

FACULTY PERFORMANCE AND SALARY ALLOCATION

3.1

Faculty Performance and Appraisal Process

3.1.1

The Wright State University Policies and Procedures approved by the Board of Trustees and recorded in the university *Faculty Handbook* (p. 23, section 2) [1994] states that "Each college will establish a procedure whereby, annually, a performance evaluation will be given to each faculty member and a copy placed in his/her department file to be used for promotion, tenure, and merit salary increment purposes."

This summative evaluation is only one means to assist faculty members in making significant contributions to the university and in achieving maximum professional growth. We believe a comprehensive faculty development and appraisal process will:

- A. Recognize the strengths and contributions of the individual completed within a specific time frame.
- B. Provide flexibility and recognition of individual differences among faculty in contributions to teaching, service and scholarly productivity.
- C. Allow opportunities to enable faculty to satisfy appropriate professional goals within the context of the college goals.
- D. Address role and performance expectations of the faculty member in teaching, service, and scholarly productivity.
- E. Assist the faculty member in identifying areas for appropriate professional growth.
- F. Provide the faculty member with the means and offer encouragement for personal and professional development, a primary responsibility of the individual.
- G. Assist the faculty member to:
 - 1. Identify and clarify role expectations of the profession, college, and department.
 - 2. Identify behaviors needed to perform the role effectively.
 - 3. Understand the standards of performance.
 - 4. Appraise current levels of performance.
 - 5. Receive feedback relating to needed performance improvement.
- H. Provide a basis for appropriate salary adjustments that reflect the unique contributions of each individual to organizational goals.
- I. Include departmental appraisal in developing common goals, benefits, and objectives relating to the mission of the college and the university.
- J. Be formative and summative in nature.

Performance Agreement Plan

3.1.2

The primary purposes of the Performance Agreement Plan (PAP) are to: (1) improve performance, and (2) provide evidence for administrative decisions relating to promotion, tenure, and performance based salary adjustments.

Feedback from chairs and the dean will be a resource for improved faculty performance in teaching, scholarly activity, and service. Faculty are encouraged to use the following guidelines in developing the Performance Agreement Plan.

Description of Areas of Evaluation

3.1.2.1

It is important to note that the university, college and faculty have the right to expect that all members of the faculty and staff maintain the highest standards of ethical behavior and professional competence.

Teaching

The following areas are delineated for faculty guidance:

- Teaching one's assigned load.
- Service as an advisor and/or mentor for students.
- Providing students with appropriate syllabi.
- Revising syllabi to reflect changes in content and/or process.
- Providing regular and timely feedback to students.
- Submitting student evaluations of each course taught each quarter.
- Maintaining office hours, and fulfilling advising responsibilities.

The competent teacher is well versed in the discipline, able to diagnose learning situations, able to use a variety of instructional modalities, and is able to inspire the students to creative or analytical thinking. To verify faculty teaching competence, the chair will review data related to the following clusters of teaching competencies:

- (a) **Organizational Competence**. This refers to compliance with identified expectations as listed above. Data regarding this area may be derived from the chair's observations, from verbal student feedback, and from additional written feedback from students.
- (b) **Technical Competence**. Technical competence refers to management of the classroom, teaching methods, knowledge of content, explanation of key concepts, discriminative evaluations of student performance, organization, planning, and assignments. The source data for the review of this area may include:
 - Faculty reports on self evaluation.
 - Course syllabi.

- Instructional materials (a package of materials that represents what the faculty member does in class, e.g., handouts, lecture notes, audio/visual aids, modules, etc.).
- Student work (e.g., samples of high and low quality examinations, projects, term papers, etc.).
- Student feedback including the basic form administered in each class and other evidence such as notes, verbal comments, enrollment increase, video tapes, etc.
- Classroom observations as needed.
- Evidence of innovative instructional designs.
- Evidence of activity to stay current in one's field.
- Service as an advisor and/or mentor for students.

Scholarship

Two principles generally accepted by university committees are: (1) scholarship has little utility unless it is communicated to others; and (2) scholarship can best be judged through data based research, solution to specific problems, new applications, new theoretical or philosophical constructs, or production of creative products (e.g., art, literature, multimedia).

Scholarship is usually communicated to others through publications, presentations, material production, or formal reports about specific problems. Annually, the chair will review progress toward achievement of objectives specified in the faculty member's PAP for scholarship. This process permits summative evaluations of scholarship on an annual basis. The PAP also may provide for progress evaluation for up to three years. A portion of the annual evaluation may be based upon accumulated evidence (e.g., drafts, data bases, research plans, etc.) of the accomplishment of specific activities included in the faculty member's long-range plan. The chair's summative review should take into consideration criteria such as:

- Evidence that the product has been evaluated by some form of peer review (e. g., refereed journals, panel of external experts, juried shows, publications by recognized publishers, etc.).
- Funding by a governmental or other agency.
- Evidence that the scholarship is considered useful and provides a contribution to the field.
- The role of the current scholarly effort in the overall plan of the faculty member.
- Papers at professional meetings.
- Citations in published material.
- Service as a referee or editor.

- Requests to have the faculty member review textbooks and/or curriculum.

Professional Leadership and Service

Each faculty member has responsibilities in the Service area. This area includes: (1) service to the department, college and university; (2) service to the organized profession (local, state, national and international); and (3) outreach service to our constituencies (schools, agencies, colleges and business/industry).

Each faculty member is expected to attend and actively participate in the program development and organizational work of the department, college, and university. The distribution of emphasis among these areas will vary from faculty member to faculty member. Different opportunities are available to those in different disciplines. The faculty member's plan should reflect both areas of strength and areas of desired professional growth.

In evaluation of this area the chair and dean may take into consideration:

1. Attendance and participation in meetings of groups within the university of which the individual is a member. This includes program, department, college, and university faculty meetings, committee meetings, and ad hoc assignments.
2. The quantity and quality of the contribution to the above work groups.
3. Evidence of contribution to the organized profession and/or service to the constituencies of the department, college, and university.
4. Evaluative indicators derived from feedback from peers and/or those who have benefited from service activities contributed by the faculty member.

Analysis of Performance by the Chair

3.1.2.2

The chair will complete an analysis of performance and productivity for each departmental faculty member in relation to that individual's PAP. The chair will note an evaluation of performance in the domains of teaching, scholarship, and service. Documentation is expected as noted above.

Performance Agreement Plan Development/Approval and Review Process

3.1.3

Description of the Process

3.1.3.1

The college's Faculty Development and Appraisal Process is designed to encourage both long- and short-range planning for maximum professional development and contribution to the university. While the academic year is used as a basis for the annual review, the process encourages establishing long-range goals and permits interim (progress) evaluations of these goals before requiring a summative evaluation. The annual cycle of plan development, approval, modification (as necessary), reporting, and review leads to the next cycle and provides a continuity of professional growth and contribution. During the August-September conference, the faculty member will discuss with the chair the previous year's accomplishments and plan for the new academic year.

Timeline

3.1.3.2

A tentative timeline of specific steps in the process follows:

TIMELINE	
<u>Activity</u>	<u>Completion Date Example</u>
Submission of the plan by the faculty member	December 1
Approval of the faculty plan by the department chair and dean	January 1-15
Mid-year review of the plan by the faculty member and chair	June 1
Submission of the self-report	December 30
Preliminary review of the faculty self- report by chair and preparation of the evaluation	February 1
Evaluation summary to dean	February 15
Review and recommendation summaries by the dean	March 1
Chair conference with faculty member to review evaluation results and compensation decision	March 1-15
Review of appeal cases	March 15-April 1
Decision and communication to faculty member	April 15

Performance Rating and Reporting

3.1.3.3

The final outcome of the above process will be a rating of "unsatisfactory", "minimally satisfactory/needs improvement", "meritorious/commendable", or "outstanding/ exemplary" in each area of evaluation. This rating will be arrived at following an analysis of all available information by the chair and a review by the dean. Chairs are encouraged to consider different accreditation and state standards in arriving at their assessment. The criteria for meritorious/commendable evaluation ratings have been noted above. Faculty members who do not meet the criteria for "meritorious/commendable" will be rated as either "unsatisfactory" or "minimally satisfactory/needs improvement." These ratings will be based on the amount of work outlined in the PAP which has NOT been completed and/or been completed in an unsatisfactory manner.

Exemplary Criteria

3.1.3.4

In developing a PAP that demonstrates superior or unusually high standards of performance for a given academic year consider the following guidelines:

1. Recognition by ones peers.

2. Receipt of awards, e.g., "outstanding article", etc.
3. Evidence of extremely high performance standards, e.g., prepare, submit and publish books, monographs or articles, revise regularly taught courses, service on several professional committees, etc.

The evidence suggests that professional judgment by the department chair, dean, colleagues' opinions, and external constituents are critical elements in arriving at this determination. Judgments must be based on evidence provided by faculty members and others involved in the assessment process, i.e., sophisticated third party appraisals. It is this collective judgment that provides fairness and equity to the process of performance agreement plans and subsequent evaluation of results.

In addition to the single word rating, the chair will provide written commentary describing his/her perception of accomplishment and areas of needed improvement. Unsatisfactory ratings or disagreements over the evaluation will be reviewed by the dean. The chair's narrative commentary should provide the faculty member with specific observations to assist in further professional development. In the case of unsatisfactory performance in one or more areas, the chair will specify the area(s) of deficiency and possible consequences if the situation is not corrected. Each faculty member's plan should include specific plans for remediation of deficiencies.

After the review conference between the chair and the faculty member, there is provision for appeal if the faculty members believes that is necessary. The normal sequence of performance planning, reporting, and conferencing will provide for the appropriate development and appraisal of all faculty. In many cases no additional data will be needed. It may be found that a faculty member's performance does not meet expectations and a plan for improvement will be developed. In other cases, provision should be made for recognizing and rewarding excellent performance. In addition, there may be the situations in which a faculty member and the chair cannot agree upon the appraisal report. It is appropriate in these situations (unusually effective performance, ineffective performance disagreements) that a peer evaluation be made in order to reconcile differences in perceived performance. In these cases following the conference between the faculty member and the chair, the chair will gather and forward a recommendation to the dean for review. The dean will report the final decision to the chair for communication to the faculty member by July 15.

The Salary Allocation Process (Note: In recent years, WSU administrative directives have altered this process.)

3.1.4

The initial step of the salary allocation process will be to set aside an amount from the total salary pool for making equity adjustments. The balance of the pool will be divided into two equal portions and allocated as described below:

- A. Part I Allocation: All faculty who meet requirements for basic merit based on the process described in this document will receive an increase in their salaries as a percentage across the board.
- B. Part II Allocation: This process is a criterion referenced system using weighted unit value for each of the three performance areas: teaching, service, and scholarship. Possible ratings in these performance categories and their unit values follow:

Unit Values and Rating Scale

3.1.4.1

Unsatisfactory	No units
Minimally Satisfactory/Needs Improvement	1 unit per performance area (possible total of 6 [3] units)
Meritorious/Commendable	2 units per performance area (possible total of 6 units)
Outstanding/Exemplary	3 units per performance area (possible total of 9 units)

An illustration of the evaluation matrix to be used is as follows:

Rating Scale

Performance Category	Unsatisfactory	Minimally Satisfactory/Needs Improvement	Meritoriously/Commendable	Outstanding/Exemplary
Teaching				
Service				
Scholarship				
Total Units				

The total number of units for all faculty determined through this appraisal process will be divided into the total of this portion of the merit pool to determine the dollar values of one unit. The dollar amount of an individual faculty member's salary allocation will be determined by multiplying the total number of units they have received times the dollar value of a unit.

Performance Appraisal and Salary Inequity Appeals Processes

3.1.5

Performance Appraisal Appeals Process

3.1.5.1

Procedures for evaluating performance of faculty in the College of Education and Human Services were previously described in Section 3.1 of this manual.

As outlined in the Faculty Performance and Appraisal Process section of this document, ratings of performance in teaching, scholarship, and professional leadership and service for each faculty member are arrived at following an analysis of all available information by the department chair and a review by the dean. Information used in this evaluation includes a self report and supporting exhibits prepared by the faculty member, student evaluation of instruction, and other evidence relating to performance.

Following a decision on performance rating in consultation with the dean, the department chair meets with each faculty member to review evaluation results and the decision relating to compensation. In addition to reporting on performance rating and compensation, the chair provides a written commentary on accomplishments and on areas in need of improvement.

The college's faculty performance evaluation process also provides that the chair's narrative commentary include specific observations to assist the faculty member in further professional development. In case of unsatisfactory performance in one or more areas—teaching, scholarship, and/or professional leadership and service—the chair will specify the areas of deficiency and possible consequences if the situation is not corrected.

In circumstances where a faculty member does not agree with the appraisal report and one or more performance ratings, the chair and the faculty member will reach agreement on one or a combination of the following actions: (1) the faculty member will provide additional information about the performance rating(s) in question, and/or (2) documentation relating to the performance review will be submitted by the chair to the CEHS Faculty Affairs Committee for review.

The CEHS Faculty Affairs Committee's responsibility is to review documentation of the faculty member's performance in relation to criteria in the college's appraisal policy and the written commentary by the chair and to prepare a written report to the chair on its conclusions about the validity of the evaluation.

The chair will review information provided from either or both of these actions and forward a recommendation to the dean. The dean will report the final decision to the chair for communicating to the faculty member.

Salary Inequity Appeals Process

3.1.5.2

In the event a faculty member perceives an inequity in their salary due to allocation of annual raises over a period of three or more consecutive years, the following procedures are provided:

- a. The faculty submits a written description of the basis for their claim and supporting exhibits relating to it.
- b. The department chair reviews all documentation relating to the claim of salary inequity in consultation with the dean. The department chair prepares a written report of the decision, including the rationale for it, from this consultation. The chair then meets with the faculty member to review the decision. The faculty member is provided a copy of the written report from the meeting with the dean.
- c. In circumstances where a faculty member does not agree with the decision about their claim of salary inequity, the chair and the faculty member will reach agreement on one or a combination of the following actions:
 - (1) The faculty member will provide additional information about the claim.
 - (2) Documentation relating to the claim of salary inequity and supporting exhibits provided by the faculty member and the decision and rationale from the consultation of the dean and chair will be submitted by the chair to the CEHS Faculty Affairs Committee for review.
- d. The College Faculty Affairs Committee's responsibility is to review the basis for the claim of salary inequity, supporting documents relating to that claim, and the report from the chair and dean's consultation and to prepare a written summary to the department chair of its findings about the validity of the claim.
- e. The product of c.(1) and/or c.(2) will be reviewed at a meeting of the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean.
- f. In the event the claim is not settled through these processes, subsequent appeals procedures are outlined in the "Salary Inequity Appeals" document approved by the University Academic Council 6/5/89.

Student Evaluation of Instruction Policy

3.1.6

The *Wright State Faculty Handbook* provides the following (Page 45, Section Two, 1994):

Critical to any system of student evaluation of teaching is the student's belief that (1) evaluations will be taken seriously, and (2) grades for a course will not depend upon the student's evaluation of the course or its instructor.

To encourage students to respond honestly and thoughtfully to each item on the teaching evaluation form, the following procedures for administration are recommended:

1. Each instructor will be evaluated in each teaching quarter and at least once each year in each different course taught using the university approved Student Evaluation of Instruction Form (refer to 6.1.10 for sample of form).
2. Evaluations should be administered at the end of the quarter, preferably in the tenth week but no earlier than the ninth week. When a course is team-taught, evaluations should be administered shortly after each individual instructor's teaching responsibilities are complete.
3. Ample time during class should be made available for the purpose of administering evaluation forms.
4. Instructors should inform students that instructors will not have access to the data generated by the form until after grades are submitted.
5. Instructors should explain the likely uses to which the data generated by the form will be put.
6. Instructors should leave the classroom prior to the distribution of evaluation forms.
7. A student volunteer (or assignee, if necessary) should distribute and collect the teaching evaluation forms and return them to the appropriate department, college, or school office.
8. The appropriate academic units should provide the envelopes in which the completed evaluation forms are to be sealed and transmitted. The student volunteer (or assignee) should sign above the sealed lip of the envelope.
9. After course grades are submitted, instructors should receive completed forms in keeping with the academic unit's policies.

FACULTY WORKLOAD

3.2

Faculty Workload Policy

3.2.1

Introduction

3.2.1.1

The faculty in the College of Education and Human Services (CEHS) has developed a faculty workload policy. It should be considered as an appendix of the CEHS Faculty Performance Planning and Evaluation Process (PAP, October 1993). The workload policy does not exist in isolation. It is meant to be understood and operationalized in the context of the college PAP. The workload policy and FPPEP are intended to assist faculty individualizing annual plans to promote professional development and contributions to the department, the college, the university, and the community. The CEHS faculty workload policy and PAP are congruent with the mission of CEHS and WSU. The CEHS faculty workload policy is explained in narrative as well as in an outline form.

In the College of Education and Human Services, workload is determined by the dean and department chairs who work individually with the faculty to develop annual professional plans. These plans determine workloads, and are evaluated at year's end based on the faculty generated and adopted CEHS *Performance Appraisal Planning*.

Areas of Faculty Responsibility

3.2.1.2

Teaching

Teaching is the most important activity of the faculty in the College of Education and Human Services. Although service and scholarship are also important components of a faculty member's workload, teaching our students well is our foremost responsibility. Most faculty in the college teach both undergraduate and graduate students. While the college may eventually have graduate programs at the doctoral level that will require a reassessment of the faculty's workload, current assignments do not vary significantly between undergraduate and graduate teaching assignments.

In addition to routine classroom instruction and because of the clinical and practice intensive nature of teaching future school personnel and human services professionals, faculty spend a large portion of their teaching efforts with students in the field and in individual and small group supervision. Faculty in the college currently teach approximately 30 quarter hours per academic year. Teaching, consisting of some or all of the following, includes:

- Assigned classes
- Course preparation
- Student supervision on WSU campus
- Travel and supervision of students off WSU campus
- Laboratories/Clinics
- Exam preparation/administration/scoring
- Grading (e.g., papers/projects)
- Professional development (e.g., reading professional literature/conference workshop attendance)
- Thesis advisement/student research projects
- Minimum of 6 office hours plus additional student appointments or advising
- Practicums/Internships

- CEHS faculty engage in the teaching activities above, and others, approximately 3-4 days per week (a range of 60-80% of a typical work week).

Service

Service has historically been emphasized in our college and it is particularly important to the College of Education and Human Services as it transitions to a professional school. The college is proud of its historical and evolving partnership with area agencies and schools, and its inclusion in the John Goodlad's National Network for Educational Renewal. The intent is to simultaneously transform and renew the education of educators and the public schools. The college is also proud of the several and varied clinics in which undergraduate and graduate students are educated for a wide variety of service provider roles (e.g., counselors, reading teachers). The college has had a long history of its faculty providing both consultative and clinical services to the community and expects to maintain and perhaps expand these as appropriate in the future.

Faculty devote extensive time to department, college, and university committee work by which most policies and procedures are determined. Many faculty also have administrative responsibilities (e.g., chairpersons, clinic directorships, coordinators, program advisors, committee chairs). Lastly, faculty are also very active in professional and community service (e.g., board positions, conference organizations, consultation to schools and agencies, provision of testimony in support of pending legislation, accreditation evaluation teams, panel members, Ohio Department of Education committees, etc.). Service activities (spread out over 1/2 to 1 day a week, and representing approximately 10-20% of a faculty member's weekly work effort) in the CEHS consist of some or all of the following:

University/College/Department

- Committee meetings
- Committee assignments
- Community service projects (e.g. CEHS partnership)
 - Preparation
 - Travel time
- Administrative time (e.g., program advising, conducting advisory meetings, follow-up studies, reports)
- Administrative leadership (e.g., chairpersons, directors, coordinators, program advisors, committee chairs)

Community

- Clinical/Consulting practice
- Non-Clinical consultation/practice
- Advisory board members/chair
- Presentations

Professional

- Leadership/Committee positions in professional organizations
- Accreditation team membership/chair

Scholarship

Faculty strive to maintain active involvement in scholarly endeavors in their respective professional areas, disciplines, or areas of inquiry. Such activity enriches their teaching and

service and contributes to the knowledge base. CEHS faculty spend approximately one-half to one day per week (approximately 10-20% of the work week) engaged in scholarly inquiry. Scholarship/Inquiry is reflected in a variety of products including some or all of the following:

- Writing (e.g., chapters, articles, books, reviews, grants)
- Creative products (e.g., video, art, media)
- Editorship
- Library research
- Conducting research
- Professional presentations (local, state, regional, national, international)

Supplementary Instructional Assignments

3.2.1.3

It is the policy of the college not to make supplementary (or overload) instructional assignments of regular classes. Supplementary assignments for workshops and other service activities may be made within the Division of Professional Practice and Research with approval of the department chair.

Department chairs will not request that a faculty member take on a supplementary assignment without the prior consultation with and approval by the dean. In addition, when such a request is made, mutual agreement must be reached by the faculty member, the department chair, and the dean that the assignment will not interfere with other teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities. A memorandum of agreement form relating to supplementary assignments is attached to this policy statement (refer to 6.1.1).

Provisions relating to pay for supplementary assignments are described in college policy relating to compensation. Instructional assignments for individuals with reduced loads for program leadership or service roles, research responsibilities, or administration will be considered supplementary (or overload) only when the level exceeds the normal teaching assignment level of the college.

It is mutually understood that this additional responsibility will not interfere with scholarly productivity, professional service, or regular teaching assignments.

Office Hour Policy

3.2.1.4

Faculty are expected to spend a considerable amount of time (30 or more hours) on campus advising students, consulting with other faculty, preparing for classes, teaching classes, engaging in scholarly efforts, and other university work or on specific off-campus assignments. Although they are usually available to students and others during these times, they are expected to select a minimum of 6 hours weekly to be designated as "Office Hours." These office hours should be reasonably distributed with regard to time of day and days per week. They should also be selected so that the faculty member would be unavailable only on rare occasions during posted hours.

To assist in advising students and others who wish to make contact with the faculty member, office hours should be:

1. Posted on the office door.

2. On file with the faculty member's secretary.
3. On file in the department chair's office.
4. On file in the Dean's Office.

Outside Employment of Faculty

3.2.1.5

(Authority: Section 3.07, University Code of Regulations; Administrative Memorandum 72-3; and Supplement dated September 5, 1979)

This policy area is currently under review by the provost.

Summer Salary Policy

3.2.2

The summer program at Wright State University is offered in varied time frames. While some courses are scheduled over the entire period, many courses are provided during one of the two five-week terms within the quarter.

Teaching in the summer program is contingent on availability of adequate budgetary resources, appropriate courses and adequate enrollments. Undergraduate courses with enrollments of fewer than fifteen (15) students and graduate courses with enrollments of less than ten (10) will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Enrollment requirements for workshops are based on individual workshop costs.

Guidelines relating to faculty load and compensation for participation in the summer program follow:

1. The basic pay rate per quarter credit hour of regular courses for full-time assignments is 1/36th of the faculty member's base salary for the preceding three quarters. Salary for teaching regular courses in excess of full-time is calculated at the appropriate supplemental assignment rate.
2. The pay rate for workshops which are part of a full time assignment will vary between the supplemental assignment rate and the 1/36th salary formula depending upon workshop enrollments. The pay rate for workshops in excess of full-time will be at the supplemental assignment rate regardless of enrollments.
3. A full-time assignment for regular and special faculty teaching during only one five-week term is two courses and a minimum of 6 credit hours per term. A full-time assignment for faculty teaching courses scheduled for the full period of the quarter is twelve (12) credit hours.
4. A regular teaching assignment during the summer program generally is limited to one term. The intent of this provision is to help insure that faculty members have time for vacation and to be involved in other activities such as teaching at another institution, writing and research, course development, consulting, or educational travel. However, various combinations of regular teaching assignments and workshops during the summer quarter may be agreed upon by the faculty member and department chair.

Compensation provisions relating to full-time assignments are based on the expectation that the faculty member will be available for student advising, service, and scholarship activities for either a five-week term or the full quarter.

Any deviations from these policies and procedures must be considered on an individual basis and described in writing by the department chair and approved by the dean in advance.

GUIDELINES FOR APPOINTMENT, CONTINUATION, AND PROMOTION FOR ACADEMIC FACULTY AND RANK

3.3

Faculty Role and Responsibilities Pertaining to the CEHS Mission

3.3.1

The College of Education and Human Services (CEHS) at Wright State University has as its primary mission a commitment to training education and human services practitioners who value human diversity and inclusiveness. A primary task of the college is to prepare students for effective functioning in the years ahead in a manner which will enable them to respond creatively to emerging roles and the changing nature of education and human services.

The education of the professional practitioner evolves through a curriculum characterized by scholarly, disciplined thought and action that is grounded in science, the humanities, personal and professional knowledge and experience, and is enhanced by interdisciplinary perspectives. The curriculum emphasizes competencies basic to practice, but allows students to specialize in areas of interest. The faculty understands that the academic and applied preparation received through Wright State University (WSU) initiates a process of life-long professional development and public service.

The College of Education and Human Services endeavors to integrate theory, scholarly work, skills and values with applied procedures through supervised practice at a variety of on- and off-campus educational and clinical sites. Thus, much of teaching and learning is experiential, requiring individual and group supervision.

The basic competencies taught are related to an evolving and developing scientific and scholarly knowledge base. Further, these competencies encompass the knowledge, attitudes, and skills required for the provision of services. The resources, especially faculty resources, which are necessary to carry out the CEHS mission must be varied and diverse. Although faculty resources must be integrated into a coherent whole, individual faculty themselves must be heterogeneous, with many unique strengths to meet the educational needs of our various clients.

The CEHS has subscribed to building a balanced faculty related to the college's goals. The curriculum must address both a knowledge base and the experience gained via professional practice. Thus, it is evident a diverse faculty is needed to actualize the curriculum. That diverse faculty must implement explicitly focused activities for a coherent curriculum to be achieved.

As members of a university-based and university-valued program, faculty are expected to be involved in activity related to the strategic plan of the college. Faculty must contribute to college and department needs with their related focused activities in the areas of *teaching*, *service*, and *scholarship*. The combined performance of teaching, service, and scholarly activities comprise the faculty members contribution to the implementation of the curriculum. The level and quality of this combined faculty role and the performance thereof establishes for each faculty member an individualized plan related to the appointment, continuation, and promotion for academic rank in the college.

Consistent with this introductory summary, the College of Education and Human Services is moved to create and sustain a faculty that is different from more traditional, discipline based faculty in the following ways:

1. The academic curriculum of the professional programs includes the classroom and fieldwork. Teaching must occur in the classroom, the practice setting, and through the role modeling of the faculty. Teaching which integrates the scholarly and the

practice base is required of CEHS faculty. Accordingly, a teacher-practitioner-scholar model is essential for most of the faculty positions in the college.

2. Carefully supervised clinical and educational laboratory experiences, practicums and internships represent a fundamental part of the curriculum. These key experiences are organized and implemented in a variety of settings, on campus, with community service providers, in educational settings (some administered and managed by the CEHS). Accordingly, many faculty have a high level of involvement in supervision, management, or administration functions related to these key learning experiences.
3. A high level of creative/scholarly inquiry in the form of research and development is encouraged. However, because of the emphasis on teaching and practice, the research output of individual faculty members varies, and a balance of teaching, service, and research is a college-wide but not necessarily an individual faculty member's responsibility.
4. The academic reward system must be flexible because college needs require faculty members with varied academic, administrative, and practice expertise, and with different backgrounds, philosophies, skills, and contributions in the academic setting.

The College of Education and Human Services holds the academic standards established by the parent institution (Wright State University) in high esteem. Because the college's programs and the composition of its faculty differ in some details from those of the university generally, the college has established the following guidelines for appointment, reappointment (continuing), and promotion. These guidelines are consistent with the philosophy of the university and with the strategic plan goals and programs of the CEHS.

Promotion in academic rank is a mark of distinction and recognition among the academic community of the College of Education and Human Services of Wright State University. Time in rank per se is neither an absolute nor sufficient criteria for appointment or promotion to the next academic rank. However, four years at the current rank is ordinarily required to demonstrate the sustained performance expected for appointment or advancement to the next academic rank.

Areas of Faculty Responsibility

3.3.1.1

Teaching

In the College of Education and Human Services, student learning is the primary objective. Hence, even though scholarship and service are important components of a faculty member's responsibilities, teaching is the primary function of the CEHS faculty. Teaching takes many forms, including lectures, seminar discussions, individual tutorial sessions, supervision, clinical exercises, and other types of instruction.

Teaching necessarily involves much more than the hours spent in a classroom. Faculty members spend considerable time reading and writing to prepare lectures and class presentations. They design, organize, and refine courses continuously. They gather materials for use in the classroom and work to incorporate new instructional technologies into their classes. Teaching includes evaluating student performance and providing feedback. In addition, faculty monitor the success of academic programs through student outcome assessment activities that establish and monitor overall student performance.

Teaching graduate students frequently requires extensive one-on-one activity and a particularly large expenditure of time. Mentoring those students, sometimes on a daily basis, is an important part of the entire teaching program, and individual attention is especially intensive as graduate students conduct and report their research projects culminating in master's or educational specialists theses.

Similarly, advising is intimately related to the educational process. Faculty members spend a great deal of time outside of class working with students in a variety of ways. Faculty members also work with students in reviewing their programs of study, meeting graduation requirements, and providing career guidance. Moreover, teaching requires a faculty member to devote significant effort to maintain his/her professional skills. To remain current, a faculty member must be conversant with current publications, participate in professional organizations in one's discipline, and remain aware of new developments in his/her field.

Service

The second important component of a CEHS faculty member's responsibilities is service to the university, to the professions and, in keeping with Wright State University's metropolitan mission, to the local, national, and global communities. It is important to observe that many service activities also contribute to teaching or scholarship or both. Moreover, they are essential for the healthy functioning of the university, for the creation and dissemination of knowledge, and for fulfilling the university's many obligations to society.

Some examples include: university committee duties entailing academic program development and campus governance; service to WSU students and student organizations; service to local/regional/national professional societies and scholarly journals; service directed toward enhancing the quality of life in the greater community; and assistance to key societal institutions such as businesses, governments, health care providers, human service agencies, public schools, and other colleges' universities.

Scholarship

Academic scholarly/creative inquiry is the hallmark of the university; therefore, all individuals seeking appointment or promotion at the rank of assistant professor or above must have documented evidence in this area. Scholarly activity alone, however, does not have to be the primary area of his/her achievement. Academic scholarly/creative activity includes some or all of the following:

Basic Scholarship: The creation of new knowledge.

Outputs from basic scholarship activities include but are not limited to publication in refereed journals, research monographs, textbooks and scholarly books, chapters in textbooks and scholarly books, proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic meetings, publicly available research working papers, papers presented at faculty research seminars, editorships, conducting original and/or applied research, and translations.

Applied Instructional Scholarship: The application, transfer, and interpretation of knowledge to improve practice and teaching in a profession.

Outputs from applied/service scholarship activities include but are not limited to

professional presentations, public/trade/practitioner journals, in-house book reviews, papers presented at faculty workshops, creative/innovative educational or clinical programs, innovative treatment or delivery systems, grant writing and/or other funding awards, technical reports, professional writing (e.g. documentary or critical edition), consulting or providing expert testimony, film or other media project, archival materials (e.g., bibliographies and databases) and newsletters. Outputs from instructional development activities include but are not limited to written cases with instructional materials, instructional software, publicly available materials and new curriculum materials or support materials (e.g., slides, video presentations, computer software, teachers' manuals).

Faculty Ranks

3.3.2

Lecturer

3.3.2.1

For the academic rank of lecturer, the candidate must be qualified to teach but normally does not hold the terminal degree in the discipline of the department of appointment. Lecturers cannot be promoted or granted tenure. Initially, lecturers are appointed for a period not to exceed two year's duration. Lecturers may be reappointed for additional periods, of up to three years each. At the end of each appointment period, the appointment shall expire unless positive action is taken by the lecturer's department. Minimal conditions for reappointment are satisfactory performance and need of the department; however these conditions, while necessary, are not in themselves sufficient for reappointment and there is no obligation on the part of the department to recommend reappointment even if these conditions are met.

Instructor

3.3.2.2

For the academic rank of instructor, the candidate must have documented evidence of successfully completed training in his/her field with appropriate degree and credentials. This rank is generally, but not solely, the rank given a new faculty member who has not yet received the terminal degree, or to a practitioner whose primary function is instruction or clinical supervision. The instructor rank may be designated at the outset as the permanent rank for a particular position.

Assistant Professor

3.3.2.3

The academic rank of assistant professor is ordinarily the entry rank for faculty in the college. For this rank the candidate must have the terminal degree in his/her discipline/ profession, documented evidence of successfully completing training in his/her field with appropriate credentials, and some evidence of focused academic scholarly/creative activity as defined above.

When advancing from the rank of instructor, in addition to holding the terminal degree, the candidate must demonstrate effective performance in his/her discipline that is recognized by others in the field within the local community of scholars. This performance must be documented in teaching, service, and scholarship. Teaching involves the education and mentoring of students. Service is provided to the department, college, university, community, or profession. Scholarship involves the activities listed above which are relevant to the candidate's profession.

Associate Professor

3.3.2.4

The candidate must hold a terminal degree in his/her discipline/profession and appropriate credentials. For the academic rank of associate professor, the candidate must have documented

evidence of continued progress in the areas of the candidate's expertise through teaching, service, and scholarship. This progress should be recognized within the local community of scholars and preferably also at the state, regional, or national levels. Performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship must be documented and reflect the development of a sustained professional area focus.

Professor

3.3.2.5

The candidate must hold the terminal degree in his/her field and appropriate credentials. For the academic rank of professor, the candidate must have documented continued progress in an established area of expertise through teaching, service, and scholarship from when the rank of associate professor was awarded. This expertise should be recognized within the local community of scholars and preferably also at the state, regional, and national level. Performance in the areas of teaching, service, and scholarship must be documented and clearly reflect sustained effort in the candidate's professional area.

Tenure Status of Faculty Members

3.3.3

The College of Education and Human Services operates under the university policies as stated in the *Wright State University Handbook for the Faculty*. In effect, this policy states that tenure may be granted in two ways:

1. "Tenure upon promotion: faculty members promoted to the rank of associate professor or professor from within the institution will receive a grant of tenure at the time of promotion."
2. Tenure upon completion of probationary service: the policy calls for a maximum length of probationary service for professors, 2 years; associate professors, 3 years; assistant professors, 6 years. Tenure normally is granted to fully affiliated associate or full professors. Although the policy allows the granting of tenure at any time during the probationary period, in practice, faculty members normally are not considered for tenure until the completion of the specified period (see *University Handbook for the Faculty*, for complete details).

(Approved by CEHS Faculty, 11/29/95 Effective Fall, 1996)

CEHS Promotion and Tenure Process

3.3.4

Note: For promotion and tenure procedures, refer to section **2.1.6.3, Other General Guidelines and Considerations** in this manual and/or the *WSU Faculty Handbook*.

PROFESSIONAL LEAVE FOR FACULTY

3.4

Professional Development Leave Program

3.4.1

The purpose of a Professional Development Leave (PDL) is to provide for a specific updating and renewal of a faculty member's professional competence.

Criteria (In order of application)

3.4.1.1

1. The proposal for a PDL must be acceptable in its containing the following:
 - a. Dates for the leave.
 - b. Objectives.
 - c. Planned activities (what, where, with whom).
 - d. Expected results (please indicate explicitly how the planned activities will contribute to your teaching and research activities).
 - e. Means whereby the results will be communicated to the faculty of the College (public lectures, seminars, etc.).
 - f. Description of how the professional leave will benefit the college, university, and larger community in terms of teaching, service, and scholarship.
2. Longevity at Wright State University (fully affiliated services).
3. If there is a tie due to equal longevity, then the committee will break the tie on the basis of the proposal's value to the college, university, and larger community.

Proposal

3.4.1.2

Faculty who plan to apply for PDL leave should submit a two-page proposal clearly indicating:

- a. Dates for the leave (specify if leave includes a request for supplemental quarters of leave).
- b. Objectives.
- c. Planned activities (what, where, with whom).
- d. Expected results (indicate explicitly how the planned activities will contribute to your teaching and research activities).
- e. Means whereby the results will be communicated to the faculty of the college/school (public lectures, seminars, etc.).

Each proposal should be reviewed by the department (unit) faculty development committee and the chair (coordinator) of the unit. Letters attesting to the merit of the proposal should be appended to each request. The proposal and support documentation should then be forwarded through the dean to the college/school committee responsible for faculty development. If the

department fails to support a specific leave request, the faculty member may forward the request directly to the college committee for review. If a department faculty development committee is not practical because of the small size of the department, then a college/school committee may receive the proposals directly.

The college/school committee responsible for faculty development will, in consultation with the dean or the dean's representative, review the proposals and rank them for awards. Every effort should be made by the college/school committee and dean to ensure that, insofar as merit allows, awards are equitably distributed across the spectrum of college departments and programs. The ranked proposals will then be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs. A representative, university-level committee (usually the faculty representatives of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee) will review all the prioritized requests for supplemental leaves and make its recommendations to the president through the Office of Academic Affairs.

Implementation Schedule

3.4.1.3

Adjusted salaries for regular professional development leaves:

Plan I - Supports the faculty member for one quarter at one hundred percent of salary. Therefore, there is no change in total salary. The faculty member simply has one quarter off for approved professional development purposes.

Plan II - Supports the faculty member for two quarters at eighty-three percent of salary. Under this plan, the faculty member will provide one quarter of regular academic service and have two specified quarters off for approved professional development purposes.

Plan III - Supports the faculty member for three quarters at fifty percent of salary. Under this plan, the faculty member has three consecutive quarters off for approved professional development purposes. The salary is calculated as one-half of the regular academic base.

The table below provides an example of faculty salary adjusted by plan.

<u>Nine Month Base Salary</u>	<u>Calculated Base for Professional Leave</u>		
	Plan I	Plan II	Plan III
\$20,000	\$20,000	\$16,667	\$10,000
25,000	25,000	20,833	12,500
35,000	35,000	29,197	17,500

For twelve (12) month faculty, the salary will be determined from a calculated three-quarter base.

Administrative stipends will be paid only for periods of full service to the university. That is, such stipends will not enter into salary calculations above.

Important points to remember:

The dean should emphasize the following to all who seek professional leave:

- Upon termination of a professional leave, recipients are expected to serve the university for a minimum of one year.

- Upon return, and by the end of the quarter following the leave, the faculty member must submit, through the dean to the provost for Academic Affairs, a written report summarizing the results of the development leave.
- A faculty member's state retirement contribution is calculated as a function of the regular salary that would have been paid had the faculty member not been on leave. All faculty benefits and fringe benefits which are provided by Wright State university shall remain current and in full force throughout a professional development leave, except that any fringe benefit provided by another source during the period of leave shall release the university from the obligation of providing the similar benefit.

(Accepted by the Academic Council on January 9, 1978. Revised 9/11/85 to incorporate supplemental leave program.)

Supplemental Leaves: Supplement to the University Professional Development Leave Program

3.4.2

The Professional Development Leave Policy of Wright State University, as approved by the Board of Trustees on June 8, 1977, states as its purpose,

". . . to advance the academic competence of faculty members and to enhance their contribution to the university as teachers and scholars." The trustees further wrote that "professional leave is a privilege gained by service to the university."

This report recommends supplementing the existing professional development leave program (PDLP). We believe this addition will serve the interest of the university by helping the PDLP better achieve its intended purpose. We have based our recommendations on: (1) an analysis of the existing PDLP at WSU; (2) a survey of past recipients of PDLP's and their recommendation for change; and, (3) a survey of comparable programs at other state universities in Ohio.

A supplemental research/scholarly leave program would provide qualified faculty members with the opportunity to compete for two or three quarters of leave at full salary for outstanding research/scholarly projects requiring more than one quarter to complete. The requests for supplemental quarters would be judged competitively as part of the PDLP leaves; supplemental leave could also be coupled with extra-mural funding.

The university will allocate no fewer than twenty quarters of supplemental leaves each year. The School of Medicine could participate in the program, but any supplemental leaves for the School of Medicine would be funded separately since that school is separately budgeted. The leave quarters will be granted competitively to individual faculty members based on the demonstrated need for a leave of two or three quarters. Recommendations for supplemental leaves will be initiated by the appropriate college committee. The final recommendations will be made by a representative, university-wide committee.

Major Assumptions

3.4.2.1

- Supplemental leaves will be tied to regular professional development leaves. They will be for one or two quarters at 100% salary combined with a regular 100%, one-quarter professional development leave.
- The total number of faculty granted leaves will be based on the normal professional development leave quota--12% of eligible faculty.

- All other criteria for professional development leaves would remain the same.
- Regular professional development leaves of one (at 100%), two (at 83%), and three (at 50%) quarters will still be available for faculty who are not approved for supplemental leaves. They may also be coupled with extra-mural funding.
- On-going salary and benefit costs of faculty on leaves will be absorbed by each college.
- Replacement costs (if any) for the regular professional development leave portion of the leave will be underwritten by the college.
- As funding permits, the university will attempt to provide adjunct replacement funding for sections normally scheduled for a leave recipient. At a minimum, 75% of adjunct replacement costs for the supplemental portion of a leave will be funded. The funds will be transferred from a special university account to the college for payment of adjunct replacements.
- Replacement funding for this program would be provided by committing a portion of the general university indirects generated by extra-mural research grants.

Implementation

3.4.2.2

- Faculty members will specify, as part of their professional development leave requests, the number of quarters they believe their leave project requires or merits. If the request is for more than one quarter, the proposal will specify the number of additional quarters (one or two) they wish to be considered for full funding.
- The college/school committee, as part of its recommendation, will rank the approved leaves in priority order for consideration for supplemental quarters of leave.
- A representative, university-level committee will review all the prioritized requests forwarded by the colleges/schools and make its recommendations to the Office of Academic Affairs.
- Should a faculty member with an authorized leave not be approved for supplemental funding, he/she may (1) take the leave as originally projected with the reduced salary as specified in the university's professional development leave policy or (2) renegotiate with the dean for a lesser number of quarters (one or two) at the designated salary support level.

(Approved by Wright State University Board of Trustees 6/6/85)

GENERAL TRAVEL

3.5

See section 56.01 of *The Wright Way Policies and Procedures* manual.

CEHS faculty and staff must follow all current WSU policies and procedures in place at the time of their professional travel. Each faculty and staff member is expected to familiarize themselves with current travel policies before travel occurs.

SELECTION PROCESS OF ADJUNCT FACULTY AND GRADUATE ASSISTANTS IN CEHS **3.6**

Adjunct Faculty **3.6.1**

Recruitment, Orientation, and Supervision **3.6.1.1**

The selection and appointment of adjunct faculty will be made by department chairs and reviewed by the dean. The selection will be based on education, experience, unique expertise, recommendations from the field, personal knowledge of the candidate's performance, and input from the program coordinators and/or program consultants. All administrative detail associated with the appointment of an adjunct faculty member will be initiated by the department chairs.

The orientation of the adjunct faculty will be handled by the department chairs. Each adjunct faculty member will receive an adjunct faculty handbook that will provide information about contracts, compensation, textbooks, syllabi, library, grading procedures, keys, secretarial services, etc. In addition, a conference will be arranged between the instructor and the program coordinator or his designee.

The supervision of the adjunct faculty will include:

- a. The utilization of the student evaluation form.
- b. Periodic administrative classroom visitations.
- c. Periodic contacts will be made with the instructor during the quarter by the department chair.

Graduate Assistants **3.6.2**

The following is a step-by-step procedure for the allocation and selection of graduate assistants in the College of Education and Human Services.

Allocation **3.6.2.1**

1. In January, the Dean's Office will solicit proposals for graduate teaching assistant and graduate assistants from department chairs of the college.
2. The requests are then compiled by the business manager and the compilation forwarded to the dean.
3. As soon as the budgeting process will permit, the business manager will meet with the dean to determine the GA and GTA allocation for the forthcoming academic year.
4. When the allocation has been determined, the Dean's Office will inform the faculty/program committees of the status of their request (yes/no allocation).

Selection **3.6.2.2**

1. Continuing students (GAs and GTAs) should be given preference for a second year assignment if their performance has been satisfactory in the first year assignment. A third year assignment is rare and is ordinarily approved only after consultation with and approval of the dean.
2. If continuing students are not selected for particular positions, new applicants may be considered.

Criteria for Establishing Allocation Priorities

3.6.2.3

1. Potential for increasing faculty/student credit hour productivity (i.e., larger classes).
2. Potential for increasing quality of instruction by direct instructional support (e.g., co-facilitating groups, assisting in labs, micro-teaching).
3. Potential impact through support of a program or a college function (e.g., arranging practicum sites, clinical arrangements, teacher center, Professional Field Experiences Office, Educational Resource Center).
4. Potential impact through the indirect support of a program or college function, via the support of all individuals in a program area (i.e., program faculty).
5. Potential impact through the direct support of the teaching of one individual faculty member.
6. Potential impact through the direct support of the research of one individual faculty member.
7. Potential impact through the direct support of the research of all college faculty (i.e., floater).