

Departmental Personnel Standards Requirements for Tenure-Track Instructional Faculty per UPS 210.002 (3/22/2023 version)

Revised by Mark Carrier (9/21/2023)
Original Version by Ed Collom (7/12/2021)

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

UPS 210.002 Overview

“This document establishes the minimum standards that govern retention, promotion, and granting of tenure (RTP) for probationary faculty, and the promotion of tenured faculty in the absence of approved Departmental Personnel Standards.” (Page 2, Section I.A.1.)

“These standards shall serve as guidelines for development and interpretation of Departmental Personnel Standards. For departments without approved Departmental Personnel Standards, the standards in this document shall be the basis to evaluate faculty performance.” (Page 4, Section II.A.1.f.)

“Approved Departmental Personnel Standards are controlling documents in all personnel decisions.” (Page 13, Section III.A.2.)

“Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall normally be formally reviewed by the department as part of the program performance review or an accreditation process. Exceptions to this timeline may be granted in consultation with FAR. The outcome of this formal review may be proposed revisions or reaffirmation of the existing standards. In either event a summary of the discussion shall be forwarded to the CPSRC.” (Page 14, Section III.A.4.g.)

General Departmental Personnel Standards Requirements

“Each department shall develop standards for the evaluation of faculty members of that department. These standards shall be consistent with Section II of this document and 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.” (Page 13, Section III.A.1.)

“Departmental Personnel Standards should state the necessary levels of performance for positive decisions for tenure and promotion in a manner that specifies the total requirements. The DPS may also include specific language regarding the frequency of the activities.” (Page 4, Section II.A.1.c.)

“For instructional faculty, teaching should be the most important criterion for retention, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor.” (Page 4, Section II.A.1.d.)

“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.” (Page 5, Section II.B)

Requirements for Retention of Probationary Faculty

“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 review.” (Page 4, Section II.A.2.)

“When weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement.” (Page 4, Section II.A.2.)

If service credit was granted, candidates “shall include documentation of accomplishments during those specific years for which the service credit was granted.” And, “accomplishments during service credit years shall be weighed in reasonable proportion... (and) ...shall never be sufficient in and of themselves for the granting of promotion and/or tenure.” (Page 2, Sections I.D.1. and 2.)

Per UPS 210.000 Section I.K. (page 4), “A Full Performance Review may be requested for any probationary faculty member at any level of review for probationary years three or five when, typically, only an Abbreviated Review would be required.” (Thus, DPS documents should specify the conditions under which this recommendation should be made.)

Tenure Requirements

“[A] positive tenure decision requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth, and future potential that meet the expectations stated in the approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document.” (Page 4, Section II.A.3.a.)

“The decision to grant tenure shall be based solely on an evaluation of the faculty member's performance as documented by the evidence contained in the WPAF and Appendices... When concerns have been expressed in earlier review cycles, a candidate for tenure is expected to have addressed these concerns specifically in the narrative.” (Page 5, Section II.A.3.b.) (underline added)

Early Tenure Requirements

“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.” (Page 5, Section II.A.3.c.)

Promotion Requirements

“The University expects that the tenured faculty will continue to strive for excellence in teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. Promotion to Professor requires that the tenured faculty member has displayed accomplishments that meet the expectations for promotion stated in the approved Departmental Personnel Standards, or, in the absence of such standards, Section II of this document. The decision to grant promotion to the rank of Professor shall be based on a record that indicates sustained commitment to the standards described herein.” (Page 5, Section II.A.4.c.)

“These standards state the necessary levels of performance for positive decisions. Levels of performance required for promotion to Professor should be equal or greater than the performance required for promotion to Associate Professor.” (Page 4, Section II.A.1.e.)

“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).”

(Page 5, Section II.A.4.d.)

“Accomplishments documented for the promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor. The WPAF shall be submitted by October 1 of the sixth probationary year for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. Therefore, the review period for promotion to professor begins October 2 of the sixth probationary year. Any materials added to the WPAF during the review process (i.e., after October 2) for promotion to Associate Professor shall not count again for promotion to Professor.” (Page 5, Section II.A.4.e.)

“A candidate for promotion may withdraw their promotion request without prejudice at any level of review prior to the final decision. The withdrawal request must be submitted in writing to FAR. If the withdrawal request is submitted prior to October 1 or the faculty member fails to submit a WPAF by October 1, the candidate may be eligible to serve on the DPC.” (Page 5, Section II.A.4.g.)

Early Promotion Requirements

“A probationary faculty unit employee shall not normally be promoted during probation.” (Page 5, Section II.A.4.b.)

“Early promotion to Professor requires that the faculty member has displayed excellence and sustained commitment to 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.” (Page 5, Section II.A.4.f.)

Evaluation of Teaching Requirements

“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.” (Page 5, Section II.B.)

“The evaluation shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account any efforts to improve teaching performance.” (Page 6, Section II.B.1.a.)

“The evaluation should also take into account evidence of cultural taxation.” (Page 6, Section II.B.1.a)

“A faculty member’s teaching performance should be assessed using the criteria below.” (Pages 6-8, Section II.B.1.b.)

1. Establishment of a conducive learning environment for a diverse student body and historically marginalized population.

2. Creation of a course linking learning goals to methods of assessment and student outcomes.
3. Effective use of a variety of instructional methods and learning modalities.
4. Establishment of appropriate academic standards and holding students accountable for the standards of the discipline of study.
5. Building and enhancing currency in the relevant discipline(s) and pedagogical developments as related to teaching.
6. Compliance with University, College, and Department policies governing instructional duties as outlined in faculty handbooks and University Policy Statements. (underline added)

“Where quantitative evidence is used in the application of criteria for teaching performance and disciplinary and pedagogical currency, departments should strive to maintain an appropriate balance between quantitative and qualitative evidence.” (Page 9, Section II.B.1.b.)

Student Opinion Questionnaire Requirements

“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.” (Page 15, Section III.B.5.) (underline added) “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.” (Page 9, Section II.B.1.c.)

“Student Opinion Questionnaires... ..are neither valid nor reliable measures of teaching effectiveness. ...SOQs can be impacted by racial, gender, and linguistic bias... ..must be interpreted cautiously and contextually. Overall, patterns of objective responses and written comments obtained in different courses over several semesters shall be considered more informative than isolated, individual comments.” (Page 9, Section II.B.1.c.)

“If departmental personnel documents specify SOQ score ranges that characterize instruction as “exceeds expectations,” “satisfactory,” etc., then they shall also detail how other measures of teaching effectiveness are evaluated, including peer evaluations, quality of teaching materials and assessments, self-reflections, etc. This is to avoid the cognitive bias that over- weighs quantitative measures relative to qualitative measures.” (Page 9, Section II.B.1.c.)

“It is important to note that for SOQ ordinal scales frequency distribution and dispersion are more appropriate measures than averages.” (Page 9, Section II.B.1.c.)

“The questions included in the instructional evaluation forms shall align with the criteria for evaluating teaching performance, as stated in the approved Department Personnel Standards...”

(Page 15, Section III.B.3.)

Grade Distribution/Academic Rigor Requirements

(Departments are no longer required to include grade distribution data as part of the evaluation of teaching.)

“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.” (Page 9, Section II.B.1.d.)

Evaluation of Scholarly and Creative Activity Requirements

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)

“Faculty shall demonstrate continuing, regular activities that result (or are judged likely to result, in the case of second- and third-year probationary faculty) in high quality peer-reviewed (when appropriate) scholarly publications, funded grants, or creative performances or exhibits.” (Page 10, Section II.B.2.b.1.)

“Quantity does not substitute for quality. Evaluation shall consider the importance of each achievement (e.g., the status of a journal, press or venue, whether a publication is an article or a note and whether a performance or exhibition is regional, national, or international in scope) and the faculty member's contribution in the case of co-authored or other collaborative work.” (Page 10, Section II.B.2.b.1.)

“...work that has been accepted for publication or presentation after a peer-review or jury process shall be distinguished from work that was not subject to a peer-review or jury process.” (Page 10, Section II.B.2.b.1.)

“Documentation of the peer-review or jury process must be included as documentation in the WPAF. The Departmental Personnel Standards may state specific criteria for when a scholarly or creative work is considered complete (e.g., when it is accepted for publication or presentation without revision, when it is published online, when it is published in print, etc.) In absence of these criteria, scholarly or creative works shall be considered to have been completed when they have been accepted for publication or presentation without further revision.” (Page 10, Section II.B.2.b.1.)

“The evaluations, at all levels, should take into account evidence of cultural taxation.” (Page 10, Section II.B.2.a)

“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.” (Page 6, Section II.B)

Evaluation of Service Requirements

“Each faculty member shall contribute to the profession, to the University, and to the community through appropriate professional and service activities.” (Page 10, Section II.B.3.a.)

“Approved Departmental Personnel Standards shall address those professional, University, and community service activities that are appropriate indicators of service contribution for its faculty.... Activities shall be related to one’s profession at Cal State Fullerton.” (Pages 10-11, Section II.B.3.a.)

“Evaluation shall assess the quality, duration and significance of service.” (Page 11, Section II.B.3.b.)

“The evaluation shall take into account evidence of cultural taxation.” (Page 10, Section II.B.3.a)