



California State University **Chico**  
Social Science Program

## **Personnel Guidelines and Standards**

Agreed to by Social Science faculty  
December 12, 2023  
Approved May 13, 2024

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

Glossary of Abbreviations Used in This Document ..... 3

1. Introduction ..... 4

2. The Social Science and Special Programs Personnel Committee ..... 4

3. Lecturer Faculty – Hiring ..... 5

4. Assignment of Courses ..... 5

5. Review of Lecturer Faculty ..... 5

6. Range Elevation for Lecturers ..... 9

## **GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT**

- BSS:** The College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, in which Social Science and Special Programs is housed.
- CBA:** Collective Bargaining Agreement
- FDEV:** Faculty Development. This is an office on campus that provides programming to help faculty improve their teaching. They also sometimes offer programming to help with the area of professional achievement.
- FPPP:** Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures. This is an official document put out and updated annually by the University.
- MOI:** Mode of Instruction. There are many modes of instruction, but may include in-person, ChicoFlex, synchronous online, and asynchronous online.
- PAF:** Personnel Action File. This file of official documents is kept and maintained by the Dean's Office.
- SFOTs:** Student Feedback on Teaching
- TLP:** Technology and Learning Program
- WPAF:** Working Personnel Action File. The WPAF is the combination of the PAF and the dossier, which is the file to which you will add your narrative and supporting materials to. It should include some of the same documents (such as SFOTs and Peer Evaluations of Teaching) as the PAF, but goes beyond those in the PAF. Committees at all levels of review will primarily work from your WPAF.

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

These guidelines and standards have been developed in accordance with the CSU, Chico Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures ([FPPP](#)) and the CSU Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement ([CBA](#)).

NOTE: Social Science and Special Programs, as of 2023, has no tenure-line faculty teaching Social Science courses, except for thesis and internship units, which are supervised by the Program Coordinator, MA Coordinator or other faculty member who is evaluated by another department. Thus, these Personnel Guidelines address only Personnel matters of lecturer faculty.

## **2. THE SOCIAL SCIENCE and SPECIAL PROGRAMS PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

### **Membership and Leadership**

- The Social Science Personnel Committee is comprised of the Program Coordinator, the MA Coordinator, and one tenured faculty member from the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, chosen in consultation with the Dean. There must be three voting members on the Social Science Personnel Committee.
- The Personnel Committee shall be chaired by the Program Coordinator, who will call and preside at meetings and carry out other appropriate duties.
- The Personnel Committee will elect a secretary who will keep minutes.

### **Operation and Procedures**

- Quorum shall be defined as 2 of the 3 members of the Committee.
- The Personnel Committee Secretary shall take minutes of the meeting indicating the time, place, and date of meetings; members present; and any action(s) taken. No minutes on details of the committee's discussion or deliberations shall be taken.
- Only Committee members will be allowed to vote on personnel matters.

### **Notification of Faculty**

- The Program Coordinator shall inform new faculty of the need to maintain a dossier, which will become part of the Working Personnel Action File (WPAF), and the kinds of materials to be included in it.
- The Program Coordinator shall inform continuing faculty under review of the need to update their dossiers annually.

### **Confidentiality**

- All deliberations and decisions of the Committee shall not be discussed outside of Personnel Committee meetings.

- Information received by the Committee shall be treated confidentially.

### **3. LECTURER FACULTY – HIRING**

#### **Advertising for Lecturer Appointments**

- If there is a need for lecturer faculty once all 3-year appointees have been assigned courses, the Program Coordinator shall work with Faculty Affairs and Success to post a lecturer pool in CHRS for recruitment.
- The Program Coordinator shall send reminders to currently employed lecturer faculty unit employees (other than those in an existing 3-year appointment) informing them of its openings.

#### **Eligibility Criteria for Hiring**

- For lower division courses, minimum qualifications normally include a master's degree or Ph.D. in a social science field. Additionally, college level teaching in the social sciences is preferred. Candidates from a closely related field may be considered.
- For upper division and graduate courses, a Ph.D./Ed.D. or ABD in a social science field is strongly preferred, as is demonstrated expertise (through research, practice or college teaching experience).
- A master's degree in a social science discipline is considered the minimum requirement, decided on a case-by-case basis, based on teaching assignment, training, and experience.
- Lecturers are required to consult with the Program Coordinator to discuss course content. In this consultation, the parties must come to an agreement regarding appropriate course content and compliance with Social Science Program Student Learning Outcomes, University writing course requirements (if applicable), and any General Education expectations.
- The Social Science and Special Programs will comply with Article 12 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and Article 5.2 of the Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures (FPPP).

### **4. ASSIGNMENT OF COURSES**

Social Science and Special Programs follows the Order of Assignment of available work for temporary faculty outlined in Article 12.29 of the CBA and Section 5.2.7 of the FPPP, as well as policies governing workload and faculty responsibilities (Articles 20.1, 20.2 and 20.3 of the CBA).

### **5. REVIEW OF LECTURER FACULTY**

Teaching effectiveness is the first, minimum, and indispensable requirement for appointment, reappointment, and range elevation of Lecturer faculty who teach.

#### **Procedures for Full-Time and Part-Time Lecturer Reviews**

Evaluation procedures shall follow those outlined in the FPPP 9.0. The guidelines below are meant to augment those sections.

- Lecturers who are not eligible for nor are currently holding a three-year appointment will undergo an annual review and classroom observation for the initial two personnel cycles, followed by biennial rather than annual reviews. The review shall consider the candidate's work performance since their initial date of appointment or since the last evaluation, whichever is more recent.
- Lecturers eligible for an initial three-year appointment shall be evaluated in the academic year preceding the issuance of the initial three-year appointment. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire six or more years of consecutive service on the same campus that make up the qualifying period for the initial three-year appointment.
- Lecturers holding three-year appointments who are eligible for subsequent reappointment shall be evaluated in the third year of their appointment, and may be evaluated more frequently upon the request of either the employee or the Dean. The evaluation shall consider the faculty member's cumulative work performance during the entire preceding three-year period.
- Lecturers will be notified by the Dean's office and/or Personnel Committee Chair if they will be having a review during a particular academic year, and of the due date for submission of their dossier.
- Reviews will normally not be conducted during a lecturer's first semester.
- All lecturers will participate in the normal SFOT process for all classes taught.
- Lecturers are required to submit a dossier (which is part of the Working Personnel Action File—WPAF) that at minimum includes a reflective narrative on teaching, a current curriculum vitae, SFOTs (Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning), and Peer Evaluations. See detailed instructions below.

### **Peer Evaluations**

Peer Evaluations of teaching will be conducted for all faculty under review.

- Courses to be observed will be determined by the Program Coordinator, but a range of courses in the candidate's regular rotation and a range of modes of instruction (MOIs) a candidate normally teaches should be evaluated over time.
- In accordance with article 15.14 of the CBA, the individual being evaluated shall be provided a notice of at least five days that a classroom visit is to take place. There shall be consultation between the faculty member being evaluated and the individual who visits their class. The faculty member should submit a syllabus, an outline for the scheduled visit, and lecture materials prior to the classroom visit.
- The observing faculty member will write a report using the evaluation criteria in the Peer Evaluation Form provided by the Personnel Committee Chair. The report must be discussed with and signed by the candidate prior to its entry into the WPAF.
- The candidate may also request a visit by anyone who is qualified to comment on their instructional effectiveness. A candidate-initiated visit is optional and outside the required peer evaluation.

- In accordance with the FPPP (8.1.4.f), the evaluation of **online classes** should take place with the candidate present to give a narrative of online material. The scope of such evaluations shall be reasonably equivalent to the scope of one classroom visit. In certain circumstances, when suggested by the person being evaluated and agreed to by the evaluator, limited instructor-granted course access can be given at the discretion of the person being evaluated. In order to assess the effectiveness of instruction in online courses, additional and/or substitute methods of data gathering likely will be necessary. For example, while some online courses include real-time instruction by the faculty member—allowing for the equivalent of a classroom visitation—other courses might consist of asynchronous content exclusively. The candidate, with the Program’s assistance, is to provide a sufficient evidentiary basis for evaluation.

## The Dossier

The committee will request, during the candidate’s first year of appointment and each subsequent period of review, that they submit a dossier and other materials relevant to instruction for the review of lecturer faculty.

Materials that the committee uses for this evaluation shall include a dossier with the following components:

1. A curriculum vitae using the provided template
2. A self-evaluation of teaching in the assigned course(s) that shall include, but not be limited to, the following areas:
  - a. A teaching philosophy statement, which shall include a reflective narrative on teaching that expands beyond Chickering’s 1987 *Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education* (e.g., use of AAC&U Equity-Minded practices; LEAP criteria: essential learning outcomes, principles of excellence, high impact practices, authentic assessments, and students’ signature work; Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics.)
  - b. Discussion of any professional growth and development activities that demonstrate consistent competence in maintaining currency in the field to improve teaching and learning in the classroom (e.g. additional education, research, conference participation, publication, grant activity, etc.).
  - c. Discussion of awareness of equity gaps (if they exist) within courses and plans to address these, as well as any data showing reductions in grade equity gaps or lack of grade equity gaps.
3. Additional material to allow for a robust evaluation, including course syllabi, assignments, exams/tests/quizzes, examples of graded student work (with permission of the student), evidence of organization, scholarship-knowledge in the field, and effective communication, and any other material that demonstrates teaching effectiveness.
4. Student Feedback on Teaching and Learning (SFOTs), if available, including a narrative that provides a written reflection on the SFOTs. SFOTs shall not weigh excessively in the overall evaluation of teaching performance and shall not be used to determine a

candidate's knowledge of their discipline.

5. Copies of faculty classroom visits (peer reviews) in at least one course per academic year from the appropriate period of review and a written reflection on the peer reviews.
6. In addition to the primary criterion of teaching, lecturer faculty shall be evaluated with respect to engaging in professional activity in the field appropriate to their teaching field, duties as defined by their assignment, and professional ethics and conduct. Other contributions that may not have been specified in the job description but which represent positive assistance to the program, college or university may be included. These may include advising, research, scholarship, creative activity, service to the University, profession, and to the community, or other professional responsibilities (See FPPP article 9).

- If the dossier is not submitted, this may be documented as *Unsatisfactory* in the candidate's Periodic Evaluation.

### **Criteria for Review of Full-Time and Part-Time Lecturers**

Lecturers are required to provide evidence that they SATISFACTORY in the area of Instruction, including their SFOTs, peer reviews of teaching, and other materials according to the FPPP and guidelines from the Dean's Office.

### **SATISFACTORY**

All faculty are required to meet at a minimum the following standards:

- An understanding of faculty teaching responsibilities and one's professional role in and out of the classroom.
- Competence in the subject matter, currency in the field: the Program expects lecturers to keep current in the field(s) in which they teach as demonstrated in their course syllabi, exams, and other classroom materials.
- Effective and professionally appropriate interaction with students in and out of class.
- Use of suitable course content, materials, and technology.
- Submit all course syllabi to the Social Science Program Coordinator or staff before the semester begins. Syllabi are to include a course schedule by topic of all readings (with full citations), assignments, activities, tests/exams/quizzes, etc.
- Reasonable level of rigor in course content, process, and evaluation.
- All faculty members are required to schedule a minimum of 20 minutes of office hours per week for each weighted teaching unit (WTU) applied to instruction. The maximum number of required office hours is four hours (240 minutes) per week for instructional assignments of 12 WTUs or more, although faculty members may schedule more. Office hours may be in-person or online.

Failure to reasonably meet any of these standards, especially after feedback from students, peers, the Personnel Committee, or Program Coordinator may be sufficient (depending on the severity) for a rating of UNSATISFACTORY regardless of other criteria that may be met.



Additionally, candidates who are rated as SATISFACTORY should show:

- Favorable peer evaluations allowing for improvement over time.
- Evidence of having incorporated peer and student feedback into their teaching.
- Improvement in student evaluations over time (when reasonably possible), especially after the first semester teaching a new course, or using a new mode of instruction.

In accordance with article 9.1.3.d of the FPPP, lecturers may discuss research, publications, or service that are not part of their work assignment, but which result in positive contributions to the Strategic Plans and Goals of the Program, College, University and/or to the Community. While service is not required, evidence of these contributions may be acknowledged in the Department's evaluation, though such activities will not directly affect the evaluation of the lecturer's teaching.

## **6. RANGE ELEVATION for LECTURERS**

When hired, lecturers are assigned to a range (A, B, or C) based on their qualifications, experience, and course assignments. Range elevations are a promotion from one range to the next (for example, from Lecturer A to Lecturer B). They are significant promotions that come with at least a 5% salary increase. Lecturers must apply for a range increase as a separate process than the personnel review process.

For eligibility and details, refer to the FPPP, section 12. The Dean's Office will notify lecturers when they are eligible for range elevations.

The FPPP stipulates candidates "must have achieved professional growth and development since the initial appointment or last range elevation, whichever is most recent. Professional growth and development is defined as 'teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field,'" (FPPP 12.1.2.c-d) and requires each department to clearly define teaching excellence and maintaining currency in the field. Accumulated teaching experience alone is not considered "teaching excellence" sufficient for range elevation (FPPP 12.1.2.d.1).

The Social Science Program defines teaching excellence as the following:

- Consistently favorable peer evaluations and SFOTs
- Continually refining and improving teaching practices based on self-reflection and feedback from student and faculty evaluations
- Effectively developing and using course materials that reflect the current state of knowledge and practices in the field
- Clearly aligning assignments and assessment with course student learning outcomes
- Creating and teaching a new course for the department that has not previously been in the catalog, including participation in getting the course approved by the university
- Development and applying innovative and effective ways of teaching subject matter to diverse student populations

- Successfully collaborating with faculty in teaching and learning activities, such as working with faculty to assess learning objectives and teaching strategies, especially for successful online instruction and engagement
- Advised or supervised honors thesis, student research project, MA thesis, or comprehensive exams
- Participating in Faculty Learning Community focused on teaching or mentoring, or in an intensive summer learning program
- Serving in an official role for other faculty as a trainer, facilitator, mentor, or evaluator in teaching. This includes being the mentor in an FLC (faculty learning community), training other faculty in TLP-sponsored programs such as Go Virtual and ChicoFlex training, serving as a QOLT (Quality Online Learning and Teaching ) mentor, serving as a fellow or evaluator for a teaching-related program through FDEV, or being assigned an official mentoring role within the Program or College
- Demonstrated reflection on, engagement with, and ongoing attempts to improve pedagogical methods in light of equity gaps and awareness of diversity and inclusion
- Implemented [Universal Design for Learning](#) to make all materials highly accessible for all students.

Professional growth and development activities that could be used to demonstrate consistent competence in maintaining currency in the field to improve teaching and learning in the classroom:

- Increased mastery of the discipline evidenced by additional relevant education or an additional degree
- Contributing to and planning professional development activities on campus
- Presenting original work at professional scholarly meetings and conferences
- Attending conferences, meetings, lectures, and workshops related to teaching assignments
- Collaborative research and creative activity involving the campus and the community
- Publications, exhibitions, and/or performances that advance knowledge in the field(s) of one's teaching assignments
- Grant proposals to conduct research in the discipline, to support pedagogy, or to further the mission of the University.

###



## Department/Program Standards Approval Sheet

---

Process:

- a) Department or program votes; if approved, Department Chair/Director submits to College Dean for review.
- b) College Dean reviews, consults with Department Chair/Director regarding questions/ issues, then forwards Dean reviewed Word document to Faculty Affairs and Success via email for review.
- c) Faculty Affairs and Success reviews for compliance with CBA/FPPP, consults with the Dean and Department Chair/Director as needed, then forwards Department/Program Standards to Provost for review and approval;
- d) Provost reviews and approves, recommending changes if necessary, then returns document to Faculty Affairs and Success.
- e) If not approved, Faculty Affairs and Success forwards requested changes for revision and re-submission to Dean and Department Chair/Director.
- f) If approved, Faculty Affairs and Success adds *Provost Designee Approved* *Date* footer to the document and:
  - a. Routes this approval sheet with approved Department/Program Standards for signatures via Adobe Sign,
  - b. Uploads document to Faculty Affairs and Success Standards website, and
  - c. Informs Dean and Department Chair/Director of approval with link to Faculty Affairs and Success website location.

---

Chair/Director Approval:  Date: May 14, 2024

Dean Review:  Date: May 14, 2024

Provost/Designee Approval:  Date: May 15, 2024