, student club educational activities, and other forms of work with individual students and student teams outside the scope of a class. Note that student advising is expected only from tenure-line faculty, but lecturers that participate in such activities should include them in their WPAF. Student advising should be evaluated using the following criteria.

- The degree to which the candidate meets the assigned supervisory WTU workload.
- Candidates that go above and beyond their assigned workload to supervise students should be recognized by the DPRC committee for the current evaluation period. At the same time, it should be clear that going above and beyond the assigned workload is not sustainable in the long run and the candidates should not be encouraged by the DPRC to continue to go above and beyond their assigned workload in the future. **Teaching improvement activities** can be measured by the candidate's documented efforts in teaching improvement and their teaching improvement plans. It should be evaluated via the following components:
- Candidate's teaching narrative and reflections on student comments in their WPAF,

- Candidate's participation in teaching improvement activities (workshops, seminars, working groups, communities of practice, etc.),
- Candidate's Professional Development Plan narrative in their WPAF as it relates to teaching improvement,
- Participation in mentorship programs, and
- Redesigning existing courses to address student comments and improve presentation of course content. This can include creating new slides/course notes, redesigning labs and assignments, creating projects and tests that more closely reflect the course content and learning outcomes, and so on.

4.2.6 **Teaching Philosophy** is defined as the candidate's documented teaching philosophy in their WPAF. A well-developed, articulated, and implemented teaching philosophy is critical to the student classroom experience. Such a teaching philosophy lends a degree of consistency and structure to a course that enables students to more easily acclimate to, participate in, and learn from. It should be evaluated using the following means:

- How closely the candidate follows their teaching philosophy as documented by existing evidence,
- How following the teaching philosophy has helped the candidate achieve the learning objectives of each course taught by the candidate, and
- How the teaching philosophy aligns with the CSSE department mission and vision statement and how it supports Universal Student Success efforts.

4.2.7 The department teaching expectations are that, at a minimum, each candidate will:

- Adhere to good pedagogical practices,
- Display and maintain currency in the field,
- Engage in activities to improve teaching effectiveness as required,
- Implement continuous cycle of improvement based on student and DPRC feedback, and
- Address consistent negative comments in student evaluations.

4.3 Evaluation Criteria for Professional Development

4.3.1 Professional Development output is expected from tenure-line faculty and not expected from lecturers, but lecturers that participate in such activities should include them in their WPAF so that they can be recognized.

4.3.2 The CSSE Department values a myriad of types of professional development activities as outlined in this section. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the individual candidate to find the right balance between the different activities and the best avenue to disseminate their professional development.

4.3.3 When applicable, it is the responsibility of the candidate to provide evidence of the quality of their research output using metrics outlined in this section. In addition, members of the DPRC may optionally read work that is attached to the WPAF in order to assess its appropriateness and quality.

4.3.4 This section lists a plethora of approaches to document professional development achievements. There is no expectation that a candidate will have contributions in every single category.

4.3.5 **Peer-reviewed Scholarly and Scientific output** is defined as disseminating professional development or pedagogical research in peer-reviewed outlets. This can include:

- Published books and book chapters,
- Peer-reviewed publications in academic venues (conferences, journals, workshops, and posters),
- Presentations that include invited talks at academic venues, universities, professional meetings, and industry partners, and
- Patent applications granted.

- 4.3.6 The CSSE Department acknowledges that publishing in a good peer-reviewed conference on computer science or software engineering can be just as prestigious as publishing in a peer-reviewed journal. Therefore, the department values peer-reviewed conference publications and peer-reviewed journal publications equally.
- 4.3.7 **Funded Research and Development** is defined as the projects and activities for which the candidate has secured funding as PI, Co-PI, senior personnel, or consultant. This is evaluated based on:
- Number of funded proposals,
 - Amount of money brought through funded research,
 - Diversity of funding sources, and
 - Balance of internal and external funding and the degree to which internal funding helps secure external funding.
- 4.3.8 **Professional Development Activities:** In addition to funded and published work, the DPRC values additional work. This can include:
- Unpublished books or book chapters,
 - Manuscripts submitted for peer review in academic venues (journals, conferences, workshops, posters),
 - Funding applications (pending or unsuccessful),
 - Patent applications pending,
 - Professional consulting,
 - Involvement with industry, non-profit organization, or government organization (e.g., working on research and development projects, serving on advisory boards, etc.),
 - Participation in open-source project development, and
 - Service to the professional community that has a research or professional development component (for example, service on a committee to create a new standard).
- 4.3.9 **Involvement of students in research:** Following the teacher-scholar model, it is important to provide research and scholarship opportunities to students. Therefore, publications with students and involving students in research are activities that are highly valued by the CSSE Department. Sections 4.3.10-4.3.12 contain a breakout of important student-related activities.
- 4.3.10 The following research and professional development activities with **graduate students** are highly valued.
- Supervising of M.S. theses. Both the number and quality of the M.S. theses that were supervised should be considered. The quality of a M.S. thesis can be evaluated, for example, in terms of nominations for awards and the academic impact (see Section 4.3.11).
 - Peer-reviewed publications with graduate student co-authors.
 - Number and quality of non-thesis independent studies or other work with Cal Poly M.S. students.
 - Participation in the supervision of non-Cal Poly graduate students.
- 4.3.11 The following research and professional development activities with **undergraduate students** are highly valued:
- Number and quality of senior projects with a research component that were supervised,
 - Peer-reviewed publications with undergraduate student co-authors,
 - Number and quality of non-senior project independent studies or other work with Cal Poly undergraduate students that have a research component, and
 - Participation in supervision of non-Cal Poly undergraduate students in research activities.
- 4.3.12 The following research and professional development activities with **high school students** are highly valued:
- Involvement of high school students in scholarly activities and

- Outcomes of scholarly activities involving high school students (peer-reviewed publications, presentations, etc.)
- 4.3.13 The impact of the professional development research or pedagogical work of the candidate can be reported using the following criteria.
- Any academic impact metrics applicable to the candidate's work, such as (but not limited to): number of citations of peer-reviewed work by the candidate, acceptance rate of conferences where the candidate has published, impact factor of a journal where the candidate has published, number of books sold, and so on.
 - Academic scholarship honors and awards, including, but not limited to Cal Poly/CSU-wide scholarship awards, conference awards (such as "Best Paper" or "Test of Time" awards), industry awards, or documented peer recognition for research (such as Distinguished Membership in societies).
 - Documented evidence of tangible impact of the candidate's work, such as adoption of their work in industry and widespread use of tools/methodologies developed by the candidate within the professional community.
- 4.3.14 **Scholarship and professional development plans**, as documented in the candidate's Professional Development Plan in their WPAF, are important because they show the direction in which the candidate's research and professional development is expected to grow.
- 4.3.15 Currency in one or more research areas is critical for tenure-line faculty. Therefore, it is important for tenure-line faculty to attend conferences related to their field of research.
- 4.3.16 The impact of the professional development of the candidate on Universal Student Success, if applicable, should be documented in the candidate's WPAF. Such contributions should be valued by the DPRC because they help support the CSSE department's vision and mission statement.
- 4.3.17 The department's professional development expectations are that, at a minimum, each candidate will have on average at least one or two peer-reviewed submissions every academic year and at least one successful professional development accomplishment (e.g., funded grant, accepted patent, published book, published book chapter, published peer-review paper, etc.) every academic year. However, it is common for the professional development output to vary over the period of review.

4.4 Evaluation Criteria for Service

- 4.4.1 Participating in service activities is expected from tenure-line faculty and not expected from lecturers, but lecturers that participate in such activities should include them in their WPAF so that they can be recognized. For lecturers, their service activities should be evaluated relative to how these activities enhance their teaching.
- 4.4.2 All kinds of service, including department, college, and university committee, local community service, and service to the profession are valued by the department.
- 4.4.3 The future plans for service, as documented in the candidate's Professional Development Plan, are an important component for evaluating the service of the candidate because it demonstrates the expected future growth of the candidate in the area. A candidate's Professional Development Plan should include anticipated growth of the candidate in their commitment to service activities.
- 4.4.4 Faculty should be provided with flexibility in terms of how they set their own goals for demonstrating service. Whenever possible, faculty should determine the service balance that they are most comfortable with and passionate about because this will help promote service in general. However, faculty are expected to perform the minimum amount of service that is expected from their appointment. The chair of the CSSE Department shall assign service assignments as needed.
- 4.4.5 The department service expectations are that every tenure-track member should perform service activities commensurate with their assigned WTU service workload. Moreover, it is expected for faculty

members who achieved tenure to have leadership service roles at the department, college, or university level.

4.5 Evaluation of Other Factors

- 4.5.1 Other factors include professionalism, collegiality, initiative, and dependability.
- 4.5.2 Professionalism is defined as following generally accepted professionalism guidelines, including the guidelines outlined in Cal Poly's Faculty Code of Ethics (on AP website), the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, and the ACM/IEEE-CS Software Engineering Code. Violating these guidelines, for example by plagiarizing work, is a serious offense that should be reflected in the evaluation of the candidate.
- 4.5.3 Collegiality is important because it demonstrates the ability to work with other colleagues and to resolve professional conflicts.
- 4.5.4 Participation in department activities and discourse, appropriate to rank and appointment, is also an important component of this category.
- 4.5.5 Commitment to Universal Student Success activities is an important evaluation criterion of the process. Each candidate is encouraged to submit a Universal Student Success statement as part of their WPAF that describes Universal Student Success activities that span the areas of teaching, professional development, and service (examples of such are included in the CFPP Section 3.4.4). Such activities will be evaluated in terms of their value to students, colleagues, and the general public.

4.6 Numeric Evaluation

- 4.6.1 As per AP procedures, a numeric score will be assigned to a candidate who is being evaluated. This score will reflect the degree to which the candidate exceeds, meets, or falls below the department's expectations. When evaluating a candidate, it is crucial to evaluate their case in the context of external and internal (to the department, college, and university) factors and the overall Professional Development Plan of the candidate.
- 4.6.2 Professional development (see Section 4.3), and service (see Sections 4.4) are not required from lecturers. Therefore, lecturers will be evaluated based on their performance in the area of teaching (see Section 4.2). If a lecturer reports professional development or service activities that are germane to their professional growth, then this will be considered additional activities that should be highly valued by the DPRC in terms of how these activities enhance the candidate's teaching.
- 4.6.3 Tenure-line candidates who perform work above the department's expectations on common metrics for teaching (see Section 4.2), professional development (see Section 4.3), and service (see Sections 4.4) and who help advance the department's priorities as outlined in the department's mission and vision statements should be assigned a positive evaluation score.
- 4.6.4 Tenure-line candidates who perform work below the department's expectations on common metrics for teaching (see Section 4.2), professional development (see Section 4.3), or service (see Sections 4.4), or who do not help advance the department's priorities as outlined in the department's mission and vision statements should be assigned a score that signals that significant improvement is needed. The evaluation of such candidates should include detailed steps on how the candidate can improve their work performance in order to reach a satisfactory evaluation score. A candidate who repeatedly receives a score that indicates that significant improvement is needed and who does not address the DPRC's recommendations risks an evaluation that does not recommend retention and/or promotion.
- 4.6.5 In order for a tenure-line candidate to receive an exceptional overall score for the purpose of early promotion and/or tenure, the DPRC should evaluate them highly in teaching, professional development, service, and other factors.



- 4.6.6 When evaluating a candidate, the DPRC should consider both the amount of work and the quality of work that was performed by the candidate. For example, a single high-quality external grant can influence the DPRC committee to give the candidate a positive evaluation for professional development. Similarly, a candidate that has successfully published in multiple well-respected conferences or journals should receive a positive evaluation for professional development.

5 Leave of Absence and Difference in Pay (DIP)

5.1 Selection of Department Professional Leave Committee (DPLC)

- 5.1.1 The CSSE DPLC will consist of the tenured faculty of the department elected by a simple majority of tenure-line faculty, where the department chair will not be part of the committee. Similarly, faculty applying for leave with pay and faculty that are part of the College Professional Leave Committee (CPLC) are not eligible to be part of this committee.
- 5.1.2 The Chair of DPLC will be elected by the members of the DPLC with a simple majority vote.

5.2 Presentation of Leave Applications.

- 5.2.1 Each faculty member applying for a sabbatical or DIP will present their leave application in front of the CSSE Department during a department meeting. The length of the presentation should be at least five minutes, which should include time for questions and answers.
- 5.2.2 When evaluating the leave of absence and DIP applications, faculty are strongly encouraged to consider the evaluation rubric that is shown in Appendix A of the CFPP.
- 5.2.3 The members of the CSSE DPLC will conduct a simple majority vote for each candidate. The chair of the DPLC will send a memo to the chair of the CSSE Department and to the CENG Dean listing the candidates that have received approval from the DPLC.

5.3 Evaluation Criteria

- 5.3.1 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 the department and Cal Poly and its students, scope and activities, probability of success, and reasonableness of timeline.
- 5.3.2 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 the CBA.
- 5.3.3 In addition to the criteria for reviewing leave applications that are outlined in Appendix A of the CFPP, members of the DPLC committee are encouraged to consider the following additional factors.
- Bringing new knowledge to the department. This can mean, for example, the applicant being able to teach new courses (or teach existing courses differently) or use the acquired knowledge during the leave to supervise senior projects or graduate theses. Such knowledge can be acquired from academia, industry, non-profit entities, or different means. This can also involve the applicant learning about new teaching styles. The applicant is encouraged to share their leave experience with the CSSE Department upon return.
 - Increasing the external recognition of the department. This can include publishing papers, presenting talks, organizing events, and so on.
 - Bringing resources to the department, such as external or internal funding.
 - Bringing or enhancing networks and collaboration opportunities for the department.

6 CSSE Department Chair and Associate Chair Selection Process

6.1 CSSE Department Chair Selection Process

- 6.1.1 Under normal circumstances, the CSSE Department has a department chair who is appointed by the dean of the CENG for a three-year term.
- 6.1.2 Before the end of the third year of the department chair's term, the CSSE Department shall recommend to the dean of the CENG a candidate for the next three-year term. Similarly, if the current department chair leaves their position, then the department shall recommend to the dean of the CENG a new candidate for the chair position.
- 6.1.3 The CSSE Department shall have a discussion on whether the department would prefer to request that the dean of CENG approve an external department chair search. The motion to request the approval of an external chair search must be approved with a qualified majority of the general vote. If the department approves the motion for an external chair search, then the chair of the tenured committee shall draft a memo to the dean of the CENG requesting permission to conduct the external chair search. The CSSE Department recognizes that an external chair search can only be approved if there is an adequate budget. If the dean grants such a request, then the department may discuss and suggest to the dean one or more candidates for an interim chair position to serve during the academic year when the external search for the department chair is conducted. The CSSE Department shall elect a Department Chair Selection Process Facilitator (the facilitator) using a qualified majority general vote. The facilitator should be a tenured member of the department who is not running for the department chair position.
- 6.1.4 The facilitator has the following responsibilities.
- Organize the nomination process of the candidates for the department chair position.
 - Organize the presentation and question and answer meeting sessions of the faculty with the department chair candidates.
 - Solicit from the candidates and distribute to the department any written statements describing the candidate's vision for the chair position, or any other materials that the department requests from the candidates as part of the chair selection process.
 - Organize any procedural discussions regarding the department chair selection process and hold any votes on motions pertaining to the process.
 - Organize the faculty vote for the department chair and collect the results.
 - Announce the results of the vote to the department and facilitate finalization of the department's recommendations to the dean.
 - Write a memo to the dean of the CENG summarizing the recommendations of the department.
- 6.1.5 There shall be a one-week window where members of the department can nominate candidates for the chair of the CSSE Department. Members of the CSSE Department can also self-nominate. All nominations should be sent to the facilitator.
- 6.1.6 Only tenured members are eligible to be nominated to be the department chair. Each nominee should accept the nomination within one week by submitting a one-page statement of interest to the facilitator. The letter of interest should typically address the following topics:
- Why the faculty member is interested in becoming a department chair,
 - Their vision for the department, and
 - Any specific steps the candidate plans to take to support the mission and vision statement of the department.
- 6.1.7 The facilitator shall share the statements of interest with all members of the department.
- 6.1.8 The facilitator shall schedule meetings of the members of the department with each candidate. Each meeting should typically consist of a 15-minute presentation that allows the candidate to present the case

of why they should be the chair of the department followed by a 25-minute question and answer session. The other candidates should not be present during the meeting.

- 6.1.9 After one week, the facilitator will schedule a general department meeting to discuss and vote on the candidates. Each member of the department will be given the opportunity to share their opinion of the candidates.
- 6.1.10 A general vote shall take place to determine the level of department support for each candidate. Note that this is an advisory vote and the dean of the CENG makes the final decision and appointment.
- 6.1.11 It is customary for the voting to be done online to allow for the greatest number of respondents. Normally, the voting will be open for one week and all members of the department will be allowed to vote. It is customary for the vote to be administered by a person outside the department to ensure the integrity of the vote.
- 6.1.12 After the voting has closed, the facilitator will schedule a meeting to announce the results. If there is a clear winner of the vote, then this person should be considered the winner, and the facilitator should submit their name as the nominee in a memo to the dean.
- 6.1.13 If multiple candidates are tied for the greatest number of votes, then the members of the CSSE Department shall decide by a qualified majority vote how to proceed, where possible options include:
- sending the names of all the candidates that tied to the dean of CENG for consideration,
 - holding new elections with the same candidates,
 - holding new elections with only the candidates that tied for the greatest number of votes, or
 - restarting the process from the beginning and allowing for new nominations (only faculty that are newly nominated will meet with the members of the department to present their case and answer questions.)

6.2 CSSE Department Associate Chair Selection

- 6.2.1 The role of the Associate Chair of the CSSE Department is to help the chair of the CSSE Department in achieving the vision and mission statement of the department and help in the day-to-day operations of the department. The associate chair of the department will be appointed for a period of one academic year.
- 6.2.2 At the start of the academic year, all candidates that are interested in the position shall meet with the department chair.
- 6.2.3 After talking to all candidates, the department chair shall present their top candidate for the position to the department during a department meeting.
- 6.2.4 The candidate that was selected by the department chair shall be approved by a general qualified majority vote.
- 6.2.5 The candidate needs to be approved by the dean of the CENG before they are appointed.
- 6.2.6 If during the academic year the associate chair decides to terminate their appointment as associate chair or are relieved from their duties as associate chair by the Chair of the CSSE Department, then a new associate chair may be appointed using the steps outlined in this section.
- 6.2.7 At the end of their term, the associate chair should present a one-page report of their activities as an associate chair to the members of the department.
- 6.2.8 An associate chair may serve multiple consecutive terms in this position.

7 Selection of Affiliate Members of the Department

7.1 Affiliate Members Definitions

- 7.1.1 An Affiliate Member of the CSSE Department is a full-time lecturer or a tenure-line faculty member with a home department that is not the CSSE Department, but who by the nature of their academic work, of their own volition, and with the consent of the CSSE Department is treated as a member of the CSSE Department.
- 7.1.2 Affiliate Member status grants a faculty member the following privileges:
- Participation in non-personnel CSSE faculty votes, or broader votes that the CSSE Department takes (the affiliate member is encouraged to only participate in votes where they have enough information to make an informed decision),
 - Access to computing resources that are available to the CSSE Department,
 - Streamlined process for becoming instructors-of-record for CSC supervisory graduate and undergraduate courses,
 - Affiliation with the Noyce School of Applied Computing, and
 - Access to any opportunities for funding that are available to CSSE Department members (e.g., funding opportunities open only to CENG faculty).
- 7.1.3 Affiliate Members of the CSSE Department may have a 0% appointment in the CSSE Department or an appointment that is greater than 0%.
- 7.1.4 All non-0% appointments are subject to a MOU that should be worked out by the candidate, the chairs of the CSSE Department and the home department of the applicant, the dean of the CENG, and - if different - the dean of the college of the applicant's home department.

7.2 Approving Affiliate Members

- 7.2.1 The faculty member who wishes to become an affiliate member of the CSSE Department shall reach out to the department (or one or more CSSE faculty) to discuss their intent.
- 7.2.2 Any CSSE tenure-line faculty can bring up a nomination for affiliate member status to the department (normally, by announcing the nomination at a department meeting).
- 7.2.3 The CSSE Department shall invite the candidate to attend a department meeting and give a short presentation of their work and describe their reasons for seeking the affiliate membership status, which should be followed by a question-and-answer session.
- 7.2.4 Next, the department shall have a meeting to discuss the nomination.
- 7.2.5 At the end of the discussion, the department shall conduct a qualified majority general vote.
- 7.2.6 If the vote is successful and the candidate is seeking affiliate membership status with 0% appointment, then the name of the candidate will be submitted in a memo to the dean of the CENG for approval.
- 7.2.7 If the vote is successful and the candidate is seeking an affiliate membership status with more than 0% appointment, then the department chair shall inform the candidate, and the candidate shall engage in the process of negotiating their MOU with the chairs of the departments and the deans of the colleges that are affected. If required, the faculty member or faculty members who brought the nomination forward shall write a memo to the department chairs and the college deans to describe the CSSE Department's support for the nomination.
- 7.2.8 If the recommendation vote is unsuccessful, then the department chair shall inform the candidate that their application for affiliate membership status was not granted.



Appendix A: Example Teaching Preference Form

Name:

Date:

CSC and CPE Teaching Preferences

Please refer to the course descriptions available at <http://www.catalog.calpoly.edu/> as you complete this page. Graduate courses are numbered 5xx. Please describe your level of interest and preparedness in each of the areas below using the following definitions:

Interest

- A I really want to teach this
- B I would enjoy teaching this
- C I am willing to teach this
- D I am not interested in teaching this

Preparation

- W I have taught in this area
- X I would need a little preparation
- Y I would need significant preparation
- Z I would need extensive preparation

Add comments or additional areas in which you would like to teach if you wish.

Course	A	B	C	D	W	X	Y	Z
CSC 101								
CSC 102								
...								
Additional Courses								

Please list graduate courses that you would like to teach (see CSC/CPE 5xx courses):

Comments and additions, including other courses that you would like to create:



OFFICE OF THE PROVOST AND
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

MEMORANDUM

To: Robert Crockett, Interim Dean
College of Engineering

Date: October 2, 2025

From: Albert A. Liddicoat, Ph.D. *AL*
Interim Provost and Executive Vice President

Copies: Aaron Keen
Simone Aloisio

Subject: Revised Computer Science and Software Engineering Department Faculty Personnel Policies

The subject document, approved by the Computer Science and Software Engineering Department faculty, is approved for immediate implementation. Please provide the Computer Science and Software Engineering Department faculty access to the document as soon as possible.