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Personnel Procedures for Lecturers
Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
(Approved by Department on April 13, 2023)

In this document, a lecturer is defined as a non-tenure track faculty hired for lecture/recitation/laboratory instruction who is not a graduate student in the Department nor a recent (within the last year) graduate from the Department hired temporarily while he/she is seeking employment elsewhere.

I. Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Lecturer Evaluation Committee

A. An Evaluation Committee consisting of three to five tenured or FERP faculty not currently serving on the Departmental Personnel Committee or as the departmental representative to the College Personnel Committee shall be selected by a secret ballot at the beginning of each academic year from a pool of all eligible faculty members in the Department. Immediately after election, the Evaluation Committee shall meet, elect a Chair and report the selection to the Chair of the Department.

B. Duties of the Evaluation Committee

1. The Evaluation Committee shall evaluate the teaching effectiveness of all lecturers in the Department each academic year and make recommendations regarding retention.

2. All other procedures applying to the evaluation of lecturers not referred to in this document shall follow the regulations in Section 700 of the Administrative Manual.

II. Criteria for retention of lecturers in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

A. Evaluation of Lecturers: Teaching Effectiveness and Direct Instructional Contributions

The candidate must provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Evaluation Committee of a strong commitment to good teaching. In addition to the criteria used to assess effective teaching (see sections II.A.1-4 below), demonstrations of this commitment may include, but are not limited to development of innovative teaching methods, improved instructional materials, and participation in Department curriculum development.

The teaching effectiveness of a candidate shall be assessed as follows.

1. Teaching Materials

The candidate shall provide sample exams, course syllabi and other course materials the candidate has developed to the Evaluation Committee for review, as well as access to course Learning Management System (e.g., Canvas) sites.

2. Class Visits

a. At least one class of each candidate shall be visited by a member of the Evaluation Committee during the fall semester, or during spring semester if the candidate did not teach for the Department in the fall. A written report shall be prepared for each visit as part of the teaching evaluation report. If no member of the Evaluation Committee is from the sub-discipline of a faculty member to be evaluated, the course coordinator may be asked to make the class visit and prepare a written report for the Committee.
b. If a class visit indicates a potential problem, another member of the Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair shall make a second visit. A written summary shall be made of this second visit and shall be included in the evaluation report. If a faculty member gets a negative class visit summary, or if the Committee/Department Chair determines that there is a problem with the teaching by a faculty member, the Department Chair shall convene a meeting between the faculty member, the Department Chair, and members of the Evaluation Committee to discuss the issue(s).

3. Student Evaluations

Each semester, evaluation of the candidate’s teaching shall be obtained using the Department’s Student Evaluation of Faculty form. The Evaluation Committee and the Department Chair shall review the numerical scores and the comments of the candidate’s student evaluations and the contents shall be placed in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File (PAF).

4. Consultation

The Evaluation Committee will review the candidate’s PAF and shall gather input about each candidate from tenure-track faculty in the Department, including from the Department Chair and course coordinators. In addition, the Committee/Department Chair shall provide students the opportunity to consult with the Committee/Department Chair regarding the candidate.

B. Recommendation

1. Following a class visit and review of the PAF, student evaluations, and teaching materials and consultation with faculty and students, the Evaluation Committee shall forward its evaluation report and recommendation on retention of the candidate to the Department Chair. A copy of the evaluation report and recommendation shall be given to the faculty member, and a copy shall be placed in the faculty member’s Personnel Action File kept in the Department office.

2. In the event of an overall negative annual review, a letter shall be sent to the faculty member by the Department Chair indicating what must be done to address the concerns that have been raised. A copy of this letter shall be placed in his/her PAF. If the faculty member displays a pattern of unaddressed concerns over multiple annual reviews, their appointment may not be renewed at the end of the appointment period.

3. The above procedures shall be distributed to all faculty members at the beginning of each academic year.

III. Range elevation of lecturers in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry

A. Range Elevation General Policy Statement

Range elevation of a Chemistry and Biochemistry Department lecturer to Lecturer C, Range 4 or Lecturer D, Range 5 occurs in circumstances when the candidate demonstrates the highest-caliber level of excellence and commitment to strengthening the department’s program. The candidate must meet the University-wide criteria in specified Section 712.2 of the Administrative Manual and the Department-specific criteria outlined below. The candidate must also engender confidence in the Department Chair that professional activities and development will continue after range elevation and that the candidate will continue to meet their professional responsibilities as outlined in Section 700.
B. Eligibility

Eligibility for range elevation is governed by the policies described in Section 712.2.1 of CSUN’s Administrative Manual and Section 12.17 of the CSU Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement. These policies stipulate that Lecturers eligible for lecturer range elevation shall be limited to lecturers who have no more eligibility for Service Salary Increases pursuant to provision 12.10 in their current range and have served five (5) years in their current range.

C. Departmental Procedures for Range Elevation

1. The University’s procedures for Range Elevation are detailed in Section 712.2.2 of CSUN’s Administrative Manual. The University’s procedures supersede those outlined here in the case of any discrepancies (i.e., in the case of any updates to the University’s procedures).

2. Brief summary of the range elevation application process within the Department

a. Eligible lecturers seeking elevation must request such elevation in writing (by e-mail) from Department Chairs no later than May 1 (Spring Semester) or October 31 (Fall Semester).

b. Lecturers must provide supporting documentation that shows how they have met the University and Departmental Criteria for range elevation. Towards this end, lecturers should prepare a Professional Information File (PIF; see section 703.1.1 of the Administrative Manual), which will be used to evaluate their case along with the lecturer's Personnel Action File (PAF; see 703.1.2). The lecturer must submit the PIF along with their request for elevation.

c. The Department Chair shall notify the lecturer of the Chair’s recommendation in writing (by e-mail) within three weeks of receipt of the request.

i. Upon a positive recommendation, the recommendation, application letter, and personnel files are forwarded to the Dean immediately.

ii. Upon a negative recommendation, the lecturer has five (5) working days to request a meet-and-confer session with the Department Chair (Section 714.2.1 of CSUN’s Administrative Manual). The Department Chair shall not forward to the Dean a negative recommendation until a requested meet-and-confer session has been completed. The applicant can submit supplemental documents in support of their case before or during the meet-and-confer session and may bring an advisor to the session. Within five (5) working days following this meeting, the Department Chair shall notify the lecturer in writing (by e-mail) as to whether or not the Department Chair’s original recommendation has changed. If the Chair’s recommendation has changed to a positive one, only this positive recommendation, in writing, shall be forwarded to the Dean along with the applicant’s application letter and personnel files. If the Department Chair’s recommendation remains negative following the meet-and-confer session, the Department Chair will forward to the Dean, in writing, this recommendation, along with the applicant’s application letter and personnel files.

d. The Dean makes the final decision to grant or deny range elevation (see Section 712.2.2 and 714.2.2 of CSUN’s Administrative Manual for detailed procedures).
D. Criteria for Range Elevation

1. University Criteria

Section 712.2.1.b. of CSUN’s Administrative Manual stipulates that to secure range elevation lecturers must **demonstrate achievement appropriate to their work assignments and the mission of the university.** To receive a range elevation, lecturers must continue to **demonstrate professional development since their initial appointment or last range elevation.** **Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered sufficient for range elevation.**

Section 712.2.2.b. directs Departments to provide specific criteria for range elevation.

2. Departmental Criteria

a. Teaching Effectiveness and Direct Instructional Contributions
   
   i. Excellence in Teaching

   In order to be recommended for range elevation, the candidate must provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Department Chair of having achieved excellence in teaching.

   The Evaluation Committee evaluates each lecturer on ten specific areas at the yearly retention reviews. Instructors are evaluated in the ten areas noted above based on a classroom visit and examination of schedules, syllabi, sample exams, quizzes, sample handouts, course website(s), and “Student Evaluation of Faculty” reports. Scores in each of the ten areas are assigned based on a scale in which one (1) is the best score and five (5) is the worst. A “perfect” overall teaching evaluation score in this system is a ten (10).

   Excellence in teaching goes above and beyond satisfactory scores in these ten areas. To demonstrate excellence in teaching, a candidate must show evidence of:

   a. consistently achieving excellent scores in all ten areas of review on the Evaluation Committee’s Teaching Evaluations (achieving an average score of 15 or lower) across the last 5 years;

   b. responsiveness to feedback;

   c. development of innovative teaching methods or improved instructional material;

   d. establishment and maintenance of a track record of continual growth and development as an instructor (for example, attendance at faculty development seminars);

   e. participation in Departmental curriculum development by, for example, developing new laboratory experiments or new classes in consultation with tenure-track faculty in the appropriate subdivision and/or the curriculum committee.

   Additional activities that could serve as evidence for excellence in teaching could be, for example, effective teaching at multiple levels of instruction (lower-division, upper-
division and/or graduate level);

ii. The teaching effectiveness of a candidate will be assessed as follows:

The Department Chair will use the candidate’s Personnel Action File (PAF) and Professional Information File (PIF) to assess the candidate’s teaching excellence. Of particular importance in this assessment are the Evaluation Committee’s teaching evaluations, Committee Chair recommendation letters, and additional relevant evidence provided by the candidate in the PIF.

b. Contributions to the Department and/or University

i. Participation in the Department and/or University

In order to be recommended for range elevation, the candidate must provide evidence to the satisfaction of the Department Chair of significant contributions to the smooth functioning and/or improvement of the Department. This evidence must demonstrate a sincere commitment to improving and expanding the quality, effectiveness, and breadth of the Department’s academic program. The candidate should demonstrate an ability and willingness to assume leadership roles within the department. An instructor might make contributions to the Department and University by, for example:

a. running or helping to run an on-campus student chapter of a scientific professional organization;

b. initiating student learning centered programs in consultation with the appropriate Departmental faculty and/or committee(s);

c. serving on departmental committees such as the Assessment Committee or the Curriculum Committee;

d. assisting with attaining and maintaining national accreditation or assessing the department’s academic program;

e. research and scholarly activity involving students or serving on Master’s degree student thesis committees.

ii. A candidate’s contributions to the department and university will be assessed by examination of supporting documentation provided in the PIF.