



Department Committee Guidelines for Range Elevation AY 23-24

TABLE OF CONTENTS ([links to each section](#))

[BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT](#)

[SUPPORT DURING AY 23-24 APPLICATION PROCESS](#)

[RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES FOR RANGE ELEVATION EVALUATORS](#)

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Range elevation is a process by which lecturers apply for assignment to a higher salary schedule (from LA to LB, LB to LC, or LC to LD). Candidates should articulate how they have grown over time in their assignment to merit moving into the next range; for instance, someone who is currently an LA should establish how they warrant range elevation to LB. An award of range elevation carries with it a minimum 5% increase in salary. Higher increases may be recommended.

Upon hire, lecturers are placed in ranges according to terminal degree status and/or teaching and/or professional experience in their fields typically as per an established "Terminal Degree/Hire Requirements" schedule established by each department. Starting salaries are established by departments in accordance with the appropriate salary range, taking into account equity issues and market demands. A lecturer is not required to obtain a higher level degree in order to obtain range elevation unless it has been made clear to the lecturer that a higher level degree is required as part of their assignment.

As explained in [University Policy S21-2](#) (pp. 13-19):

To be recommended for range elevation, a lecturer must demonstrate professional growth and development appropriate to the lecturer's work assignment and the mission of the university during the period between the date of initial appointment or, where applicable, the date of the last range elevation and the time of the current request. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not a criterion for range elevation. This is the only review period in which candidates' professional achievements shall be evaluated.

The policy includes Appendix A (pp. 18-19), a broad list of activities candidates may consider in establishing professional growth and development (e.g., curriculum and program development, leadership in and beyond SJSU, additional degrees, etc.). Evaluators must remember that these activities are examples of what can be considered; pursuant to CBA Article 12.19, criteria for range elevation “shall be appropriate to lecturer work assignments.”

The range elevation process is not new, though it has been modified recently in the following ways:

- **Eligibility:** Per contract, lecturers are eligible for range elevation when they reach the SSI maximum in their current range and have served five years in their current range. Because SSI is no longer common, CSU and CFA agreed to another means beginning in academic year 2017-18: Full-time Adjusted Service (FTAS). Although this is a simplification, to establish FTAS eligibility a lecturer’s appointment fractions over the years in their department since last range elevation (or since hire if there had been no range elevation) were added, and when 6 or more years of FTAS were achieved according to an agreed upon formula, eligibility was met. This is why there has been an increase in the number of eligible lecturers in the past four years with a marked increase in 2019-20 and 2020-21.
- **Period of review.** The period of review is the time spent in appointments in the department at the current range. For example, if hired at LA in spring 2013, the review period is spring 2013 to present. If elevation to LC was effective Fall 2011, the review period is Fall 2011 to present.
- **Role of academic assignment in range elevation:** Meritorious service alone does not warrant range elevation; it is a form of advancement. In the application, the candidate demonstrates growth with consideration to their appointment in the department.
 - Criteria used at time of hire (minimum degree, years experience) are not applied in range elevation.
 - Factors not related to their job duties are not considered (e.g., a nobel prize in chemistry may not add value to teaching writing, and it isn’t required to be a great chemistry instructor).
 - Evaluators consider how the faculty member has advanced in their academic assignment, understanding of their discipline, engagement in leadership in their assignment, earning success in their professional careers, or attaining professional development that enhances their contributions to their teaching, service, RSCA, or other areas as appropriate to their assignments during the period of review.

SUPPORT DURING AY 23-24 APPLICATION PROCESS

Lecturers eligible for range elevation should have received notification to that effect via their SJSU email address; if you have any questions regarding your eligibility, please contact [University Personnel - Faculty Services](#). At this time, they were invited to signal their intention to submit a range elevation application via email. All those who are eligible for range elevation were invited to attend a [range elevation](#)

[workshop](#) on August 31st, sponsored by the Office of Faculty Success, University Personnel - Faculty Services, and the Center for Faculty Development. Faculty seeking range elevation could also request a confidential consultation with Deanna Fassett, Assistant Vice Provost for Faculty Development.

RECOMMENDED BEST PRACTICES FOR RANGE ELEVATION EVALUATORS

Range elevation binders have traditionally been organized by department staff who assisted applicants in gathering documents. Now candidates seeking range elevation assemble and submit their cases in eFaculty, but this is still a relatively unfamiliar process for lecturers. As such, we recommend personnel committees consider the following three principles as they review cases during this cycle:

1. Be adaptable to where documents may appear in each applicant's file. Because both the range elevation process and procedures are still relatively unfamiliar to candidates (in comparison to more established processes like RTP evaluation), it is important to be flexible in addressing materials as they appear in a candidate's case, even if these materials are in unexpected tabs in eFaculty. For example, candidates may upload most materials as a single .pdf to the "Review: Lecturer Range Elevation" tab, they may mix up their CV and their index, and/or they may have a more narrative index than what we typically see in RTP. What is most important is providing a fair and comprehensive review of what the candidate has included in eFaculty irrespective of its location.

2. Remember, as with most personnel processes, candidates orient differently to instructions and deadlines. While we have endeavored to support candidates in submitting complete range elevation cases, it is possible that some have submitted their case with missing materials or with materials evaluators wouldn't ordinarily expect in a range elevation case. While it is important to evaluate candidates on what they submit in eFaculty, it may help evaluators to know that some candidates may have submitted their cases with haste or without thoroughly considering what they should include. We encourage evaluators to do their best to understand the candidate's argument for range elevation and to evaluate what the candidate has presented in eFaculty for whether range elevation is warranted at this time.

If reviewers suspect that documents that were intended to be submitted to eFaculty, or required items like SOTE/SOLATEs are missing, they may contact the faculty member to check on the matter. Committees may suspend review while items that got lost in eFaculty or required items are added to the application. Contact eFaculty@sjsu.edu to request upload of missing items (and possibly timeline extension).

3. Be flexible in addressing gaps in a candidate's case. Working remotely has presented candidates, evaluators, and department and college offices with challenges in locating and retrieving personnel documents.

We recommend flexibility in addressing any gaps in a candidate's case created by the lack of digitized files (most often prior evaluations, direct observations, or SOTEs prior to 2013). Candidates received the

advisory that they did not need to include SOTEs from prior to 2013. We also advised candidates to make a good faith effort to acquire any missing prior evaluations or direct observations; however, evaluators should note that missing required elements are most often the result of documents being out of reach of the candidates due to office closures.

Candidates should account for missing documents required by policy. For example, departments should have messaged faculty when they could not locate requested items. Committees should have clarity about whether missing required documents were unattainable or just missing. The committee may make a request of UP - FS to locate required items that may be in the faculty member's permanent PAF.