

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost

2007-08 Guidelines for Evaluation of Faculty

Please note that these guidelines are based upon the requirements of the current *WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement*.

I. Eligibility

1. Any member of the bargaining unit who is currently in service in an AAUP-AFT represented classification and was represented by the AAUP-AFT on the last day of winter term (May 15, 2007) and the first day of the fall term (August 17, 2007) may be considered for a selective salary adjustment and should be evaluated.
2. Special justification should be given in recommending merit 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 2006-2009 *WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement* requires consultation with 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 *Agreement*, Article XII.B.4).

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 by-laws.

In all units, there must be an updated professional record on file for each person considered for selective salary adjustments. The ultimate responsibility for an updated professional record lies with the individual faculty member.

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 credentials of faculty members and make 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.

Each dean shall recommend selective salary increases to the Provost. The dean's report shall include his/her summary evaluation of the faculty member pursuant to Sections III and IV of the 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 teaching, research (or creative professional achievement for faculty in the creative or performing arts), 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 increase for a faculty member would exceed 10.0%, 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 collective bargaining agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT:

For faculty: “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, college, and/or University and/or public and/or professional service which benefits the University. At all levels, assessments shall take into consideration such unit, school/college, and University factors as are in force” (*Agreement*, Article XXII).

Article XII.B.4.a also states that the committees “shall also consider equity when appropriate.”

IV. Factors for Evaluation of Faculty

Evaluation of faculty members for selective salary increases shall be based on their contributions in scholarship, 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 of 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 which are listed below.

I. Teaching

(a) *The quality of undergraduate teaching.* The information obtained from the unit’s student evaluation forms and the individual’s submitted teaching evidence shall be used as part of the assessment of teaching. Reports of classroom visitation by the department chair, dean, or another formally designated representative may be used, where such visitations 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 good evidence of instructional effectiveness.

(b) *The quality of graduate teaching.* The quality of graduate dissertations and theses, doctoral examination scores, 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, examinations, etc.

(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.

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

(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 honorary society may be considered in assessing his/her contributions to the instructional program.

(i) Other evidences of excellence in teaching should also be used. These should be specially noted by the department chair, faculty advisory committee, or dean in preparing the evaluation worksheet.

(j) In clinical programs, clinical teaching, demonstration 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 faculty member's teaching.

2. 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 usually after 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 that 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 performing and creative arts, performances, exhibitions, recitals, and similar creative activities are evidence of scholarship. (These may be the exclusive methods of scholarly activity or may be in conjunction with publication, depending on the standards in the field.) Film production, publication of poetry, short stories, books of fiction, or other, similar creative endeavors constitute scholarly work in some disciplines.

Performance, exhibition and recital should be evaluated by its quality, by the reputation or standing of the occasion, by whether the activity was invited, by whether the occasion was national or regional, and by the comments of reviewers on the performance or exhibition. Similarly, reviews of creative writings are useful in assessing the quality of such work.

(c) In evaluating a faculty member's scholarly work, attention should be given to book reviews, papers delivered (especially those which are invited and those which are refereed as a condition of presentation), published abstracts, delivery of invited lectures at societies, academies, or other institutions or groups 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 work awarded by reputable institutions, academies, etc. outside the University should carry substantial weight in evaluating scholarly work. Successful competition for 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 scholarship should be regarded as evidence of a faculty member's scholarly credentials. Certain University recognition,

specifically the Distinguished Faculty Fellowships and the Board of Governors Faculty Recognition Award, reflect peer judgment that a faculty member's scholarship is of very high quality.

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 which 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 the Detroit area.

(c) *Service to the University.* This includes service on departmental/school/college, and university committees. Professional participation in AAUP-AFT activities should also be included (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 which evaluate faculty for prizes, awards, grants, etc., and other service activities which 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 activities in teaching, scholarship and service which are recognized as appropriate by various academic disciplines or professions, each faculty member should be evaluated for the purpose of setting selective salary increments.

I. Teaching

Group 1. A faculty member 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 evidenced by very high levels of performance on all pertinent teaching criteria, by concrete evidence of highly favorable student evaluation, 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.

Group 2. Faculty members placed in Group 2 should have demonstrated 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 a faculty member in Group 2 is that he/she must be engaged in teaching that, while not among the very highest group in the school or college, would clearly qualify him/her to meet the **current** standard for promotion to his/her present professorial rank.

Group 3. Faculty members placed in Group 3 should be engaged in effective teaching on some of the pertinent teaching criteria. Generally such faculty members will receive somewhat mixed reviews of teaching from students and from faculty colleagues, and evidence of student learning will be mixed. In

general, a faculty member placed in Group 3 is engaged in satisfactory teaching, but his/her teaching would not be sufficient to gain promotion to his/her present rank using **current** promotion standards.

Group 4. A faculty member placed in Group 4 generally receives substantially less favorable student and peer evaluations of teaching as compared 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 his/her present rank and would not be sufficient to gain appointment to the University in any rank.

2. Scholarship

Group 1. For full professors, placement in Group 1 should indicate a record of scholarship that has gained very 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 in research universities whose national standing in the same discipline is clearly above that of Wayne State University.

For associate professors, the same high quality of work is required. The scope of the work will be somewhat less because he/she has not been active for as long a period as outstanding full professors in the same field. There should be national recognition that the faculty member's work is very important; it should be favorably and regularly cited. Associate professors in this group should compare favorably with leading faculty members in the same rank in research universities whose rank in the same discipline is clearly above that of Wayne State University.

For assistant professors, there should be evidence of very high quality work which promises to be in the forefront of his/her field. 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 some evidence of high quality work published in selective journals. An assistant professor should be placed in Group 1 if the quality of his/her scholarly work is high enough to promise that, with continued work of the same quality and with a substantially broader record of such work, he/she would have high prospects for becoming a leading scholar in the field among his/her contemporaries.

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.

An assistant professor should be placed in Group 2 if he/she is engaging in good quality scholarly work which meets the expectations on which he/she was hired but which does not yet show such promise that, if continued at the current level of quality and substantially broadened in amount and scope, it would promise that he/she would become a leading scholar in the field among his/her contemporaries.

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

Group 3. Associate and full professors should be placed in Group 3 if they are maintaining a regular and continuing program of scholarly activity, but it is not high enough in quality and/or not large enough in amount 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.

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 weak quality. An assistant professor shall be placed in Group 4 if he/she does not meet the standards of Group 3.

3. Service

Group 1. A faculty member should be placed in Group 1 if he/she has engaged in substantial high quality service to his/her profession and/or the community and has, in addition, rendered, at a minimum, consistent, high quality service in a responsible role to the University.

Group 2. A faculty member should be placed in Group 2 if he/she has engaged in substantial high quality service in responsible roles to the University and has a record of some responsible contributions to his/her profession and/or the community.

Group 3. A faculty member should be placed in Group 3 if he/she has given only modest service in quantity or quality to his/her profession, the community, or the University.

Group 4. A faculty member should be placed in Group 4 if he/she does not meet the standards of Group 3.