

## Audit of Departmental Personnel Standards

Revised by Mark Carrier (September 2023)

Original Version by Ed Collom (6/18/2020)

### Note

This audit is based on the version of [UPS 210.002](#) with an effective date of 3-22-23. Please email or call Mark Carrier (mcarrier@fullerton.edu ; x2778) in [Faculty Affairs & Records](#) if you find a mistake or need clarity or anything else.

### Introduction

#### Overall Purpose

The purpose of this document is to assist programs in developing and/or revising their Department Personnel Standards. It is important to bring the DPS into alignment with the minimum standards set forth in UPS 210.002. If the department DPS are not in alignment with those minimums, then the department standards could be declared out of compliance, resulting in the substitution of the UPS 210.002 document for the department standards. Additionally, departments without DPS must use the UPS 210.002 standards as the evaluation standards.

#### Instructions

Compare the existing DPS or the draft DPS with the questions below. Revise the draft DPS as necessary.

**IMPORTANT DISCLAIMER: Nothing in this document guarantees the approval of DPS in the DPS approval process.** The prompts below are provided by Faculty Affairs & Records for self-reflection that leads to improved drafts as you go through the DPS approval process. The prompts are not comprehensive; rather, they represent the most anticipated issues that will arise. Each program will need to address all of the components of DPS as laid out in UPS 210.002.

### Prompts

(Yellow highlights are new to the 3-22-2023 version of UPS 210.002.)

\* 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.” (underline added)

**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 may be granted in cases when a faculty member demonstrates a record of distinction in Teaching, Scholarly and Creative Activities, and Service and superior accomplishments significantly beyond what is expected for tenure on the standard timeline. The candidate's record must establish compelling evidence of distinction in all three areas and must inspire confidence that the pattern of strong overall performance will continue." (underline added)

Section II.A.4.f. 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." (underline added)

**Does the document align with the requirements of UPS 210.002 II.B.?**

"Each level of review shall evaluate the WPAF 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 criteria of performance in teaching, scholarly/creative, and service."

**Does the document provide alternative pathways to promotion to Full Professor (UPS 210.002 II.A.4.d)?**

"Departments are encouraged to consider offering different paths to promotion to Professor (e.g.: exceptional performance in teaching and service, and satisfactory performance in research)" (encouraged but not required)

**Does the document address cultural taxation (UPS 210.002 II.B)? (new in UPS 210.002, 6-8-22 version)**

- "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."
- "The [teaching] evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation." (II.B.1.a)  
"The [scholarly and creative accomplishments] evaluations, at all levels, should take into account evidence of cultural taxation." (II.B.2.a)
- "The [professional, university, and community service] evaluation shall take into account evidence of cultural taxation." (II.B.3.a)

**Does the document address the inclusion of mentoring as an important activity (UPS 210.002 II.B)?**

"Mentoring students-and particularly engaging them in research and other scholarly and creative activities-is an especially valuable form of faculty work. It therefore also deserves consideration in the evaluation process." (new in UPS 210.002, 6-8-22 version)

**Are the guidelines for the evaluation of teaching performance, used for interpreting SOQ data or summaries, fair and equitable? (III.B.5; new in UPS 210.002, 6-8-22 version) (underline added)**

**Does the document reflect consideration of the most recent updates to the illustrative list of criteria and sources of teaching evidence (UPS 210.002 II.B.1.b, 6-8-22 version), including...? (*underlines added*)**

- “Sets clear communication guidelines with students (UPS 300.004)”
- “high impact practices (HIPS)” as evidence for a classroom environment that encourages student interaction and engagement
- “recorded lectures” as evidence of “clarity of presentation”
- “Creates a classroom environment that contributes to equitable learning for all students”
- “Accessible technology appropriate to the learning experience”
- “Pedagogical methods” that “consider student needs”
- “Academic goals, expectations, and/or competencies appropriate to the course”
- “Grading system is fair, transparent, and conducive to learning” Letters of support as evidence of supervision, mentorship
- “Developing service learning opportunities, community-engaged learning opportunities, and/or semester abroad courses”
- “Gives final exam or project, if required by the instructor....”

**Does the document detail how Student Opinion Questionnaire data is employed in evaluations per UPS 210.002 II.B.1.c.?**

- “While use of standardized Student Opinion Questionnaires is required as part of the evaluation process, any data gathered from SOQs must be considered within a broader constellation of artifacts and should follow evidence-based guidelines and best practices”
- “Overall, patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments”
- Guidelines shall also be developed per UPS 210.002 III.B.5.: “Each department shall develop fair and equitable guidelines for the evaluation of teaching performance so that Student Opinion Questionnaires (or summaries) submitted in the WPAF can be interpreted.” (*underline added*)

**Does the document discuss grade distribution data and its role in evaluations in accordance with UPS 210.002 II.B.1.d.?**

“Faculty members are expected to maintain high standards regarding student achievement in all courses taught as evidenced by their syllabi, assignments, samples of graded student work etc. Grade distributions shall not be used to determine academic rigor. Academic rigor shall be assessed based on readings, assignments, samples of student work, rubrics, etc.”?

**Does the document include consideration of community engagement?**

“Scholarly and creative endeavors shall, when appropriate, be integrated with teaching, actively involve students, engage with the community, and attract external support. (Page 9, Section II.B.2.a) (*underline added*)

**Does the document reflect consideration of new updates to the illustrative list of service activities that includes sponsoring student organizations, developing/facilitating internships, service learning opportunities, and community-engaged learning opportunities? (UPS 210.002 II.B.3.b, 6-8-22 version)**

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. The evaluation should take into account evidence of cultural taxation.” (*underline added*)

**Does the document provide sufficient levels of standards of performance?**

UPS 210.002 III.A.4.h states: “In no case may Departmental Personnel Standards require lower substantive levels of performance than those required by law, University policy, or Section II of this document.”

**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 is located on the [Academic Senate website](#). NOTE: 240.000 and 240.100 were rescinded in 2013 and replaced by several Executive Orders from the Chancellors Office (see UPS website)

**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.

Concern about the college’s “established list of preapproved journals categorized into five categories”  
➡ make sure that this list is uploaded into the WPAF by the candidate OR if the list changes rarely, then embed the list into the standards.

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?

- P. 7, need a hard return before “a. narrative and self-assessment...”
- p. 7, third to last line, need a space after “was given,”
- p. 9, in a. Evaluation of Pedagogical..., “Excellent”, there is an extra period after “VI. A. 2. A.”
- p. 9, in a. Evaluation of Pedagogical..., “Excellent”, there is an unnecessary “x” before “VI. A. 2. A.”
- p. 9, in a. Evaluation of Pedagogical..., “Marginal”, there is an extra period after “VI. A. 2. A.”
- p. 17, in 3. b., there is an extra period after “assistant professor rank.”

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