

9-2014

Right Flier: Newsletter of the AAUP-WSU Volume 15, Number 1, 2014-2015

American Association of University Professors-Wright State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/rightflier>



Part of the [Mass Communication Commons](#), and the [Organizational Communication Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(2014). Right Flier: Newsletter of the AAUP-WSU Volume 15, Number 1, 2014-2015. , 15 (1).
<https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/rightflier/48>

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by the American Association of University Professors at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Right Flier Newsletter by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact library-corescholar@wright.edu.

The Right Flier

The Newsletter of AAUP-WSU

Volume 15, Number 1
2014-2015

Editors: Marty Kich and Linda Farmer

What's New in the CBA's? Part 1: Annual Evaluations of Teaching and Service

Rudy Fichtenbaum
Chief Negotiator, AAUP-WSU

Introduction

This is the first in a series of *Right Flier* articles explaining what is new in the recently adopted collective bargaining agreements for both TET and NTE faculty.

One of the major changes in both CBAs is the language on annual evaluation, Article 11. This article will explain the changes starting with the TET CBA, followed by an explanation of annual evaluation for NTE faculty, which is entirely new. (The first NTE CBA was for one year, and the raises were across-the-board; so, we postponed dealing with the issue of annual evaluation until the recent negotiations that led to the new NTE CBA.)

In the past, for TET faculty the criteria for teaching, scholarship and service were set forth in each department's bylaws. Under the new CBA, annual evaluation criteria for teaching and service are contained in the CBA and are thus the same for all TET Bargaining Unit Faculty. The new criteria for teaching and service supersede the annual evaluation criteria in department bylaws. Annual evaluation criteria for Scholarship will remain in department bylaws.

In developing these criteria, the parties looked at criteria in department bylaws in each of the colleges and attempted to develop criteria that were largely in effect in most departments across the University. Although there were differences in criteria between departments, the AAUP-WSU insisted on establishing criteria that would not retroactively raise standards for evaluating the performance of faculty.

TET Criteria for Teaching and Service

To begin with, the new system for annual evaluation is being done on a 0 to 3 scale, rather than the 0 to 4 scale that was used in the old CBA. Using three years of data, chairs will evaluate teaching and service; the starting point for evaluating teaching and service will be to assess whether a faculty member meets the criteria for a score 2. A score of 2 in teaching and service (“high merit”) will be given if a member’s performance in the previous three calendar years meets reasonable expectations for his or her assigned workload.

A member can receive a score of 3 (“exceptional merit”) if performance, over the last three years, is substantially above expectations for “high merit.”

If a faculty member does not meet the criteria for “high merit,” he or she will generally be given a score of 1 (“conditional merit”). In extreme cases, however, a member can receive a 0 (“unsatisfactory”) if teaching is seriously deficient or the member engages in little or no service.

For teaching, reasonable expectations (needed for “high merit”) are defined as “mostly positive student evaluations” and satisfying all essential teaching related behaviors. The CBA has a list of these essential teaching related behaviors in Section 11.3.1.1; they include preparation and distribution of syllabi, meeting classes on a consistent basis, professional classroom behavior, effective organization of course content, effective communication with students, being available to advise and assist students, effectively evaluating student learning, and insuring that course material and content is current.

To receive “high merit” for service, all untenured faculty are expected to engage in “routine service” described in Section 11.3.2.1. Tenured faculty, in addition to routine service, must also meet requirements for “expected service” described in Section 11.3.2.2.

“Routine service” consists of activities such as regular attendance at department meetings and effective service on at least one department committee or the equivalent. “Expected service” involves a combination of “active engagement” and “leadership.” Over a three-year period faculty must participate in six “engagement activities” (an average of two per year) and two “leadership activities” or an equivalent combination of engagement and leadership.

The list of engagement and leadership activities is contained in Section 11.3.2.2 and now, for the first time, includes service to AAUP-WSU, the Ohio Conference of the AAUP, or the national AAUP. In previous contracts service for AAUP was not counted except for service on the Faculty Governance Committee.

TET Criteria for Scholarship

Scholarship will continue to be evaluated using criteria in department bylaws on a 0 to 4 scale. The chair will average the annual evaluation scores for the previous three years and multiply this score by 0.75, resulting in a scholarship score in a 0 to 3 range. Any three-year scholarship score that is less than 1 will be rounded to 1, since shortcomings in scholarship expectations result in adjustments to workload under the terms of the Workload Memorandum of Understanding, which has been in effect since our transition to semesters.

TET Merit Scores and the Allocation of Merit Raises

Section 11.2.6 now contains a series of workload weights -- e.g. standard workload, teaching-focused workload, teaching-intensive workload, service-focused workload, research-focused workload, etc. These weights will be used to calculate a maximum overall score (weighted average) for a member, using the scores (0-3) for teaching and service and (1-3) for scholarship.

The overall score will then determine a member's "merit raise" using the formula in Section 11.7. As has been the case in previous CBAs, the effect of this formula is to divide a department's merit pool into two equal parts. The first part is allocated using the principle that members with equal scores get equal dollar raises. The second part is allocated using the principle that members with equal scores get equal percentage raises.

NTE Criteria for Teaching and Service

Like TET faculty, NTE faculty will be evaluated on a 0 to 3 scale for both teaching and service, using three years of data to measure performance. As was the case with the TET faculty, the starting point for annual evaluation will be to determine if a member meets the criteria for "high merit" i.e., a score of 2.

A score of 2 in teaching and service ("high merit") will be given if a member's performance in the previous three calendar years meets reasonable expectations for his or her assigned workload.

A member can receive a score of 3 ("exceptional merit") if performance, over the last three years, is substantially above expectations for "high merit."

If a faculty member does not meet the criteria for "high merit" he or she will generally be given a score of 1 ("conditional merit"). In extreme cases, however, a member can receive a 0 ("unsatisfactory") if teaching is seriously deficient or the member engages in little or no service.

For teaching, reasonable expectations (needed for "high merit") are defined as "mostly positive student evaluations" and satisfying all essential teaching related behaviors. The CBA lists these essential teaching related behaviors in Section 11.3.1.1 including: preparation and distribution of syllabi, meeting classes on a consistent basis, professional classroom behavior, effective organization of course content, effective communication with students, being available to advise and assist students, effectively evaluating student learning, and insuring that course material and content is current.

To receive “high merit” for service, faculty with a standard teaching load are expected to perform “significant service.” Significant service is defined in Sections 11.3.2.2 and 11.3.2.2.1.

Faculty with intensive teaching (no course release for “significant service”) will receive “high merit” (a score of 2) if they meet expectations for “routine service.” As was the case for TET faculty “routine service” consisting of activities such as regular attendance at department meetings and effective service on at least one department committee or the equivalent.

Faculty whose performance in teaching and/or service in the previous three years substantially exceed the expectations for “high merit” will be assigned a score of 3 (“exceptional merit”) for teaching and/or service.

Once the department chair assigns scores, but before evaluations are given to the member, the dean will review the scores and make adjustments as necessary to insure that the criteria have been applied consistently across the college.

NTE Merit Scores and the Allocation of Merit Raises

Section 11.2.6 contains two ranges for weighting teaching and service, one for faculty with an intensive teaching load and the other for faculty with a standard teaching load. These weights will be used to calculate a maximum overall score (weighted average) for a member, using the scores (0-3) for teaching and service.

The overall score will then determine a member’s “merit raise” using the formula in Section 11.7. The effect of this formula is to divide the merit pool in a college into two equal parts. The first part is allocated using the principle that members with equal scores get equal dollar raises. The second part is allocated using the principle that members with equal scores get equal percentage raises.

Conclusion

From our perspective, the new annual evaluation procedure for both TET and NTE faculty is still less than ideal, because it still involves a fixed pool of money; thus, “merit raises” at Wright State are still a zero-sum game. We have consistently argued that if the administration were truly interested in rewarding performance, it would agree to a system in which faculty would receive annual raises that were across-the-board and then have the opportunity for additional promotions (beyond the rank of Professor, Senior Lecturer or Clinical Assistant Professor). These promotions would allow for a faculty members work to be evaluated by his or her peers and result in a promotional raise as a reward for performance. The criteria used for making these decisions would be those that are already in place and agreed to by both the faculty and the administration.

Thus far, however, the administration has been unwilling to adopt such a system, which we believe would truly reward performance. But we also view this new system as being fairer in the sense that there will be greater consistency in evaluating teaching and service.