

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Provost

2009-10 Guidelines for Evaluation of Academic Staff

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 will be represented by the AAUP-AFT on the last day of winter semester (**May 15, 2009**) and the first day of the fall term (**August 19, 2009**) may be considered for a selective salary adjustment and should be evaluated.
2. Continuing lack of application or eligibility for promotion bears on whether a staff member's qualifications meet selective salary adjustment standards. Such persons are eligible for merit salary adjustments; but special justification should be provided in recommending them for such adjustments.

II. Procedures

1. Committees

It is the policy of the University to obtain peer advice before making merit salary adjustments, and the 2006-2009 *WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement* requires consultation with salary committees prior to making recommendations.

Directors will make recommendations to the appropriate vice president or dean. If a salary committee exists in the office of the director, the director shall chair the committee with vote.

Each dean/vice president shall, in addition, consult a salary advisory committee prior to making recommendations on selective salary adjustments to the Provost. The committee shall consist of bargaining-unit academic-staff members elected according to college/school/division by-laws (*Agreement*, Article XII).

In all units, there must be an updated professional record available in the dean/director's office for each person recommended for merit salary adjustments. The ultimate responsibility for an updated professional record lies with the individual academic-staff member.

2. Evaluation

In making selective salary recommendations to the appropriate vice president or dean, directors 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.

The dean/vice president shall convene the elected college/division advisory committee. Each advisory committee shall review the credentials of members of the academic staff and make evaluations pursuant to the provisions of Sections III and IV of these Guidelines. The advisory committee shall also recommend the amount of the merit salary adjustment each member of the academic staff should receive. The dean/vice president shall recommend selective salary increases to the Provost. The recommendation shall include his/her summary evaluation of the academic staff member pursuant to Section III and IV of these Guidelines. The evaluation shall be expressed in separate numerical scores of 1.0 to 4.0 (with increments of 0.5 if necessary, 1.0 being the highest) for job performance, and scores of 1.0 to 3.0 (with increments of 0.5 if necessary, 1.0 being the highest) for scholarship (when appropriate), professional achievement, and service. No other evaluation materials should be forwarded unless the dean/vice president believes that special justification is needed in specific cases or if the Provost so requests.

If the total selective increase for an academic staff 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 academic staff in tenure/tenure-track positions, the assessments of a candidate's qualifications shall be based on excellence in job performance, and excellence in appropriate scholarly and professional achievement.

For academic staff not on a tenure-track appointment, the assessments of a candidate's qualifications shall be based on excellence in job performance. Excellence in professional achievements is also required, but is given secondary

weight. Excellence in scholarly achievement, at the option of the academic staff member, will be considered but is not required.

For both tenure-track and nontenure-track academic staff, consideration shall also be given to non-instructional service to the department, division, college and/or University and/or public and/or professional service which benefits the University and shall take into consideration such unit, school/college, and University factors as are in force.

IV. Factors for Evaluation of Academic Staff

1. Job Performance

The dean and the committee shall examine at the least the following aspects of the staff member's job performance.

(a) *Position effectiveness.* Is the staff member's performance in completing assignments such that it improves the University and is timely?

(b) *Position efficiency.* Does the staff member complete work without undue delay? Does the staff member successfully undertake a quantity of work that meets the unit head's expectations, based on the position description, and that improves the operations of the university?

(c) *Unit improvement.* Does the staff member seek ways to improve the procedures or activities in which his/her unit is engaged, recommend those improvements, and implement such improvements in cooperation with colleagues when those improvements have been approved by the head of the unit? Does the staff member readily join in efforts to implement new systems or procedures that are developed in the university?

(d) *Self-improvement.* Does the staff member take classes, attend professional development programs, read professional journals and magazines, and make other efforts to remain knowledgeable about his/her field and to learn about changes in both substantive knowledge and procedures in the field?

(e) *Cooperation with colleagues.* Does the staff member work effectively with colleagues in his/her own unit or in comparable units, when asked, to change policies, procedures, or activities relating to his/her position classification or unit in order to improve the unit and the University?

(f) *Completeness of performance.* Is the staff member performing effectively the full range of responsibilities specified in his/her position description? Do the staff member's activities continue to encompass all of the requirements (including advanced training, professional development activities, etc.) set forth in the position description?

2. Scholarly Achievement (if applicable)

Is the academic staff member continuing to undertake high quality research, writing, or studies in his/her field? Published studies are always preferred; and they are required in some academic staff classifications (e.g., librarian, archivist) and are reasonably common in some others (e.g., extension program coordinator, university counselor). In classifications where publication is not the professional norm, academic staff members may be engaged in writing for practitioner magazines, newsletters, bulletins, etc., about new substantive or procedural developments in the field. At a minimum, academic-staff members in classifications where publication is not the norm should be producing studies of the operations of their units or the university which bear on improvements in institutional activities and services.

3. Professional Achievement

(a) Is the academic staff member continuing to obtain professional training which advances his/her knowledge in the field? Taking advanced degrees or advanced courses beyond professional development to keep up with current job skills would be an example. Continuing education programs are also an example.

(b) Is the academic staff member active in presenting papers, talks, demonstrations, and so forth at professional meetings? As in the case of faculty members, attention should be given to the sponsoring group. Is it a well recognized institution or association? Is the meeting national or regional in scope? What recognition of the staff member's professional expertise and standing is apparent from the invitation to participate in the conference, workshop, etc.? Review of papers, demonstrations, etc., which are available in media or print form should be undertaken to determine their quality. Reports from prominent persons in the

field who have heard lecturers, talks, etc., would be the equivalent of obtaining referees' letters in the faculty evaluation process.

(c) In some classifications and/or in some University units, there may be an expectation for preparation of applications for various external grant funding. These grants would usually be prepared for funding that would enhance the University's ability to more easily meet its goals and objectives.

4. Service

(a) *Service to the community*. This includes membership on community boards or commissions related to the academic staff member's professional field in the university, consultancies bringing his/her professional 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.

(b) *Service to the University*. This includes service on department or administrative unit, 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 staff 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, committees establishing new administrative policy, committees developing or implementing new operating or administrative systems, committees which evaluate colleagues in the staff or faculty for university recognition, and other service activities which require extensive commitments of time and a high level of responsibility. The effectiveness and quality of a staff member's committee service should be carefully evaluated; joining committees and seeking election to various consultative bodies does not by itself constitute meritorious service.

(c) *Professional Service*. This includes substantial, high quality service as an officer or committee member in a professional association or organization in the staff member's professional field. The standing of the organization, the importance of the position or committee, and the effectiveness of the staff member's service should all be considered in making an evaluation. In fields where publication is the norm or is often possible, professional service includes editorships of journals, practitioner magazines, or books, membership on editorial boards, service as a manuscript reviewer, membership on professional review panels (including accreditation teams), and similar contributions.

V. Academic Staff Evaluation

1. Job Performance

Group 1. Academic-staff members placed in Group 1 should be undertaking the full scope of the responsibilities described in their position description with a very high degree of effectiveness and efficiency, should be making vigorous efforts to improve their job skills through study or other activities, should be engaging in substantial innovation to improve their job performance and unit, should be cooperating with the university to implement new systems, and should be serving effectively on committees relating to the unit's work. Academic staff members placed in Group 1 should generally be persons performing their job responsibilities at or near the highest levels of persons in their profession or field at comparable complex research universities.

Group 2. Academic-staff members placed in Group 2 should be meeting the same standards as the persons placed in Group 1, except that the level of performance, although not comparable to the very top rank in the nation, should meet current University standards for promotion to their present rank.

Group 3. Academic-staff members placed in Group 3 should be those engaged in the full range of responsibilities associated with their position description but whose performance of those responsibilities would not be sufficient to meet current University standards for promotion to their present rank.

Group 4. Academic-staff members placed in Group 4 should be those who are not presently engaged in the full range of responsibilities associated with their position description and whose performance of those responsibilities would not be sufficient to meet current university standards for promotion to their present rank.

2. Scholarly Achievement

Group 1. Academic-staff members placed in Group 1 should be those with a continuing record of publications and scholarly work in their fields or, where publication is not normal in their professional area, a continuing record of applied studies which advance the work of the University and are susceptible to external review and which would meet the standards of “very highest quality” in the nation’s research universities.

Group 2. Academic-staff members placed in Group 2 should have a record of publications and scholarly work in their fields or, where publication is not normal in their professional area, a continuing record of applied studies, which would be sufficient to obtain promotion to the rank they presently hold using current standards for promotion being applied in the University, but which would not meet the standards of “very highest quality” in the nation’s research universities.

Group 3. Academic-staff members placed in Group 3 should have a record of publications and scholarly work in their fields or, where publication is not normal in their professional area, a continuing record of applied studies, which would not be sufficient in scope to obtain promotion to the rank they presently hold using current standards for promotion being applied in the University.

3. Professional Achievement

Group 1. Academic-staff members placed in Group 1 should be those with a record of presentation of papers, talks, demonstrations, workshops, etc., which advance the work of the University and of their professional field and are susceptible to external verification. There will be involvement in the state, regional, and national professional organizations related to their fields, at a level consistent with their classification level and years of experience in their field and which would be consistent with the expectations of person in equivalent positions in the nation's research universities.

Group 2. Academic-staff members placed in Group 2 should have a record of presentation of papers, talks, demonstrations, workshops, etc., which would be sufficient to obtain promotion to the rank they presently hold using current standards for promotion being applied in the University, but which would not meet the standards of “very highest quality” in the nation's research universities. Also, there would be less involvement in state, regional, and national professional organizations than would be expected for a person in their classification with the same years of experience in their field.

Group 3. Academic-staff members placed in Group 3 should have a record of presentation of papers, talks, demonstrations, workshops, etc., which would not be sufficient in scope to obtain promotion to the rank they presently hold using current standards for promotion being applied in the University. Also, there would be a less than adequate level of involvement in state, regional, and national professional organizations for a person in their classification with the same years of experience in their field.

4. Service

Group 1. Academic-staff members should be placed in Group 1 if they have engaged in substantial 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.

Group 2. Academic-staff 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 his/her profession and/or the community.

Group 3. Academic-staff members should be placed in Group 3 if they have given only modest service in quantity or quality to their profession, the community, or the University.