



WAYNE STATE  
UNIVERSITY

**Office of the Provost**

**2021 Guidelines for Evaluation of Academic Staff for Selective Salary Consideration**

Please note that these guidelines are based upon the requirements of the 2013–2021 WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement (see Article XII.B.5.b and Article XXIV.II.A.2 and C.1–4).

The purpose of the Selective Salary Review process is two-fold. It is a peer-review process to identify and reward excellence in the categories of Job Performance, Professional Achievement and Service. Scholarly Achievement and equity will also be considered when appropriate. The process is also a means to provide support and mentoring when long-term Job Performance of tenured academic-staff and academic-staff with ESS is substantially below disciplinary-norms and unit factors.

**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 term (May 14, 2021) and the first day of the fall term (August 18, 2021) is required to participate in the annual selective salary review process.
2. In all units, there must be an annual report consisting of (a) an updated professional record; (b) a summary of the last three (3) years of the academic staff member's activities; and (c) a presentation of current activities, and what results are expected from these activities in the dean/chair/director's office for each person recommended for merit salary adjustments. The ultimate responsibility for an updated professional record and annual report lies with the individual academic staff member.
3. All academic staff members are required to submit the annual report and to participate in the selective salary review process. Failure to participate in the annual selective salary review process shall result in no selective salary increase. Failure to participate in the annual selective salary review process two (2) times in any five (5)-year period shall also result in the forfeiture of any across-the-board raise (see WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.II.C.1).

**II. Procedures**

**1. Committees**

It is the policy of the University to obtain peer advice before making merit salary adjustments, and the 2013–2021 WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement requires consultation with salary committees prior to making recommendations. Chairs/Directors will make recommendations to the appropriate vice president or dean. If a salary committee exists in the department or office of the director, the chair or director shall chair the committee with vote.

Each dean/vice president shall, in addition, consult with a college/division 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 (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XII.B.5.b and Letter of Agreement dated May 7, 2014).

## 2. Evaluation

In making selective salary recommendations to the appropriate vice president or dean, chairs and 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 staff salary committee. Each staff salary 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 staff salary 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%, a special justification should accompany the recommendation.

### **III. Standards for Evaluation**

The standards for evaluation are those set forth for promotion and tenure/ESS in the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the AAUP-AFT and shall take into consideration such unit, school/college, and University factors as are in force.

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 non-tenure-track academic staff, consideration shall also be given to excellence in non-instructional service to the department, division, college and/or University and/or public and/or professional service that benefits the University.

### **IV. Factors for Evaluation of Academic Staff**

#### 1. Job Performance

This category is the most important of the evaluation groups. Academic staff members should be performing their job responsibilities at or near the highest levels of those in their profession or field at comparable complex research universities. They should demonstrate a high level of performance in the total range of assigned responsibilities, including quality, productivity, and the ability to initiate, prioritize, and conclude work effectively and efficiently. Other considerations

include demonstrated knowledge of the profession, unit improvement, and cooperation with colleagues.

The dean, or appropriate unit head, and the committee shall examine at the least the following aspects of the staff member's job performance.

- a. **Position effectiveness and efficiency** may be demonstrated by a high level of performance in the total range of assigned responsibilities, including quality, productivity, and the ability to initiate, plan, organize, prioritize, and conclude work effectively.
  - b. **Professional knowledge** may be demonstrated by evidence of professional knowledge required in the position; including knowledge of University policies and procedures.
  - c. **Unit improvement** may be demonstrated by evidence of creativity and innovation (e.g., suggestions for improvement in procedures or activities) that significantly contribute to the operations of the Office/Department, College/Division and University.
  - d. **Cooperation with colleagues** may be demonstrated by evidence of the ability to work in collaboration with colleagues, faculty, and administrative personnel.
2. Scholarly Achievement (if applicable)

Evidence of scholarly achievement includes continued undertaking of appropriate research, writing, or studies. Published studies are always preferred, and they are required in some academic staff classifications. In classifications where publication is not the professional norm, academic staff members may be engaged in writing for websites or social media, practitioner magazines, newsletters, bulletins, etc., about new substantive or procedural developments in the field.

3. Professional Achievement

- a. For academic staff members, continued development of professional knowledge is essential and may be demonstrated by the following: professional training, advanced degrees, certificates, or courses, or continuing education for professional licenses or certifications.
- b. Professional achievement may also be demonstrated by presenting papers, talks, demonstrations, and so forth in appropriate settings. Attention should be given to the sponsoring group with respect to the geographic scope and professional reputation or recognition of the institution or association. Consideration should be given to the significance or prominence of the academic staff member's specific role in the event and to the method of becoming a participant.
- c. In some classifications and/or in some University units, there may be an expectation for preparation of applications for 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. "Since the American Association of University Professors/American Federation of Teachers has historically been a professional organization, professional participation in Association activities shall 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 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 that evaluate staff or faculty colleagues for University recognition, and other service activities that 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 may include the editorship of journals, practitioner magazines, or other appropriate works (e.g., websites/social media, newsletters, bulletins, etc.).

### 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 individuals performing their job responsibilities at or near the highest levels of those 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 those 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.

Note: Academic staff placed in Group 3 may be considered to be falling “short of expectations in job performance”, and the “unit or School/College or division salary committee will be charged with making recommendations for improvement . . .” (WSU/AAUP-AFT Agreement, Article XXIV.II.C.2).

*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.

Note: Staff placed in Group 4 may 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.II.C.4).

## 2. Scholarly Achievement (if applicable)

*Group 1.* Academic-staff members placed in Group 1 should be those with a continuing record of appropriate publications and scholarly work in their fields or, where publication is not normal in their professional area, a continuing record of producing appropriate works (e.g., websites/social media, newsletters, bulletins, etc.) that advance the knowledge base of their field and the University.

*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, producing appropriate works (e.g., websites/Web social media, newsletters, bulletins, etc.) that advance the knowledge base of their field and the University that would be sufficient to obtain promotion—using current standards for promotion—to the next rank within their University classification.

*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 producing appropriate works (e.g., websites/Web social media, newsletters, bulletins, etc.) that would not be sufficient to obtain promotion—using current standards for promotion—to the next rank within their University classification.

## 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., that advance the work of the University and of their professional field. There may 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.

*Group 2.* Academic staff members placed in Group 2 should have a record of presentation of papers, talks, demonstrations, workshops, etc., that would be sufficient to obtain promotion to the rank they presently hold using current standards for promotion being applied in the University,

but that would not meet the standards of “very highest quality” in the nation's research universities. Also, there may 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., that 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 a record of high-quality service in a responsible role to the University and have engaged in responsible contributions to their profession and/or the community.

*Group 2.* Academic staff members should be placed in Group 2 if they have a record of quality service in responsible roles to the University and have engaged in some contributions to their 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.