MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 27, 2023

FROM: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

SUBJECT: Temporary Use of DPS Pending Revisions Related to Narrative Word Limits

Very recent changes in UPS 210.000 (“Tenure and Promotion Personnel Procedures”), section II.B.4, allow for Working Personnel Action File (WPAF) narrative lengths of up to 1,500 words, i.e., an increased narrative length maximum. An audit of Department Personnel Standards (DPS) has revealed that many existing DPS explicitly maintain a 1,000-word limit on narratives for a candidate’s WPAF.

The CSUF Academic Senate passed resolution ASD 23-67 (“Resolution to clarify USP 210.000 regarding narrative length”). The resolution resolved that the permitted lengths of narratives be 1,500 words for all departments.

After consulting with Faculty Affairs and Records, I have determined that revisions of DPS are in order, if not already being worked on. Until those DPS revisions are formally approved, the currently approved DPS are in effect, except that the former, 1,000-word limits cannot be used (i.e., are out of compliance with campus policy).
June 7, 2023

To: Irena Praitis, Ph.D.
Chair, English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics

Sheryl Fontaine, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences

From: Amir Dabirian, Ph.D.
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Subject: Departmental Personnel Standards for the Department of English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics

The proposed Departmental Personnel Standards from the English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics department have been reviewed. The document is in compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement, UPS 210.000, and UPS 210.002. In accordance with the recommendations of the Department, the College Personnel Standards Review Committee, and the Dean, I approve these standards for implementation commencing with the 2023-2024 Academic Year.

I would like to express my appreciation to all involved for their efforts in this task.

AD:mc

cc: Dr. Dana Collins, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. Georgia Spiropoulos, College Personnel Standards Review Committee
Dr. Brian Norton, Chair of the Department Personnel Committee
Faculty Affairs and Records
PERSONNEL STANDARDS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, COMPARATIVE LITERATURE, AND LINGUISTICS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

These Departmental Personnel Standards are consistent with UPS 210.000 and 210.002 and shall be understood as incorporating the requirements of UPS 210.002. These Departmental Personnel Standards and UPS 210.002 establish the range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion, and tenure decisions.

Faculty members undergoing review shall be judged on their performance in the following three areas: (1) teaching, (2) scholarship and creative accomplishment, and (3) professional, University, and community service.

Quality of performance in the three areas is more important than the number of entries under each category. As indicated in UPS 210.002, teaching is the most important responsibility of the faculty, and shall be the most important area of performance for retention, tenure, and promotion. Faculty involvement in scholarly and creative activities is also essential and shall be the second most important area of performance for retention, tenure, and promotion. Faculty members belonging to traditionally underrepresented groups (such as women and faculty of color) may experience additional demands on their time over and above the usual demands made of all faculty members. This phenomenon has been termed “cultural taxation.” in UPS 210.002 (p.5). As part of its ongoing dedication to diversity, equity, and inclusion, CSUF and the Department of English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics are committed to recognizing cultural taxation when it occurs. Faculty members shall have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their WPAF. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process.

2.0 THE PROSPECTUS

2.1 During the first year of employment in a tenure-track position, each probationary faculty member shall write a Prospectus with sections on teaching, scholarship and creative accomplishments, and service, not to exceed 500 words per section. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required, and the accomplishments the faculty member expects to achieve in each of the three areas in order to meet the
requirements of these Departmental Personnel Standards and UPS 210.002 for retention, tenure, and promotion.

The Prospectus will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the College Dean, who will each provide feedback on a timetable to be determined by the Dean, with final drafts to be completed prior to May 1. This Prospectus shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure-track position.

During subsequent years, the Prospectus may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that normally occur during the probationary period.

3.0 MENTORS

Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair shall consult with each newly appointed probationary faculty member concerning appropriate faculty mentors and shall designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors. In the event that the Chair serves as a mentor, at least one additional mentor shall be designated. At any time thereafter, the probationary faculty member or mentors may request the Department Chair to make a change of assignment.

The responsibility of the mentor(s) is to provide guidance, advice, and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation and revision of the faculty member’s Prospectus, and also to offer appropriate assistance during the probationary period.

4.0 ELECTION OF THE DEPARTMENT PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

Each year at its May elections meeting, the Department shall select a Department Personnel Committee for the coming year consisting of five members and two alternates. Alternates will serve when committee members are ineligible or unable to fulfill Committee responsibilities.

5.0 EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE: THE PORTFOLIO

5.1 The Portfolio is the basis for evaluations, recommendations, and actions concerning retention, tenure, and promotion. The Portfolio shall be cumulative and representative of the faculty member’s performance, covering the period from the beginning of the faculty member’s probationary service to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be taken. In cases where credit has been granted for prior service, the faculty member’s
Performance during that time period shall also be documented in the Portfolio. Faculty members shall have the option to include their experiences of cultural taxation in their WPAF. Evaluators shall give this due consideration during the evaluation process.

5.2 It is the responsibility of each faculty member to ensure the completeness of that faculty member’s Portfolio.

5.3 The Portfolio shall include the following items:

5.3.1 a table of contents of the Portfolio (provided by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records);

5.3.2 a table of contents of the Appendix to the Portfolio;

5.3.3 a copy of these approved Departmental Personnel Standards;

5.3.4 the approved Prospectus;

5.3.5 the faculty member’s current curriculum vitae that covers their entire academic and professional employment history, including, if applicable, any publications and service accomplishments during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit;

5.3.6 Narratives, which shall contain (a) the Prospectus prepared in year one and (b) a concise self-assessment of accomplishment in each of the three areas of performance in relation to these Departmental Personnel Standards (self-assessment narratives shall not exceed 1,000 words for each area, and the Prospectus shall not exceed 500 words for each area);

5.3.7 a complete list of the faculty member’s teaching assignments throughout the period under review, including all of the faculty member’s teaching assignments during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit;

5.3.8 a copy of the student opinion form used by the Department in evaluating the faculty member’s teaching and of student opinion form(s) used to evaluate the faculty member’s teaching during the period for which the faculty member received service credit;
5.3.9 statistical summaries by class of responses to all multiple choice questions on the Department student opinion forms for all classes which the faculty member has taught during the period under review, including all courses which the faculty member taught during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit;

5.3.10 statistical summaries of grade distributions for all classes which the faculty member has taught at California State University, Fullerton, during the period under review for which students received University credit, as well as any material which may help interpret these statistical summaries, and also statistical summaries of grade distributions for all classes which the faculty member taught during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit, as well as any material which may help interpret these statistical summaries;

5.3.11 for probationary faculty, all evaluations, responses, and rebuttals, if any, and decisions for all previous full performance reviews.

5.4 In addition to the Portfolio, the faculty member shall submit an Appendix containing supporting materials that are directly relevant to the presentation in the Portfolio.

5.4.1 The following materials must be included in the Appendix:

5.4.1.1 required documentation of the faculty member’s teaching performance, as specified in sections 6.1.2, 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, and 6.1.6 of these Departmental Personnel Standards;

5.4.1.2 required documentation of the faculty member’s scholarship and creative accomplishments, as specified in sections 7.3 and 7.4 of these Departmental Personnel Standards;

5.4.1.3 required documentation of the faculty member’s service to the profession, the University, and the community, as specified in section 8.1.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.

5.4.2 Supplementary supporting materials may also be included in the Appendix, as specified in section 6.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.
6.0 TEACHING

Reviewers shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s performance as a teacher:

6.1 Evidence must include:

6.1.1 a self-assessment narrative not to exceed 1,000 words that describes the faculty member’s teaching philosophy and strategies and provides context for interpreting student opinion forms, including addressing any concerns or problems;

6.1.2 student opinion forms for all courses that the faculty member has taught during the period under review at California State University, Fullerton, for which students received credit, as well as for all courses that the faculty member taught during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit;

6.1.3 reports of two classroom observations (following university guidelines such as those listed in UPS 210.080) made by tenured, tenure track, or active FERP faculty members chosen by the faculty member in two different semesters prior to tenure or promotional review;

6.1.4 representative syllabi and other selected materials for each course taught during the period under review (multi-section courses need be represented only once);

6.1.5 representative written assignments;

6.1.6 representative examination questions.

6.2 Supplementary evidence for evaluation of teaching performance may include but is not limited to:

6.2.1 unsolicited, signed student comments related to teaching performance, supervision, and/or mentorship;

6.2.2 descriptions of newly developed courses;
6.2.3 contributions to curriculum development;

6.2.4 descriptions of independent study projects and internships;

6.2.5 descriptions of newly-developed teaching projects;

6.2.6 evidence of student-faculty interactions, such as advising, counseling, supervision and/or mentorship;

6.2.7 materials prepared by the faculty member for student use;

6.2.8 professional activities such as public lectures, colloquia, workshops, and teaching-related research;

6.2.9 development of service learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, and/or semester abroad/away courses;

6.2.10 evidence of mentoring students in terms of professional development, such as but not limited to mentorship in research, creative activities, and service engagements;

6.2.11 recorded lectures as evidence of clarity of presentation.

6.3 Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Faculty members of the Department of English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics must demonstrate, at all levels, high-quality teaching performance and continued development toward excellence in teaching. The criteria expressed below should be understood as incorporating the requirements of, and indicating compliance with, all University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. The teaching evaluation should take into account evidence of cultural taxation. Faculty are encouraged to offer commentary on and evidence of how cultural taxation has impacted and shaped their teaching and DPC members are encouraged to thoughtfully consider this information. The DPC may consider the implications of impromptu student mentoring and the different forms it takes, student responses to subject matter, engagements with a broader student population and community members, and other dynamics that can be brought forward by the faculty member, on the probationary faculty member’s accomplishments in teaching.
6.3.1 Reviewers shall evaluate faculty members in teaching according to the principles stated in the sections that follow and using the following rating scale: Excellent, Good, and Unsatisfactory.

6.3.2 Teaching effectiveness is demonstrated through evidence in the Portfolio and Appendix of:

   6.3.2.1 course preparation and continuing commitment to teaching excellence;
   6.3.2.2 course standards;
   6.3.2.3 communication with students;

6.4 Criteria for Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness

Reviewers will evaluate all evidence presented by the faculty member to determine the quality of teaching performance. This determination will be based upon the descriptive criteria specified in these Departmental Personnel Standards.

6.4.1 Course Preparation and Continuing Commitment to Teaching Excellence

   6.4.1.1 Course objectives and requirements are made clear; materials are presented in an organized way; examples and illustrations are used; course learning goals are linked to course outcomes and methods of assessment; interactions with students are encouraged; and the breadth and depth of the course content and academic goals, expectations, and/or competencies are appropriate to the level of each course.

   6.4.1.2 Continuing commitment to teaching excellence includes such activities as development of instructional materials and strategies; development of new courses and/or revision of existing curricular offerings to reflect new developments and/or diverse voices in the field; the inclusion of activities (such as High Impact Practices) that encourage student interaction and engagement; participation in teaching programs, symposia, and workshops; instruction in and use of innovative classroom strategies; and the
relationship of these activities to the faculty member’s on-going, thoughtful self-assessment.

6.4.1.3 The evidence might include statistical summaries of student responses to questions 2, 3, and 7 of the Department student opinion survey form.

6.4.2 Course Standards

Courses are based on current knowledge and demonstrate an understanding of new ideas; relevant assignments are used; an environment fostering equal and inclusive access to learning for all students is created; students’ thinking is stimulated; and students are held to high standards of achievement, as evidenced by readings, assignments, grading rubrics, pedagogical methods that consider student needs; accessible technology appropriate to the learning experience, and similar materials (note that grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor).

6.4.3 Communication with Students:

6.4.3.1 Specific evaluation criteria are made available to students; feedback encourages new learning; feedback is timely and addresses students’ questions as they occur inside and outside the classroom setting; and effective, transparent, and fair methods of assessment conducive to student learning, are used.

6.4.3.2 Support for and encouragement of students is apparent; a clear interest in both the subject matter and teaching in general is demonstrated; syllabi and pedagogy promote equitable treatment of students; clearly defined, objective evaluation and unbiased treatment of students are provided.

6.4.3.3 The evidence might include statistical summaries of student responses to questions 5, and 6, of the Department student opinion form.

6.4.4 Rating Student Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Student opinion surveys are mandatory in every class in the Department, including those taught during summer session and intersession. In consideration
of SOQs as support for the three areas of teaching evaluation, the DPC is encouraged to consider the following guidelines:

6.4.4.1 Reviewers understand that there are circumstances in which students give low ratings to competent teachers, and times, for instance early in one’s teaching career, when such averages may be an indication of a continuing development of teaching technique.

6.4.4.2 When at least 80% of the total responses to the relevant questions (see sections 6.4.1.3 and 6.4.3.3 of these Departmental Personnel Standards) are distributed in the A or B categories, and that distribution is generally correlated with patterns of written student comments, the faculty member shall be considered to have earned an “Excellent” SOQ rating from the students. When 60% to 79% of the total responses to these questions are distributed in the A or B categories, and that distribution is generally correlated with patterns of written student comments, the faculty member shall be considered to have earned a “Good” SOQ rating from the students. When less than 60% of the total responses to these questions are distributed in the A or B categories, and that distribution is generally correlated with patterns of written student comments, the faculty member shall be considered to have earned an “Unsatisfactory” SOQ rating from the students.

6.4.4.3 In no cases will statistical data alone be the sole basis for evaluation of student responses on the Department opinion survey form. The Department acknowledges that student opinion surveys can be shaped by racial, gender, linguistic, and other forms of bias, and must therefore be interpreted cautiously and contextually. Reviewers shall look for patterns across multiple classes and semesters. Patterns of student comments, obtained in several different classes and several different semesters, shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments, and those patterns of comments shall furthermore be used to contextualize the quantitative score distributions.

6.5 Rating of Teaching Effectiveness

6.5.1 A record of teaching performance will receive an overall rating of “Excellent” in Teaching Effectiveness if it is considered “Excellent” in at least two of the three areas (course preparation and continuing
commitment to teaching excellence, course standards, communication with students), with a rating of at least “Good” in the third area,

6.5.2 A record of teaching performance will receive an overall rating of “Good” in Teaching Effectiveness if it is considered “Good” in each of the three areas (course preparation and continuing commitment to teaching excellence, course standards, and communication with students,) or “Good” in two of the areas and “Excellent” in the third.

6.5.3 A record of teaching performance will receive an overall rating of “Unsatisfactory” in Teaching Effectiveness if it is not considered at least “Good” as specified in section 6.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.

7.0 SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Scholarship and creative accomplishments may include but are not limited to the study of literary history, theory, genres, and criticism; the study of composition and rhetoric, theory, and practice; the study of linguistics; and creative writing in its various forms (e.g., poetry, short stories, novels, plays). Faculty should amass a cumulative record of scholarly and/or creative publications that is substantial and of high quality. The preponderance of a faculty member’s research and creative accomplishments should be appropriate to their appointment/areas of expertise. The evaluations of scholarly and creative accomplishments, at all levels, should take into account evidence of cultural taxation.

Reviewers shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s scholarship and creative accomplishments:

7.1 a complete citation in the faculty member’s curriculum vitae of their scholarly and creative works throughout their entire academic and professional employment history, including, if applicable, any publications during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit;

7.2 a self-assessment narrative not to exceed 1,000 words of the faculty member’s scholarship and/or creative accomplishments, including a detailed discussion of their current scholarly and/or creative activity, its connection to their teaching responsibilities and other areas of expertise, and their overall scholarly/creative agenda;
7.3 documentary evidence of some of the following kinds of scholarship and/or creative accomplishments, evidence for which must be included in the Appendix. Details of the peer review process as well as, where applicable, of co-authorship and the extent of each co-author’s contribution, must be provided:

7.3.1 peer-reviewed scholarly books, peer-reviewed edited scholarly books, peer-reviewed scholarly textbooks, peer-reviewed edited journal issues, or peer-reviewed books of creative writing (the published book or the completed manuscript with a letter of acceptance and timetable for publication);

7.3.2 peer-reviewed chapters in books (the published book or the completed manuscript with a letter of acceptance and timetable for publication);

7.3.3 peer-reviewed articles in scholarly journals (the published issue of the journal or the completed manuscript with a letter of acceptance and timetable for publication);

7.3.4 peer-reviewed academic digital projects (the published digital project or the completed project with a letter of acceptance and timetable for publication);

7.3.5 peer-reviewed works of creative writing (the published book, journal, magazine, or electronic medium or the completed manuscript with a letter of acceptance and timetable for publication);

7.3.6 conference papers published in peer-reviewed conference proceedings (the published proceedings or the completed manuscript with a letter of acceptance and timetable for publication).

Evidence of the following other kinds of scholarship and creative accomplishments may also be included in the Portfolio, evidence for which must be fully documented in the Appendix. Details of the peer review process as well as, where applicable, of co-authorship and the extent of each co-author’s participation, must be provided.

7.3.7 peer-reviewed or invited scholarly presentations at professional conferences;
7.3.8 book reviews and reviews of public performances of plays, films, or television scripts that are informed by scholarship in the field;

7.3.9 films, videos, or other performance-based materials;

7.3.10 entries in encyclopedias and dictionaries;

7.3.11 translations;

7.3.12 awards of grants or prizes for scholarly or creative work;

7.3.13 grant proposals submitted but unfunded (if possible, reviewers’ comments should be included with the proposal);

7.3.14 non-peer-reviewed scholarly or creative publications;

7.3.15 completed manuscripts submitted but not accepted (reviewers’ comments should be included as indicators of merit);

7.3.16 non-refereed invited papers, exhibits, and performances;

7.3.17 scholarship that focuses on practical applications (such as reports written for agencies or proprietary businesses);

7.3.18 works submitted and under consideration.

7.4 To assist reviewers in determining the quality and peer-reviewed status of the faculty member’s scholarship and creative accomplishments, evidence in support of 7.4.1 and 7.4.2 is required. Evidence from 7.4.3-7.4.6 is recommended:

7.4.1 journal or press details and statistics (e.g., acceptance rates, circulation figures, presence in libraries, editorial board membership, publication history, inclusion in disciplinary publication indexes, and other information which helps to clarify the publication’s significance in the field);

7.4.2 comments from peer reviewers;
7.4.3 statements of editorial policy, including indicators of reviewers and editorial board members as disciplinary peers;

7.4.4 letters from editors concerning the review process;

7.4.5 post-publication reviews;

7.4.6 citations of the faculty member’s published work in the work of others.

7.5 Evaluation of Scholarship and Creative Accomplishments

Faculty members of the Department of English, Comparative Literature, and Linguistics are expected to demonstrate, at all levels, that they are engaged in ongoing, productive scholarly and/or creative activity.

7.5.1 Reviewers shall evaluate faculty members in scholarship and creative accomplishments according to the principles stated in the sections that follow and using the following rating scale: Excellent, Good, and Unsatisfactory.

7.5.2 Criteria for Evaluating Scholarship and Creative Accomplishments

Reviewers will evaluate the evidence as listed above and that is provided by the faculty member to determine the quality of scholarly and creative accomplishments. This determination will be based upon the following criteria:

7.5.2.1 clarity of conceptualization;

7.5.2.2 thoroughness of research;

7.5.2.3 quality of the forum in which the work appears;

7.5.2.4 originality of the scholarship;

7.5.2.5 contribution to the discipline or to interdisciplinary scholarship;

7.5.2.6 impact on the field.
7.5.3 Rating of Scholarship and Creative Accomplishments

7.5.3.1 During the probationary period, a record of scholarship and creative accomplishments shall be considered “Excellent” when it demonstrates that the faculty member has a well-defined and focused scholarly and/or creative agenda; is committed to continued scholarly and/or creative growth and accomplishment; has produced scholarly and/or creative work which satisfies at least four of the six criteria specified in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and has published or submitted for publication scholarly and/or creative work whose substance and quantity clearly indicates that the faculty member is very likely to meet the standards required to earn tenure. (See UPS 210.002 and sections 7.5.3.4, 7.5.3.5, and 7.5.3.6 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.)

7.5.3.2 During the probationary period, a record of scholarship and creative accomplishments shall be considered “Good” when it demonstrates that the faculty member has a well-defined and focused scholarly and/or creative agenda; is committed to continued scholarly and/or creative growth and accomplishment; has produced scholarly and/or creative work which satisfies at least three of the six criteria specified in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and has published, submitted for publication, or made progress developing for publication scholarly and/or creative work whose substance and quantity clearly indicates that the faculty member is likely to meet the standards required to earn tenure. (See UPS 210.002 and sections 7.5.3.4, 7.5.3.5, and 7.5.3.6 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.)

7.5.3.3 During the probationary period, a record of scholarship and creative accomplishments shall be considered “Unsatisfactory” when it clearly demonstrates that the faculty member is unlikely to achieve the quantity and quality of scholarly and/or creative publication needed to earn tenure. (See UPS 210.002 and section 7.5.3.6 of
For tenure and promotion, a record of scholarship and creative accomplishments shall be considered “Excellent” if, during the period under review, it includes one peer-reviewed scholarly book, as per sections 7.4 and 7.3.1, and if that book satisfies at least four of the six criteria stated in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards, or if, during the period under review, it includes four other substantial peer-reviewed publications (or the equivalent in shorter or co-authored peer-reviewed publications) as specified in sections 7.4 and 7.3.2 – 7.3.6, each of which satisfies at least three of the six criteria stated in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards and in addition one or more scholarly and/or creative works as specified in sections 7.3.7 – 7.3.19, each of which satisfies at least three of each criteria stated in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards. Furthermore, to be considered “Excellent” in scholarship and creative accomplishments, the faculty member seeking tenure or promotion must also demonstrate that they have a well-defined and focused scholarly and/or creative agenda and are committed to continued scholarly and/or creative growth and accomplishment.

For tenure and promotion, a record of scholarship and creative accomplishments will be considered “Good” if, during the period under review, it includes three substantial peer-reviewed publications (or the equivalent in shorter or co-authored peer-reviewed publications) as specified in sections 7.4 and 7.3.2 – 7.3.6, each of which satisfies at least three of the six criteria stated in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards, and if in addition it includes one or more scholarly and/or creative works as specified in sections 7.3.7 – 7.3.19, each of which satisfies at least three of each criteria stated in section 7.5.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards. Furthermore, to be considered “Good” in scholarship and creative accomplishments, the faculty member seeking tenure or
promotion must also demonstrate that they have a well-defined and focused scholarly and/or creative agenda and are committed to continued scholarly and/or creative growth and accomplishment.

7.5.3.6 For tenure and promotion, a record of scholarship and creative accomplishments shall be considered “Unsatisfactory” if they have not achieved at least the demonstrated quality and quantity of scholarly and/or creative work which are specified in section 7.5.3.5 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.

8.0 PROFESSIONAL, UNIVERSITY, AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

Faculty shall be collegial and actively involved in professional, University, and community service. *Collegial*, from the Latin *collegium*, meaning an association or community, describes a culture in which responsibilities are shared equitably among colleagues. To serve collegially is to take up that shared responsibility with good faith and civility. Of the many types of service work, service to the Department is paramount. Faculty on leaves of absence shall ordinarily be exempt from service during the leave. Materials submitted as evidence of teaching or of scholarly and creative activities shall not also be submitted as evidence of service. The evaluation of professional, university, and community service shall take into account evidence of cultural taxation. Faculty members under review are encouraged to note the pressures of being called on to represent a particular group, being sought out specifically in formal and informal ways by students and by university constituents for committee and/or inclusivity work, and other work not always immediately recognized as standard service work. DPC members are also encouraged to seriously consider such work and are reminded that evidence of such work might not always appear in formats associated with other university service. Reviewers shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s service to the profession, to the University, and to the community:

8.1 Evidence must include:

8.1.1 a self-assessment narrative not to exceed 1,000 words of the faculty member’s professional, University, and community service, including, if applicable, any service accomplishments during the period for which the faculty member has received service credit;

8.1.2 evidence of the relevant nature and quality of service (e.g., letters or documents resulting from such work, included in the Appendix). The Department recognizes that faculty from underrepresented and
marginalized groups may perform uncredited or unacknowledged service. Faculty are encouraged to submit any and all evidence of professional, University, or community service, so as to be credited for service that may otherwise go unacknowledged.

8.2 Faculty may demonstrate continued engagement in service in the following or similar ways:

8.2.1 Professional Service

8.2.1.1 reviewing, editing, or co-editing manuscripts for journals and publishers;

8.2.1.2 organizing, chairing, responding to, or facilitating sessions or panels at professional meetings;

8.2.1.3 participating in national, regional, or local testing and evaluation of writing;

8.2.1.4 holding committee memberships or offices in local, regional, national, or international professional organizations.

8.2.2 University Service

8.2.2.1 service on University committees and offices held in such committees;

8.2.2.2 service on Department and College committees and offices held in such committees;

8.2.2.3 other special services to the Department or College;

8.2.2.4 other service to the University, such as lectures delivered to University audiences;

8.2.2.5 service to faculty organizations;
8.2.2.6 service to students including sponsoring student organizations, developing/facilitating internships, and supporting service learning/community engaged service learning opportunities.

8.2.3 Community Service

The community need not be geographically limited to Orange County.

8.2.3.1 honorary or active positions of note in community organizations;

8.2.3.2 lectures delivered to community groups;

8.2.3.3 participation in special community activities.

8.3 Evaluation of Professional, University, and Community Service

The Department’s requirements for service reflect its belief that service fosters collegiality and sustains the vitality of the profession, University, and community.

8.3.1 Reviewers shall evaluate faculty members in the area of service according to the principles stated in the sections that follow and using the following rating scale: Excellent, Good, and Unsatisfactory.

8.3.2 Criteria for Evaluating Professional, University, and Community Service

Reviewers will evaluate all evidence provided by the faculty member to determine the quality of service accomplishments. This determination will be based upon qualitative evaluations of the following criteria:

8.3.2.1 appropriateness of service to professional, University, or community constituencies;

8.3.2.2 significance of contribution to the group or entity being served;
8.3.2.3 duration of activity and significance of time commitment involved;

8.3.2.4 leadership involved;

8.3.4.5 impact on the profession, the University, or the community.

8.3.3 Rating of Service Accomplishments

8.3.3.1 During the probationary period, a record of service shall be considered “Excellent” if it demonstrates that the faculty member has served on at least one Department committee per year; is committed to continued growth and future opportunities in the area of service; has demonstrated leadership in the area of service; has a record of service contributions which satisfies at least four of the five criteria specified in section 8.3.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and has amassed a record of service, distributed in each of the three categories (professional, University, and community service), whose quantity indicates the faculty member is very likely to meet the standards required to earn tenure.

8.3.3.2 During the probationary period, a record of service shall be considered “Good” if it demonstrates that the faculty member has served on at least one Department committee per year; is committed to continued growth and future opportunities in the area of service; has a record of service contributions which satisfies at least three of the five criteria specified in section 8.3.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and has amassed a record whose trajectory indicates that the faculty member is likely to meet the standards required to earn tenure.

8.3.3.3 During the probationary period, a record of service shall be considered “Unsatisfactory” if it does not
demonstrate that the faculty member is committed to continued growth and future opportunities in the area of service; if it does not demonstrate that the faculty member has served on at least one Department committee per year satisfying at least three of the five criteria specified in section 8.3.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; or if it does not contain a demonstrated record of, or clear plans for, professional or community service.

8.3.3.4 For tenure and promotion, a record of service shall be considered “Excellent” if it demonstrates that the faculty member is committed to continued growth and future opportunities in the area of service; has demonstrated leadership in the area of service; has a record of service contributions which satisfies at least four of the five criteria specified in section 8.3.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and has amassed a record of at least 15 items of on-going, high-quality service, distributed across the three categories (professional, University, and community service), including service on at least one Department committee per year.

8.3.3.5 For tenure and promotion, a record of service shall be considered “Good” if it demonstrates that the faculty member is committed to continued growth and future opportunities in the area of service; has a record of service contributions which satisfies at least three of the five criteria specified in section 8.3.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and has amassed a record of at least nine items of on-going high-quality service distributed across the three categories (professional, University, and community service), including service on at least one Department committee per year.

8.3.3.6 For tenure and promotion, a record of service shall be considered “Unsatisfactory” if it does not demonstrate that the faculty member is committed to continued
growth and future opportunities in the area of service; if it does not demonstrate that the faculty member has served on at least one Department committee per year satisfying at least three of the five criteria specified in section 8.3.2 of these Departmental Personnel Standards; and if it includes fewer than 9 items of ongoing high-quality service during the review period, distributed across the three categories (professional, University, and community service).

9.0 STANDARDS FOR RETENTION, TENURE, AND PROMOTION

9.1 Requirements for Retention

9.1.1 The goal of the RTP process is to produce faculty members who qualify for tenure after their probationary employment. To be retained during the probationary period, a faculty member is required to demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely. A probationary faculty member is required to show appropriate accomplishments, growth, and promise in each of the three areas of assessment. Moreover, when weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement. If weaknesses that suggest the faculty member is not making adequate progress toward tenure have been identified and/or not improved upon, a Full Performance Review may be requested for probationary years three or five, years when only an Abbreviated Review would ordinarily be required. The decision to retain (reappoint) a faculty member is an affirmation that satisfactory progress is being made toward tenure; therefore, a probationary faculty member shall not be retained if the cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements of tenure appear likely to be met.

9.1.2 To be recommended for retention, the faculty member’s performance in each of the three areas (teaching; scholarship and creative accomplishments; and professional, University, and community service) must receive an evaluation of “Good” or “Excellent” as specified in sections 6.6.1, 6.6.2, 7.5.3.1, 7.5.3.2, 8.3.2, and 8.3.3 of these Departmental Personnel Standards. The DPC shall have the option to recommend retention for faculty who receive an
“Unsatisfactory” rating after their first review. Under these circumstances, the faculty member will then be subject to a full review the next year. If the faculty member does not show improvement and a pattern of “Unsatisfactory” performance is established by the year four review, the faculty member shall not be recommended for retention. If a faculty member has been granted service credit, the accomplishments during the period for which service credit was granted shall be fully documented by the faculty member and weighed in reasonable proportion to the accomplishments achieved in the balance of the probationary period. Accomplishments made during service credit years shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion or tenure.

9.2 Requirements for Tenure

9.2.1 The granting of tenure is the most significant action that the University takes, because it represents an affirmation that the probationary faculty member will be an asset to the University over their entire career. Therefore, a positive tenure decision requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that meet the expectations stated in UPS 210.002 and in these Departmental Personnel Standards.

9.2.2 To be recommended for tenure, the faculty member’s performance must receive an evaluation of “Excellent” in either the area of teaching or the area of scholarship and creative accomplishments, and must also receive an evaluation of “Good” in the other two areas, as specified in sections 6.6.1, 6.6.2, 7.5.3.4, 7.5.3.5, 8.3.5, and 8.3.6 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.

9.3 Requirements for Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure. A faculty member shall not be promoted during the probationary period.

9.4 Requirements for Promotion to Professor

9.4.1 While teaching performance of high quality is expected for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, it is expected that a faculty member will continue to grow as a teacher throughout their career. For promotion to Professor, a faculty member must not only teach
well, but demonstrate that they have developed and drawn from a repertoire of effective and appropriate teaching techniques. The faculty member must also have developed new courses or engaged in research related to their teaching assignment. A faculty member at this level is also experienced and competent enough to mentor graduate students and less experienced colleagues, helping them improve their teaching performance. A faculty member may withdraw, without prejudice, a request for promotion at any time prior to the final decision. Accomplishments documented for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.

9.4.2 To be recommended for promotion to Professor, the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching and of scholarship and creative accomplishments must receive an evaluation of “Excellent” as specified in sections 6.6.1 and 7.5.3.4 of these Departmental Personnel Standards, and the faculty member’s performance in the area of professional, University, and community service must receive an evaluation of “Good” or “Excellent” as specified in sections 8.3.3.4 and 8.3.3.5 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.

9.5 Requirements for Early Tenure

9.5.1 Consideration for early tenure shall originate with a request by the candidate. A probationary faculty member may be granted tenure at any time after their first year of appointment.

9.5.2 To be recommended for early tenure, the faculty member’s performance in the areas of teaching and of scholarship and creative accomplishments must each receive an evaluation of “Excellent” as specified in sections 6.6.1 and 7.5.3.4 of these Departmental Personnel Standards, and in addition, the faculty member’s performance in the area of professional, University, and community service must receive an evaluation of “Good” or “Excellent” as specified in sections 8.3.3.4 and 8.3.3.5 of these Departmental Personnel Standards. To be recommended for early tenure, the faculty member must establish evidence of distinction beyond what is ordinarily expected for tenure and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue.

9.6 Requirements for Early Promotion to Associate Professor
The requirements for early promotion to Associate Professor are the same as those for early tenure.

9.7 Requirements for Early Promotion to Professor

To be recommended for early promotion to Professor, the faculty member’s performance in each of the three areas (teaching, scholarship and creative accomplishments, and professional, University, and community service) must receive an evaluation of “Excellent” as specified in sections 6.6.1, 7.5.3.4, and 8.3.3.4 of these Departmental Personnel Standards.