Audit of Departmental Personnel Standards  
by Ed Collom (6/18/2020)

Per UPS 210.002 III.A.1. Departmental Personnel Standards “shall indicate the specific range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions. Methods used by the department in evaluating performance shall be clear, objective, and reasonable. Methods used for quantifying any information shall be as straightforward as possible.”

Does the DPS document contain the requirements and evaluative criteria for achieving the following: retention as a probationary faculty member, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, early tenure and/or early promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Professor, and early promotion to Professor? If the department has (or will ever have) any probationary Associate Professors, does the document clarify tenure requirements and requirements for promotion to Professor? Does the document specify the conditions under which a full performance review in PY3 or PY5 (instead of an abbreviated review) should be recommended?

Does the document conform with UPS 210.002 requirements for early tenure/promotion? Section II.A.3.c. states: “Early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance in Teaching and Scholarly and Creative Activity exceed the expectations for tenure stated in the approved Department Personnel Standards…” Section II.A.4.d. states: “Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained vitality in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service that promise future potential growth. Performance in all three areas of review shall be at the level of Excellent.”

Does the document align with the requirements of UPS 210.002 II.B.? “Each level of review shall evaluate the Portfolio and Appendices according to the criteria that follow. Rather than relying largely on a single measure, written evaluations at all levels of review shall be based on and include commentary on multiple indicators of teaching performance. These shall include qualitative and quantitative data from student opinions of instruction, academic grading standards, and at least two other specific criteria listed in Section II.B.1.b. Specific Criteria for Teaching.”

Does the document detail how Student Opinion Questionnaire data is employed in evaluations per UPS 210.002 II.B.1.b.2.: “Evaluations of teaching performance shall address student opinions of instruction contained in responses to objective questions on student opinion questionnaires and contained in written comments on these forms”? Guidelines shall also be developed per UPS 210.002 III.B.4.: “Each department shall develop department guidelines for the evaluation of teaching performance so that Student Opinion Questionnaires (or summaries) submitted in the Portfolio can be interpreted.”

Does the document discuss grade distribution data and its role in evaluations in accordance with UPS 210.002 II.B.1.b.3.: “The peer evaluation of teaching performance shall address the evidence in the Portfolio relating to academic standards including summaries of grades awarded in each class taught”?
If classroom observations are employed, are they conducted in accordance with UPS 210.080?

Does the document specify the requirements surrounding the each form of service per UPS 210.002 II.B.3.a.: “…shall address those professional, University, and community service activities that are appropriate indicators of service contribution for its faculty”?

Does the document discuss the election of DPC alternate(s) in accordance with UPS 210.000 IV.B.4.: “Departmental Personnel Standards shall set forth the conditions under which alternate(s) may serve”?

Is there any reference to “Development Plans” or “Developmental Narratives”? These appeared previously in old UPS 210.000 documents and are no longer relevant.

Is there any use of the term “Student Rating of Instruction (SRI)”? This term has been replaced by Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ).

Is there any reference to Lecturers or temporary faculty? DPS documents only pertain to tenure-track faculty.

Is there any reference to University Policy Statements that have been rescinded or no longer exist? Current list: http://www.fullerton.edu/senate/publications_policies_resolutions/ups.php

Is there any reference to other policies or guidelines? The DPS document should be explicit about evaluative criteria and not reference other information without details.

Does the document include the department’s SOQ form(s) as an attachment per UPS 210.002 III.A.4.i.?

Are the section numbers/letters within the document consistent and appropriately used?

Are there any typos in the document?

Overall, is the document in conformance with the collective bargaining agreement and relevant University Policy Statements?