



Office of the Provost

2018 Guidelines for Selective Salary Evaluation of Faculty

Please note that these guidelines are based upon the requirements of the 2013–2021 WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement (*see* Article XII.B.5.a and 5.c and Article XXIV.I.A.3 and C.1–5).

I. Eligibility

1. Any member of the bargaining unit who is currently in service in an AAUP-AFT represented faculty classification and will be represented by the AAUP-AFT on the last day of winter term (May 15, 2018) and the first day of the fall term (August 17, 2018) shall be considered for a selective salary adjustment and must be evaluated.

2. Article XXIV.I.C.1 of the WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement requires each faculty member to submit an annual report consisting of

(a) an updated and signed professional record; (b) a summary of the teaching evaluations for the last three (3) years; (c) a summary of the last three (3) years of the faculty member's activities, a presentation of current activities, and what results are expected from these activities. *All faculty members are required to submit an annual report and to participate in this process.* [emphasis added]

Please note that item (b) in the above extract has been changed from a one-year summary of teaching evaluations to a three-year summary, matching the evaluation period for scholarly, creative, and research activities in item (c). This change is addressed in a letter of agreement between the Administration and the AAUP dated September 26, 2014, and has been in effect for selective salary reviews since the 2014–15 academic year.

Under the terms of the agreement, faculty members who refuse to participate are subject to the following sanctions:

Failure to participate in the annual process shall result in no selective-salary increase, no travel support, and no credit toward sabbatical leaves. Failure to participate in the annual review process two (2) times or more in any five (5)-year period shall also result in the forfeiture of any cross-the-board raise.

3. Special justification must be provided when recommending selective salary adjustments for tenured assistant professors and for associate professors who have been in that rank for more than eight years.

II. Procedure

1. Committees

It is the policy of the University to obtain faculty advice before making selective salary adjustments, and the 2013–2021 WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement requires consultation with faculty salary committees prior to making recommendations.

The elected faculty salary committee will make merit salary recommendations to the deans. The department chair will chair the committee with vote (*see* Article XII.B.5.a and 5.c).

In making selective salary recommendations to the deans, the salary committee will follow the Standards for Evaluation in Section III of these guidelines and will base their evaluations and recommendations on the Factors for Evaluation in Section IV of these guidelines.

Each dean shall consult a salary advisory committee prior to making recommendations on selective salary adjustments to the Provost. This committee shall consist of bargaining-unit faculty members elected according to college/school bylaws.

2. Evaluation

In departmentalized colleges, the departmental salary committee shall make initial evaluations of faculty members pursuant to the provisions of Sections III and IV of these Guidelines. The department salary committee shall recommend the amount of selective salary adjustment each faculty member should receive.

In all schools/colleges, the dean's faculty salary advisory committee shall review the evaluations of faculty members and enter evaluations pursuant to Sections III and IV of these Guidelines. The committee shall also recommend the amount of selective salary adjustment each faculty member should receive.

Deans shall recommend selective salary increases to the Provost. The deans' reports shall include their summary evaluation of each faculty member pursuant to Sections III and IV of these Guidelines. The evaluation shall be expressed in separate numerical scores (1.0 to 4.0, with increments of 0.5 if necessary, 1.0 being the highest) for scholarly or creative activity, teaching, and service.

No other evaluative materials should be forwarded unless the dean believes that special justification is needed in specific cases or if the Provost so requests.

If the total selective salary increase recommended for a faculty member would exceed 10.0 percent, a special justification should accompany the recommendation.

III. Standards for Evaluation

The standards for evaluation are those set forth for promotion and tenure in the WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement (Article XXII.C, paragraph 2):

The assessments of a faculty candidate's qualifications shall be based upon excellence in teaching and in scholarly achievement or, for a faculty candidate in the creative or performing arts, in creative professional achievement. . . . Consideration shall also be given to non-instructional service to the department, School/College, and/or University and/or public and/or professional

service which benefits the University. At all levels of this procedure assessments shall take into consideration such unit, School/College, and University factors as are in force.

Article XII.B.5.a also states that committees “shall also consider equity when appropriate.” Faculty Salary Committees should make a separate report on equity issues to the appropriate Chair/Director/Dean/Vice President. Such reports will then be used in the event a general salary equity program becomes available or unit heads are able to provide equity funds from other unit resources.

IV. Factors for Evaluation of Faculty

Evaluation of faculty members for selective salary increases shall be based on their contributions in scholarly or creative activity, teaching, and service. In reviewing the performance of faculty members, their productivity over an extended period of time should be considered, with emphasis placed on the last three years.

The department committee, school/college committee, and dean shall consider at least the following aspects of the candidate’s record in making their evaluations of faculty members and their recommendations for selective salary increases. The deans’ advisory committees in each college/school shall review the evaluations to assure that these matters were considered before making their recommendations to the deans. A dean’s advisory committee may request that the dean conduct an independent review of a faculty member’s performance if it is not satisfied that the evaluation made by the department committee or the initial evaluation made by the dean takes fully into consideration the aspects of the faculty member’s performance listed below.

1. Scholarship

(a) Publication is the most important means for evaluating scholarship except in the creative and performing arts. Publication of articles and essays in recognized, refereed journals of high quality is evidence of excellence in scholarship. Publication of book chapters in volumes edited by scholars of known reputation and published by respected sources are also evidence of scholarship. The publication of books and monographs from reputable houses and incorporating peer review is important evidence of scholarship. In appropriate disciplines, translation may be an accepted form of scholarship. Frequent citation of a faculty member’s work, favorable reviews of the work, and similar evaluative evidence from peers outside the University should be considered. Letters of evaluation or other external peer evaluation should not be sought as part of the salary adjustment process.

(b) For faculty members in the performing and creative arts, performances, exhibitions, recitals, and similar creative activities are evidence of appropriate scholarly activity (these may be the exclusive modes of activity or may be in conjunction with publication, depending on the standards in the discipline or sub-discipline). Film or video production, publication of poetry, short stories, books of fiction, or other similar creative endeavors constitute scholarly activity in some disciplines.

Performances, exhibitions, recitals and other types of creative activity should be evaluated on the basis of their quality, the reputation or standing of the occasion, whether the activity was invited, whether the occasion was international, national, or regional, and through the comments of reviewers on the performance or exhibition (when such critical reviews are available). Similarly, reviews of creative writing are useful in assessing the quality of such work.

(c) In evaluating a faculty member's scholarly or creative work, attention should be given to book reviews, papers delivered (especially those that are invited and those that are refereed as a condition of presentation), published abstracts, delivery of invited lectures at societies, academies, or other institutions or groups that are recognized as important or distinguished forums. These activities are, however, supplemental to publication or performance/exhibition/recital and do not, by themselves, constitute excellence in scholarship.

(d) Prizes, prestigious fellowships, and special recognition for scholarly or creative work awarded by reputable organizations outside the University should carry substantial weight in evaluating scholarly and creative activity. Successful competition for external grants and fellowships is evidence of favorable peer review in many fields and is expected in some; hence the award of grants and fellowships to support scholarly or creative activity should be regarded as evidence of a faculty member's achievements. Certain types of University recognition, specifically the Distinguished Faculty Fellowships and the Board of Governors Faculty Recognition Awards, reflect peer judgment that a faculty member's scholarly or creative activity is very high quality.

2. Teaching

(a) *Undergraduate Teaching*: The information obtained from the unit's student evaluation reports and the individual's submitted teaching evidence shall be used as part of the assessment of teaching. Reports of classroom observations by the department chair, dean, or another formally designated representative may be used where such visits have been in place for at least a year and where a standard instrument/format is used for such evaluation. Evaluation should be comparative among faculty members. The quality of undergraduate research projects, artistic exhibitions, performances, and other products of courses or individual tutorials or supervised instructional activities may be considered as evidence of instructional effectiveness.

(b) *Graduate Teaching*: The quality of graduate dissertations and theses, doctoral examination scores, and graduate research and creative projects are useful indicators of the quality of graduate teaching. Effective service on doctoral committees and master's review/thesis committees is a useful form of graduate teaching. Student evaluations should also be considered.

(c) The President's Award for Excellence in Teaching or a college teaching award represents a careful peer judgment of teaching excellence and should be given substantial weight in evaluating a faculty member's quality of teaching.

(d) Materials used to conduct the course, such as syllabi or examinations, may be considered.

(e) Special instructional materials prepared by the faculty member for use in the course, such as laboratory books, collections of readings, video materials, computer-based instructional or testing programs, etc., may be considered.

(f) Curricular innovation, as evidenced by the development of new courses or the redevelopment of existing courses, should be considered.

(g) Formally published instructional materials, such as textbooks, instructional guides, anthologies, etc. The quality of the material, the source of publication, and the scope of adoption and use may be considered in evaluating this material.

(h) Student advising beyond expected meetings with students in a faculty member's courses or with advisees assigned by the department. Specifically, a faculty member's role as a unit undergraduate advisor, graduate advisor, pre-professional advisor, or advisor to a student academic society or academic honor society may be considered in assessing his/her contributions to the instructional program.

(i) Other evidence of excellence in teaching should also be used. These should be specifically noted by the department chair, faculty salary committee, or dean in preparing the evaluation.

(j) In clinical programs, clinical teaching, demonstrations of clinical activities for students, supervision of student clinical activity, and evaluation of student clinical activity by site visits are a very important form of teaching. Both the faculty member's method of teaching (care taken with evaluations, demonstrations, advising, etc.) and the effectiveness of that teaching (as measured by student mastery of clinical skills) should be considered in evaluating a clinical faculty member's teaching.

3. Service

What constitutes service varies widely, depending on the academic field. In general, service falls into three categories. What constitutes service in each category is determined by the standards of each professional or academic field.

(a) *Service to the Profession or Discipline.* This includes editorships of journals or books, membership on editorial boards, service as a manuscript reviewer, membership on professional review panels, service as a judge or referee for creative performances and artistic exhibitions, service on important committees or as an officer of professionally significant national, state, or regional associations, and similar activities.

(b) *Service to the Community.* This includes membership on community boards or commissions related to a faculty member's academic discipline, consultancies that bring academic knowledge to bear on behalf of the community (and where only nominal compensation is involved), testimony or studies to assist community organizations to obtain knowledge and information pertinent to their activities. "Community" here encompasses groups, agencies, and institutions in both the public and private sectors and is not limited to metropolitan Detroit.

(c) *Service to the University.* This includes service on departmental, school/college, and university committees. "Since the American Association of University Professors has historically been a professional organization, professional participation in Association activities should also be credited as University service in the same manner that other professional service is credited" (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XI). A substantial level of committee service is expected of all faculty members and does not, by itself, constitute meritorious service. Weight should be given to service on especially demanding committees, such as promotion and tenure committees, curriculum committees, committees that evaluate faculty for prizes, awards, grants, etc., and other service activities that require extensive commitments of time and a high level of responsibility. The effectiveness and quality of a faculty member's committee service should be carefully evaluated; joining committees or seeking election to various consultative bodies does not, by itself, constitute meritorious performance.

V. Faculty Evaluation

Based on the standards set forth previously, including other evidence of scholarly or creative activities, teaching, and service that are recognized as appropriate by various academic disciplines or professions, each faculty member should be evaluated for the purpose of setting selective salary increments.

1. Scholarship

Evaluation Group 1: For full professors, placement in Group 1 should indicate a record of scholarship that has gained extensive national recognition for its scope and quality. Scholarship in the forefront of the field is generally required for recognition in Group 1. Professors in this group should compare favorably with leading faculty members serving at research universities whose national standing in the same discipline is clearly above that of Wayne State University.

For associate professors, the same high-quality work is required. The scope of the work will be somewhat less because they have not been active as long as outstanding full professors in the same field. There should be national recognition of the faculty member's work, and it should be favorably and regularly cited. Associate professors in this group should compare favorably with leading faculty members at the same rank serving at research universities whose standing in the same discipline is clearly above that of Wayne State University.

For assistant professors, there should be evidence of high-quality work that promises to be in the forefront of their fields. Ordinarily, consideration of the quality of a doctoral dissertation and of papers delivered but not yet published (or accepted for publication) is appropriate for assistant professors only in the first two years of appointment. Thereafter there should be evidence of high-quality work published in selective journals. Assistant professors should be placed in Group 1 if the quality of their scholarly work is high enough to promise that, with continued work of the same quality and with a substantially broader record of such work, they would have high prospects for becoming a leading scholar in the field among their contemporaries.

Evaluation Group 2: Full professors and associate professors should be placed in Group 2 if their scholarship does not warrant placing them in Group 1, but it would plainly qualify them for promotion to their present rank using current promotion and tenure standards in the University.

Assistant professors should be placed in Group 2 if they are engaging in good quality scholarly work that meets the expectations on which they were hired but does not yet show that, if continued at the current level of quality and substantially broadened in amount and scope, it would promise that they would become a leading scholar in the field among their contemporaries.

Special consideration may be given to assistant professors in their first two years of service, as indicated above.

Evaluation Group 3: Associate and full professors should be placed in Group 3 if they are maintaining a program of scholarly or creative activity that would not be high enough in quality and/or large enough in quantity to warrant promotion to their present rank under current promotion standards at Wayne State University.

Assistant professors should be placed in Group 3 if their scholarly program has not yet produced work of sufficient quantity and quality for a person seeking to build a scholarly program that holds promise for placing them among the leading scholars in the discipline among their contemporaries. Exceptions may be made for assistant professors in their first two years of service in that rank; the quality of papers they have in draft or of revisions in their dissertation made in expectation of publication as articles or a book may be examined.

Note: Faculty placed in Group 3 should be considered to be falling "short of expectations in research, . . ." and "Each unit salary committee will be charged with making recommendations

for improvement . . .” (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.I.C.4).

Evaluation Group 4: Associate and full professors should be placed in Group 4 if they have only an episodic record of scholarly work or none at all, or if the work is generally of poor quality. Assistant professors shall be placed in Group 4 if they do not meet the standards of Group 3.

Note: Faculty placed in Group 4 should be considered to be performing “substantially below the unit’s factors and norms, [and] the Salary Committee may recommend to the chair/director/dean that a peer mentoring committee be established to address the issues raised by the Salary Committee” (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.I.C.5).

Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are typically not required to engage in scholarly or creative activity as part of their professional assignments. Thus, activity in this category may not be reported by these individuals and should not be evaluated as a negative factor in annual selective salary evaluations. However, if Lecturers or Senior Lecturers report scholarly or creative activity, that activity should be evaluated using the same unit factors in force for faculty in the professorial ranks.

2. Teaching

Evaluation Group 1: Faculty members placed in Group 1 should have a record of outstanding teaching at the undergraduate and graduate levels (where there are graduate programs). Outstanding teaching should be demonstrated by very high levels of performance on all pertinent teaching criteria, by concrete evidence of highly favorable student evaluations, by demonstrably high levels of student learning, and, wherever possible, by past recognition from faculty colleagues for teaching excellence. In general, “outstanding teaching” identifies faculty members who would be in the top quarter of those in their school or college in instructional effectiveness.

Evaluation Group 2: Faculty members placed in Group 2 should demonstrate effective teaching on most pertinent teaching criteria. There should be concrete evidence of favorable student evaluation and of high levels of student learning. The standard for placing faculty members in Group 2 is that they must be engaged in teaching that, while not among the very highest group in the school or college, would clearly qualify them to meet the current standard for promotion to their present professorial rank.

Evaluation Group 3: Faculty members placed in Group 3 should be engaged in effective teaching on some of the pertinent teaching criteria. Such faculty members receive somewhat mixed reviews of teaching from students and from faculty colleagues, and evidence of student learning will be mixed. In general, faculty members placed in Group 3 are engaged in satisfactory teaching, but their teaching would not be sufficient to gain promotion to their present rank using current promotion standards.

Note: Faculty placed in Group 3 should be considered to be falling “short of expectations in . . . teaching, . . .” and “Each unit salary committee will be charged with making recommendations for improvement . . .” (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.I.C.4).

Evaluation Group 4: Faculty members placed in Group 4 generally receive substantially less favorable student and peer evaluations of teaching in comparison to faculty peers in the same school/college, and the evidence of student learning is mixed. The quality of teaching for faculty members in Group 4 is below that which would be expected to gain promotion to their present rank and would not be sufficient to gain appointment to the University in any rank.

Note: Faculty placed in Group 4 should be considered to be performing “substantially below the

unit's factors and norms, [and] the Salary Committee may recommend to the chair/director/dean that a peer mentoring committee be established to address the issues raised by the Salary Committee” (AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.I.C.5).

3. Service

Evaluation Group 1: Faculty members should be placed in Group 1 if they have engaged in substantial, high-quality service to their profession and/or the community and have, in addition, rendered, at a minimum, consistent, high-quality service in a responsible role to the University.

Evaluation Group 2: Faculty members should be placed in Group 2 if they have engaged in substantial, high-quality service in responsible roles to the University and have a record of some responsible contributions to their profession and/or the community.

Evaluation Group 3: Faculty members should be placed in Group 3 if they have provided only modest service in quantity or quality to their profession, the community, or the University.

Evaluation Group 4: Faculty members should be placed in Group 4 if they do not meet the standards of Group 3.

Note: Faculty placed in Group 3 or Group 4 should be considered to be falling “short of expectations in . . . service,” and “Each unit salary committee will be charged with making recommendations for improvement . . .” (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.I.C.4).