

POLICY ON RANGE ELEVATION FOR TEMPORARY FACULTY

This document spells out policies, organizational structures, and procedures for the range elevation of lecturers, both full-time and part-time. All procedures and actions at all levels shall conform to university policies and the Collective Bargaining Agreement. In particular, this policy assumes that the criteria to be employed in assessing the candidate's fitness for a range elevation shall be appropriate to the candidate's specific work assignment.¹

The term "range elevation" refers to the placement of a part-time or full-time temporary faculty member (hereafter, Lecturer)² on a higher salary range. Range elevation shall be accompanied by advancement of at least five percent (5%). When a Lecturer receives a new appointment, the faculty member may be placed on higher salary range. Range Elevation is neither a right of a Lecturer nor solely a reward for past service and accumulation of employment.

I. ELIGIBILITY FOR RANGE ELEVATION

Faculty who are eligible for range elevation shall be limited to any Lecturer, full-time or part-time, who have no more SSI eligibility in their current range, and have served five (5) years in their current range.

II. CRITERIA FOR RANGE ELEVATION

The burden of proof for range elevation rests with the applicant's record of achievement. It is also understood that reasonable people may disagree in the evaluation of evidence. Further, faculty members in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues. The range elevation process requires that the judgment of the university, through its administrators and peer review committees, be made with full and careful consideration of this peer judgment and be consistent with academic freedom and standards of fairness and due process.

- A) The basis for a positive recommendation for range elevation shall be based upon a positive assessment of the overall quality of the faculty member's performance commensurate with the specific work assignment, an established pattern of productive working relationships with peers and colleagues, the proposed range, and time base, as demonstrated through the evidence documented in the Personnel Action File (PAF).
- B) Length of service or time in range shall not be considered.
- C) Accumulated teaching, or other, experience is not considered sufficient for range elevation.
- D) For Lecturers holding instructional appointments, the primary criteria used in this evaluation will be teaching effectiveness and maintaining currency in the discipline in which the candidate teaches. Teaching effectiveness will be assessed using the following rubric:

¹ See Article 12.19 of the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement.

² Hereafter, the term "Lecturer" as used in this policy also refers to equivalent temporary employees who are Librarians or SSP-ARs.

Table 1: Criteria for Range Elevation for Lecturers with Instructional Assignments

Lecturer A to B	Lecturer B to C and Lecturer C to D
<p>Demonstrates a consistent commendable level of facilitating outcomes-based student learning by providing evidence of all of the following, as appropriate to the individual lecturer's work assignment:</p> <p>Continually refining and improving teaching practices based on self-reflection and feedback from student and faculty evaluations;</p> <p>Clearly aligning assignments and assessments with course outcomes;</p> <p>Applying innovative and effective ways of teaching subject matter to diverse student populations;</p> <p>Successfully adapting best pedagogical practices while developing or revising outcomes-based course materials;</p> <p>Effectively using course materials that reflect the current state of knowledge and practices in the field.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a consistent commendable level of facilitating outcomes-based student learning by providing evidence of all of the following, as appropriate to the individual lecturer's work assignment:</p> <p>Continually refining and improving teaching practices based on self-reflection and feedback from student and faculty evaluations;</p> <p>Clearly aligning assignments and assessments with course outcomes;</p> <p><i>Developing</i> and applying innovative and effective ways of teaching subject matter to diverse student populations;</p> <p>Successfully <i>developing</i> and adapting best pedagogical practices while developing or revising outcomes-based course materials;</p> <p>Effectively <i>developing</i> and using course materials that reflect the current state of knowledge and practices in the field;</p> <p>Successfully collaborating with faculty in teaching and learning activities.</p>

Currency in the candidate's teaching discipline will be assessed by examining evidence in the PAF, application letter, and Curriculum Vita (CV) that demonstrates several of the following activities. (This list is for illustrative purposes only, and is non-exhaustive.)

- Increased mastery of the discipline by obtaining one or more formal graduate degrees.
- Presentation of original research/scholarship at professional meetings or conferences of the discipline.
- Peer-reviewed publication of original research/scholarship in recognized journals of the discipline.
- Public exhibitions, performances, or other creative activities demonstrating mastery of the artistic discipline.
- Significant external employment and/or experience in professions relevant to the discipline.
- Possession of current licenses, certifications, and/or professional credentials to practice in professions relevant to the discipline.
- Significant and frequent participation in professional development activities related to scholarship and/or pedagogy of the discipline. Attendance at, and participation in, workshops, continuing education courses, professional seminars, and similar activities sponsored by disciplinary organizations.

- Composition and submission of grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support pedagogy, or to advance the educational mission of the University.
 - Other professional activities (e.g., editing a disciplinary journal) that demonstrate peer recognition of disciplinary currency and/or mastery (e.g., serving as a consultant, adjudicator, or external reviewer).
- E) For Lecturers holding non-instructional appointments, the primary criteria used in this evaluation will be the facilitation of student success and maintaining currency in the profession in which the candidate practices. Facilitation of student success will be assessed using the following rubric:

Table 2: Criteria for Range Elevation for Lecturers with Non-Instructional Assignments

Lecturer A to B (or equivalent ranks)	Lecturer B to C and Lecturer C to D (or equivalent ranks)
<p>Demonstrates a consistent commendable level of facilitating student success by providing evidence of all of the following, as appropriate to the individual's work assignment:</p> <p>Continually refining and improving professional practices based on feedback and self-reflection;</p> <p>Successfully adapting and implementing current knowledge and best professional practices to serve diverse student populations.</p>	<p>Demonstrates a consistent commendable level of facilitating student success by providing evidence of all of the following, as appropriate to the individual's work assignment:</p> <p>Continually refining and improving professional practices based on feedback and self-reflection;</p> <p>Successfully <i>developing</i>, adapting, and implementing current knowledge and best professional practices to serve diverse student populations.</p> <p>Successfully collaborating with colleagues in professional activities.</p>

Currency in the profession in which the candidate practices will be assessed by examining evidence in the PAF, application letter, and Curriculum Vita (CV) that demonstrates several of the following activities. (This list is for illustrative purposes only, and is non-exhaustive.)

- Increased mastery of the discipline by obtaining one or more formal graduate degrees.
- Presentation of original research/scholarship at professional meetings or conferences of the profession.
- Peer-reviewed publication of original research/scholarship in recognized journals of the profession or relevant disciplines.
- Public exhibitions or other creative activities demonstrating mastery of the discipline and currency in subject matter.
- Significant external employment and/or experience in the profession (e.g., service on professional boards, holding office in one or more professional organizations, or service to public agencies).
- Possession of current licenses, certifications, and/or professional credentials to practice in the profession.

- Significant and frequent participation in professional development activities. Attendance at, and participation in, workshops, continuing education courses, professional seminars, and similar activities sponsored by the profession's organizations.
- Composition and submission of grant proposals to conduct research in the a relevant discipline, to support student success, or to advance the educational mission of the University.
- Other activities that demonstrate peer recognition of professional currency and/or mastery (e.g., serving as a consultant, adjudicator, or external reviewer).

III. PROCEDURES

Programs and program coordinators when so authorized by the Provost shall fulfill responsibilities of departments and department chairs.

A) General Provisions

The following are the general procedures that apply to the entire range elevation process:

1. The candidate, the chair of the department peer review committee, department chair, and the appropriate administrator are responsible to assure that the procedures and established timelines are followed.
2. All deliberations of consultative bodies on individual personnel cases shall be conducted in executive session and remain confidential as provided by law.
Violations of this confidentiality are considered to be unprofessional conduct and may be grounds for disciplinary action.
3. All peer review committees designated to make recommendations in this process must be **ELECTED**. Vacancies can only be filled by election. Substitution of elected members by proxies is prohibited.
4. The candidate has the responsibility to place materials in the PAF, which provide documentation regarding individual achievement addressing the criteria (above) relevant to the candidate's specific work assignment. In addition, the candidate is responsible for providing an updated CV and a letter of application.
5. At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent review level, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation five (5) days prior to these materials being placed in the PAF. The candidate may, at his/her discretion, request a meeting with the person or group making the recommendation within five (5) days of this notification. Such a meeting must take place within ten (10) days of this request. However, a faculty member's right to submit a written rebuttal must be executed within the ten (10) day period stipulated by the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall accompany the PAF and also be sent to all previous levels of review. This provision shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.
6. At either level of review, but prior to the final decision, applicants for range elevation may withdraw without prejudice from consideration.
7. The recommendation, and the reasons and all rebuttals and responses, if any, shall become part of the PAF.
8. An applicant for range elevation may have access only to his/her own Personnel Action File.

B) Timelines

1. At the beginning of each academic year, the Provost (or designee) shall announce deadlines for the submission of requests for consideration for range elevation.
2. If the departmental evaluation/recommendation process is not completed within the time specified in the administrative calendar, the file shall be automatically transferred to the dean and the faculty member shall be so notified. **In such cases, the department shall not make a recommendation.** Deadlines may be extended with the written authorization of the Provost.
3. No person shall be deemed to have been elevated to a higher range because notice was not given or received by the time prescribed. It is the responsibility of the faculty member concerned to make inquiry to determine the decision of the dean, who shall give notice without delay.

C) Application for Range Elevation

1. A Lecturer who wishes to be considered for range elevation shall provide to the department and the dean the following:
 - a) letter of application, not to exceed five (5) single spaced typewritten pages, clearly stating the request and why the applicant believes that he/she meets the criteria for range elevation stated above,
 - and
 - b) complete and up-to-date vita CV.
2. The application and the vita CV shall be placed in the PAF of the applicant. This material will be deemed to have been placed in the PAF at the request of the Lecturer and will not require a five (5) day notice prior to placement in the file.
3. It is the responsibility of the lecturer applicant to see that any appropriate documentation in support of his/her application has been placed in the Personnel Action File.

D) Department Level

1. Departments have the primary responsibility to state, in writing, and in detail, the reasons for their recommendations. **Recommendations on range elevation shall be based solely upon the contents of the faculty member's PAF.** The department is responsible for preparing a complete description and analysis of the factors significant in the departmental evaluation consistent with the criteria previously described.
2. The probationary and tenured faculty of the department shall **ELECT** a department peer review committee (or a separate committee for each applicant) of tenured full-time faculty members. The department, if so desired, may function as an elected a committee of the whole; that is, the department peer review committee may consist of all eligible tenured full time faculty in the department. In either event, the recommendations of the peer review committee(s) are the recommendations of the department.
3. The meeting(s) of the peer review committee shall include confidential, careful and thorough deliberations leading to a vote. Each peer review committee's independent recommendation shall be approved by a simple majority of the membership of that committee and shall be based solely on information and documentation in the PAF.

4. The department chair may decide to submit an independent recommendation or to participate as a member of the department peer review committee.³ The department chair shall make known his/her decision, in writing to all department faculty, after consultation with the probationary and tenured faculty of the department and prior to the date beginning the campus process. A copy of the notification shall be attached to the recommendation.

The chair shall apply this decision to all applicants in that academic year. If the department chair makes an independent recommendation, s/he shall not participate in deliberations or attend meetings of the departmental peer review committee. If the chair does not make an independent recommendation, s/he may participate as a member of the department peer review committee.

5. The department peer review committee or the department chair (if making a separate recommendation) may ask the candidate to provide clarification, including documentation, for material in the PAF. The faculty member shall have ten (10) days to respond.
6. The department peer review committee and the department chair (if making independent recommendations) shall attach their written recommendations, including the reasons for the recommendations. If the chair is making a separate recommendation, then there shall be no meetings between the department peer review committee and the department chair.
7. At the conclusion of the department level review, the applicant shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The applicant shall have ten (10) days to respond before the recommendation is forwarded to the dean.
8. The department chair shall forward the recommendations of the department and the chair (if separate) and the PAF to the dean.

E) Dean's Decision

1. In the event that an applicant is not recommended for range elevation by the department peer review committee, and/or the department chair (if the chair is making a separate recommendation), the applicant shall have the right to make an appearance before the dean to present his/her case. The dean must allow a presentation of at least thirty (30) minutes. **Discussions must be limited to information and documentation in the PAF.**
2. The dean shall review and consider the recommendation(s) for range elevation, relevant material, and information contained in the PAF.
3. The dean may request clarification of either the recommendation(s) or evidence in the PAF. In such circumstances, the dean may meet with appropriate parties to discuss clarification of the information and documentation in the PAF prior to making the final decision.
4. The dean shall make a final, independent decision on each range elevation recommendation and shall notify each applicant, in writing, of that decision and of the reasons for the decision.⁴ Should the dean make a decision on any basis not directly related to the professional qualifications, work performance, or personal attributes of the person in question, those reasons shall be stated in writing and entered into the PAF and shall be immediately provided to the applicant.

³ The decision of the chair shall be the same as that for faculty in the RTP process during that same academic year.

⁴ Prior to making the final decision, the dean may consult with the Provost.

IV. APPEALS

1. A denial of range elevation shall be subject to the peer review process as described in Article 10.11 of the CBA except that the peer panel's decision shall be final.
2. All appeals relating to denials of range elevation shall be heard by a single peer panel.

References: CBA Articles 10, 11, 12, 31

Approved by Academic Senate

April 2013

February 26, 2013

Approved by President

May 2013

July 18, 2013

May 5, 2015