POLICY ON RANGE ELEVATION FOR LECTURER FACULTY

(This revised policy supersedes PS 00-11, 02-03, and 08-15.)
This policy statement was recommended by the Academic Senate on March 21, 2019
and approved by the president on April 18, 2019.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Policy has been developed in accordance with Sections 12.16 – 12.20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the California Faculty Association and the Board of Trustees of the California State University, which states, "Procedures for range elevation on the salary schedule [for lecturer faculty shall be] established at each campus by the President, after recommendation by the appropriate Academic Senate Committee" (12.16).

Each lecturer faculty member is hired in a particular salary range (A, B, C, or D). A candidate who is awarded a range elevation moves from their/her/his current salary range to the next higher range (for example, from A to B), receives at least a 5% salary increase, and becomes eligible for Service Salary Increases (SSIs) in the new range.

2.0 Eligibility, Timetable, Notification, and Effective Date

2.1 Eligibility: Eligibility rules are governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and supporting documents.

2.2 Timetable: The formal beginning of review for range elevation shall be on or about February 1 of each year. Conclusion of review normally shall be April 7.

2.3 Notification:

2.3.1 On or before November 1, the Office of Faculty Affairs shall notify those lecturer faculty who may be eligible for range elevation. Every department shall receive a list of eligible lecturer faculty.

2.3.2 Failure to notify an eligible lecturer faculty member shall not be cause for automatic granting of a range elevation. An eligible lecturer faculty member not properly notified may apply for range elevation nonetheless and follow the same time lines. If granted, the range elevation will be retroactive as though notified at the appropriate time.

2.3.3 In the notification to the lecturer faculty and the departments, the Office of Faculty Affairs shall provide the website address (URL) for the Range Elevation Policy.

2.3.4 Each eligible lecturer faculty member shall be considered for a range elevation on the salary schedule unless he/she/they informs the Department Chair in writing of her/their/his desire not to be considered at this time.

2.4 Effective Date: A range elevation salary increase shall be effective at the beginning of the first appointment in the academic year following the review.

3.0 DEPARTMENT EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The award of a range elevation on the salary schedule may be made by the Dean after consultation with the pertinent department. That consultation shall be in the form of a written recommendation to the Dean from the department.

3.1 Departments shall determine their own procedures for evaluating their lecturer faculty and preparing recommendations regarding range elevation.

3.2 All current Unit 3 employees are eligible to participate in all departmental discussions and decisions pertaining to procedures for range elevation. All such employees must be fully informed of their right to participate and of the days, times, and locations of the meeting at which these issues will be discussed. Such notification must be in writing and must be given five (5) working days before any meeting to discuss these issues.

3.3 Departments may choose one of the following configurations to evaluate their lecturer faculty for the purpose of making a recommendation on Range Elevation:

- the departmental chair,
- a designee,
- an elected Range Elevation Review Committee, or
- any combination of one or more of the above.

3.4 If a department chooses to use a Range Elevation Review Committee, all Unit 3 employees are eligible to serve on such a committee, except current candidates for range elevation.

3.5 The voting franchise for the purpose of establishing range elevation procedures and the department policy governing elections related to range elevation shall be proportional to the time base of each Unit 3 member, i.e.:

- A Unit 3 member on .20 appointment casts 1 ballot
- ".40" 2 ballots
- ".60" 3 ballots
- ".80" 4 ballots
- "1.0" 5 ballots

For purposes of determining the number of ballots an individual receives, appointments that fall between those listed shall be rounded upward.

3.6 In any subsequent election regarding the procedures for range evaluation, and/or the election procedures pertaining to range elevation, the proportional vote allotted to any employee cannot be less than the proportions described in 3.5.

3.7 In any election relating to range elevation, all voting must be by mailed secret ballots. Such elections must be held over a period lasting at least five (5) working days.

3.8 In the case of a lecturer faculty member who does not hold an appointment within a department, department-level evaluation shall be by an *ad hoc* committee of faculty appointed by the Dean of the appropriate college after consultation with the lecturer faculty as in 3.2 above.

3.9 Each department shall forward its initial procedures on range elevation to the Office of the Academic Senate within 10 working days of approving the procedures. Any subsequent changes to the department's procedures on range elevation must be forwarded to the Academic Senate by November 1 of the academic year the procedures take effect.

The review period shall cover the period since the date of initial appointment or the date of the last range elevation. In either case, if this period is six years or more, candidates only need to provide documentation for the most recent six years. Candidates may choose to document additional years.

4.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

To be recommended for range elevation, lecturer faculty must show professional growth and development appropriate to the lecturer faculty member's work assignment and the mission of the University.

This section lists examples of activities that may be used to demonstrate appropriate professional growth and development. It is neither exhaustive nor minimal, but simply a listing of the typical professional activities engaged in by lecturer faculty in a wide range of disciplines. In all cases, quality of performance and appropriateness of the activity shall be the primary consideration when evaluating the merit of a specific activity. Activities are listed alphabetically, and no weighting shall be inferred from the order:

- active participation at professional meetings and conferences;
- activities enhancing the effective teaching of the discipline;
- advising and mentoring student associations;
- collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the community;
- collaborative teaching;
- contributions to improving the campus climate (the promotion of mutual respect and acceptance of diversity in all its forms);
- creative activities in support of effective teaching;
- curriculum and program development;
- development of instructional materials;
- development of standards and/or outcomes assessment;
- editing of publications;
- external fundraising and resource development related to the mission of the University;
- fostering of collegiality;

- grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University;
- increased mastery of the discipline evidenced by additional relevant education or an additional degree;
- involvement of students in the research and creative processes;
- leadership and active participation in service activities of professional associations;
- leadership and special contributions to the basic instructional mission of the University;
- leadership in shared governance and campus life at the department, college, university, or CSU system level;
- maintenance and technical support of university labs, equipment, materials, supplies, safety standards and any other support of environments that require advanced professional attention;
- mentoring of colleagues;
- organizing events and activities for the sharing of ideas and knowledge;
- presentations at conferences;
- professional contributions to the community, including professional efforts which bring the community and the campus together;
- program advising;
- publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge;
- recruitment and retention of students;
- research and/or creative activity in discipline related pedagogy;
- research and/or creative activity in the discipline;
- teaching and instructionally related activities;
- thesis research and supervision;
- other work furthering the mission of the University.

5.0 APPLICATION PROCESS

5.1 The Candidate

5.1.1 To be evaluated for range elevation, each candidate must submit application materials that conform to the requirements of his/her/their department.

5.1.2 At a minimum, the candidate shall provide the following materials:

- a current curriculum vitae;
- a description of the candidate's work assignments for each semester of the period under consideration;
- a narrative presenting evidence, and/or examples, of her/his/their professional growth and development; and
- student evaluation summaries for all evaluated courses taught by the candidate in the department during the period of evaluation.

5.2 The Department

Each Department, as part of its range elevation procedures, shall define the materials to be considered in an application for range elevation.

5.3 Additional Information

5.3.1 The Department Evaluator(s) may seek additional information or documentation needed to support a candidate's claims. Department Evaluator(s) may also solicit written comments from the department chair or faculty peers to clarify information provided by the candidate. Any comments that are used to determine a recommendation must be included as supplemental attachments to the final written report and must be available to the candidate.

5.3.2 When a candidate is asked to provide additional information or documentation, the burden of supplying the requested material in a timely manner resides with the candidate. Failure to provide requested information shall not delay either the evaluation process or the preparation of recommendation by the Department Evaluator(s).

6.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

6.1 Department Evaluation

6.1.1 The Department Evaluator(s) shall prepare a recommendation regarding range elevation for each eligible candidate considered. This recommendation shall be a written report that includes the decision as well as the reasons for reaching that decision.

6.1.2 The Department Evaluator(s) shall assess the quality and appropriateness of the candidate's professional growth and development during the period of evaluation. Materials submitted by the candidate shall be evaluated in relation to the candidate's work assignment while employed in the department. The Department Evaluator(s) may not require, but may consider, evidence of performance outside of the area of the candidate's work assignment.

6.1.3 A copy of this recommendation shall be forwarded to the candidate, and the Dean, with a copy retained in the Department Office.

6.2 Candidate's Response (optional)

6.2.1 Upon receiving the recommendation from the Department Evaluator(s), the candidate may provide a written response to the recommendation. Such a response is optional.

6.2.2 The candidate has seven (7) days to submit a response to the recommendation, which should be addressed to the Dean, with a copy sent to the Department Evaluator(s).

6.2.3 The candidate's response shall be attached to the candidate's range elevation file at the Dean's level, with a copy retained with the candidate's file at the Department level.

6.3 Dean's Decision and Notification

6.3.1 The Dean shall make the final decision on awarding a range elevation to the candidate.

6.3.2 Following the seven (7)-day period in which the candidate has the right to respond to the recommendation of the Department Evaluator(s), the Dean shall consider the application submitted along with the recommendation and the candidate's response, if submitted.

6.3.3 The decision of the Dean shall be forwarded to the candidate and the Chair of the appropriate department.

6.3.4 In the event a candidate's request is denied, the Dean must provide the candidate, the Department Evaluator(s), and/or the department Chair with a written explanation of the

reasons for the denial, and apprise the candidate of the right to peer review (see VI below).

7.0 PEER REVIEW

Denial of range elevation shall be subject to a peer review process. Each year a Faculty Hearing Committee established in accordance with Article 10.12 of the CBA shall serve to hear appeals of any temporary faculty unit employee denied range elevation during that fiscal year. The Committee shall allow for appellants to make a presentation to the Committee and to be represented by CFA if so desired. The Committee shall convene and review the cases within thirty (30) days of the conclusion of the review period. The Committee shall render a decision within thirty (30) days of hearing the case. The decision of the Faculty Hearing Committee shall be final and binding.

8.0 RANGE ELEVATION MATERIALS

The recommendations to grant or deny a range elevation shall not be considered during deliberations for reappointment unless the lecturer faculty member includes the documents related to the recommendations in their/his/her personnel action file.

9.0 REPORTING

At the end of the Academic Year, the Office of Faculty Affairs will report on the number of lecturer faculty in each range who were eligible for range elevation, the number who applied in each category, and the number who were successful in each category.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately