Merit Policy

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards, and Processes

Academic Unit: Architecture and Environmental Design

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations

I. Merit Criteria

A. Criteria Domains:

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, and Service. To determine whether faculty members exceed expectations for merit, meet expectations, fail to meet expectations, or have unacceptable performance, a merit system will identify performance indicators and expected levels of performance for each of the relevant areas noted above. The merit system will also describe how information on the various performance indicators are combined to calculate the relevant component merit scores (i.e., Teaching Effectiveness, Research/Creative Activities, and Service). The merit system further incorporates the method by which the merit rating of the current merit period is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods to arrive at the three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases.

B. Allocation Effort:

The Department of Architecture and Environmental Design (DA+ED) considers merit that represents the activities of individual faculty members in the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service that are important from the broad academic, institutional aspirations viewpoint as well as from the specific programmatic, professional fulfillment viewpoint—the latter being shaped by accreditation requirements of the National Architectural Accrediting Board. DA+ED expects its probationary and tenured faculty to maintain a standard allocation of effort of 50% Teaching; 30% Research/Creative Work; and 20% Service. Full-time non-tenure track faculty are expected to maintain a standard allocation of effort of 80% Teaching; 20% Service. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort with the Department Chair.

C. Evaluation Formula:

The four rubrics below are used to evaluate faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service respectively. Merit committee members will individually review the faculty member’s merit dossier and provide a score in each of the areas of teaching, research/creative activities, and service on the scale from 6.00 for the highest to zero (0) for the unacceptable performance. For each performance area of review, a list of an expanded range of related activity components is provided (below the rubrics table) to enhance the opportunity for the faculty to focus their responses on expanded range of indicator items of their choosing, thus providing conducive flexibility in meeting the Department’s performance expectations.
The score scheme below applies for evaluating each area of performance: Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, and Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Category</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>4.1-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>2.1-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>0.1-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable (a pattern of annual performance that is below an expected and acceptable level)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance measurements run on increments of 0.1 only; for example, 1.6; 3.9; 5.8.

II. Performance Indicators and Expectations

A. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness:

The score scheme is integrated in the teaching evaluation rubrics as shown in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>Course design and implementation that accommodate NAAB Student Performance Criteria and produce convincing written learning outcome assessment results, including recommendations for subsequent course administrations. Quantitative student evaluations regularly exceed departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are clearly positive. Innovative teaching practices and high impact learning activities are regularly introduced and evaluated. Regular engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness. Observations by peers indicate superior levels of teaching effectiveness in studio and lecture courses.</td>
<td>4.1-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>Course design and implementation that accommodate NAAB Student Performance Criteria and produce convincing written learning outcome assessment results. Quantitative student evaluations approximate departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are generally positive. Modest engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness. Observations by peers indicate moderate to robust teaching effectiveness in studio and lecture courses.</td>
<td>2.1-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>Course design and implementation hardly accommodate NAAB Student Performance Criteria. Quantitative student evaluations are among the lowest in the department, and qualitative evaluative comments are mixed. Limited or no engagement in professional activities related to teaching effectiveness. Observations by peers indicate modest to fair teaching effectiveness in studio and lecture courses, with recommendation for improvement.</td>
<td>0.1-2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following expanded range of related activities reiterate, intertwine, or elaborate on the teaching performance indicators above.

A. Core Requirements (Undergraduate and Graduate)
   1. Addressing appropriate NAAB Student Performance Criteria in the courses taught with due synchronization with course objectives.
   2. Articulating plans for assessing course learning outcomes and presenting the results of plan implementation upon completion of the course.
   3. Minimum teaching expectations include good course syllabi, routinely meeting classes, and holding regular office hours.
   4. Other (teaching innovations that with potential to contribute to accreditation maintenance).

B. Undergraduate Instruction
   1. Student evaluations of courses taught in regular semesters
   2. Up-to-date teaching philosophy and pedagogy
   3. Teaching awards and distinctions
   4. Testimonies from colleagues associated with architectural education concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching
   5. Peer teaching observations and evaluations
   6. Supporting students in job placement, graduate applications, or entry for an award
   7. Other

C. Graduate Instruction (applies to NTTF reviews only if a part of faculty appointment)
   1. Thesis and project titles identifying the status of the work and the faculty member’s role on committees
   2. Results of student evaluations of graduate courses taught in regular semesters
   3. Graduate teaching awards and distinctions
   4. Testimonies from colleagues associated with graduate architectural education concerning preparedness and effectiveness in teaching
   5. Peer teaching observations and evaluations
   6. Records of letters of reference to assist student job placement, graduate applications, or entry application for an award
   7. Other

D. Instructional Development and Pedagogical Innovation
1. Evidence of organizational and delivery abilities by means of course outlines, syllabi, project assignment, and other items that demonstrate the nature of instruction and range of courses taught
2. Academic advising services provided to students
3. The development of new courses or the improvement of existing courses
4. Innovations in the effective use of instructional technology and resources to promote active student learning
5. Independent studies offered to students
6. Conferences and workshops attended to improve pedagogical skills
7. Courses taken to enhance instruction-related knowledge and skills
8. Member led initiatives for organizing instruction-related events
9. Other

E. Other Contributions to Student Learning and Related Scholarship of Engagement
1. Guidance of students in internships or cooperative work experiences
2. Involvement in clubs, organizations, and activities promoting faculty-student interaction
3. Participation in university initiatives to create a campus-wide learning community
4. Involvement in activities to promote departmental programs and services to prospective students
5. Participation in university, college, or departmental projects to assess the effectiveness of teaching and learning
6. Participation in professional practice or consultation for projects in architecture or related fields in line with university guidelines

B. Evaluation of Research/Creative Activates:
For the purpose of evaluation, the DA+ED aligns the classes of the research and creative activities with the perceived significance of the accomplished works in each class as depicted in the Table below. The scheme coalesces the research and creative activities into the classes of journal, proceedings, chapter or monograph; grant, creative work, and recognition item and assigns four significance descriptors that apply to each class: leading, major, standard, and modest. It is assumed that all works are refereed, except for the modest class works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance Category</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Proceedings</th>
<th>Chapter/ Monograph</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Creative Work</th>
<th>Recognition Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>Leading Article</td>
<td>Leading Paper (&amp; presentation)</td>
<td>Leading Chapter</td>
<td>Leading Grant</td>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>Leading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major Article</td>
<td>Major Paper (&amp; presentation)</td>
<td>Major Chapter</td>
<td>Major Grant</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>Modest Article</td>
<td>Modest paper</td>
<td>Modest Chapter</td>
<td>Modest Grant</td>
<td>Modest</td>
<td>Modest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the class-significance matrix, the score scheme is integrated in the research/creative activities evaluation rubrics as shown in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>Expected levels of accomplishment on research/creative activities performance indicators (for their equivalent)</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>Leading journal article; major conference paper; major grant; standard award. In mode of consistent planning and following up on research initiatives.</td>
<td>4.1-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>Major journal article; standard conference paper; standard grant (may be continuing from previous review cycle); standard award. Active in pursuing research and grants opportunities.</td>
<td>2.1-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>No activity or may be a modest work; not seeking research projects or grants; no recognition</td>
<td>0.1-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>A pattern of failing to meet the minimal requirements for acceptable performance as conveyed through disengagement with research projects, graduate work, journal and conference publications, presentation, grants, creative activities, etc.</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following expanded range of related activities reiterate, intertwine, or elaborate on the research/creative activities performance indicators above.

A. Publications/Presentations/Exhibits:
   1. Publications in peer-reviewed journals or symposium volumes or performances/exhibitions in juried settings
   2. Publication of books, monographs, and other publications, presentations, and exhibits resulting from applied research and consulting
   3. Research and publication on pedagogy in architecture and related fields
   4. Other

B. Sponsored Program Extramural Support for Research or Creative Work
   1. Number of grant applications submitted
   2. Significance and scope of the project
   3. Research funds awarded
   4. The investigator role in the funded projects
   5. Other

C. Scholarly Engagement, Professional Development, and Disciplinary Recognition
   1. Scholarly Engagement: faculty members may participate in institutionally- or faculty-initiated Scholarship of Engagement activities through centers, institutes or alliances/partnerships and in applied research. Performance indicators may include: the collaborative relationship with partnering organizations; the significance and scope of the activity; the role of the faculty member in the activity; and/or the documentation of specific contributions and accomplishments.
   2. Professional Development: performance indicators of scholarship-related professional development may include: conferences and workshops attended and courses taken to enhance scholarship-related knowledge and skills. In addition to the foregoing, a
candidate may submit and request that the department considers other evidence of achievement in scholarly work that is appropriate to his/her specific case.

3. **Reputation in the Discipline:** one indicator of the quality of a faculty member’s scholarly work is his/her reputation within his/her discipline. Examples of reputation evidences include reviewing journal papers, chairing conference sessions, reading grant proposals, participation in scholarly panel debates, work reviewed by others, work quoted by others, and setting on panels/judging award works.

4. Other

C. **Evaluation of Service:**

For the purpose of evaluation, the DA+ED works within the following service framework:

- Service falls in three categories: Institutional Service Efforts, External Community Service Efforts, and Professional Service Efforts; all are explained below.
- Institutional Service Efforts are emphasized by expecting a majority of service efforts occurring in this category, with the remaining categories still represented.
- The evaluation of a service depends on the significance of service items completed, such as chairing a committee or receiving a professional service award.
- Four descriptors (indicators) of significance are associated with completed service items: Leading, major, standard, and modest.
- Minimum service expectations include routine attendance of Department and committee meetings.
- It is not possible to collapse all possible service items snug into significance descriptor categories. Therefore, distinguishable service items examples are selected to represent the four significance descriptor categories as shown in the scheme below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance Category</th>
<th>Representative Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading Item</td>
<td>University service recognition award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairing a university ad hoc committee with heavy work mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Item</td>
<td>Chairing a university standing committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairing a departmental faculty search committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Item</td>
<td>Coordinating a departmental function, such as first year curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involving in recruitment, mentoring, or other student supportive activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serving on a college standing committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest Item</td>
<td>Volunteering acts at wide intervals, such as preview days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The representative service examples scheme above is used in evaluating the aggregate service in the Table below. It is left to the committee members’ discretion to use the service item significance descriptors to arrive to faculty service rating category under the specific conditions of each faculty—circumstances that give rise to the using comparison and interpolation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Rating Category</th>
<th>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators or their equivalent (Quantity)</th>
<th>Possible Merit Score for Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit</td>
<td>Leading Item (2) Major Item (3) Standard Item (2) Modest Item (Varies)</td>
<td>4.1-6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets expectations for merit</td>
<td>Leading Item (1) Major Item (2) Standard Item (2) Modest Item (Varies)</td>
<td>2.1-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to meet expectations for merit</td>
<td>Leading Item - Major Item - Standard Item (1) Modest Item (2)</td>
<td>0.1-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable performance</td>
<td>A pattern of failing to meet the minimal requirements for acceptable performance as conveyed through disengagement with service activities at the departmental, collegial, and university levels</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following expanded range of related service activities reiterate, intertwine, or elaborate on the service performance indicators above.

**A. Institutional Service Efforts**
1. Institutional work is indicated by departmental, college, or university committees including governing bodies, councils, special task forces, review teams, and the like
2. Support and coordination responsibilities for the department
3. Special administrative assignment, undergraduate and graduate coordination, center administration, and the like

**B. External Community Service Efforts**
1. Records of relevant activities
2. Leadership positions held
3. Community awards and other recognitions
4. Written statements or testimonials
5. Other

**C. Professional Service Efforts**
1. Records of affiliations with appropriate professional associations
2. Leadership positions held in professional associations
3. Records of service to private or extramural funding agencies
4. Attendance at professional meetings and conferences
5. Professional recognition
6. Organization of professional conferences, symposia, and the like
7. Sessions moderated at professional conferences
8. Other

Merit Committee Composition and the Election/Appointment Process
The Department of Architecture and Environmental Design Merit Review Committee is responsible for assigning an overall merit score to every bargaining unit faculty member.

The Department uses the following instruments to conduct merit reviews:
- The Faculty Activity Report (FAR)
- The Merit Review Rating Sheet for compiling results of evaluations by the departmental Merit Review Committee

The Merit Review Committee is composed from amongst the entire Department faculty, all faculty members in the Department have the obligation of serving on the Merit Review Committee and are eligible to serve. The merit committee consists of faculty members of both TTF and NTTF representatives.

Elements of the Merit Dossier
Individual faculty members document the accomplishments for the previous calendar year by means of the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) instrument. Each faculty member submits the FAR for review by the Merit Review Committee. Upon request from the Committee, the faculty member makes available supporting material. Peer evaluations and student evaluations are two examples of supporting materials.

Calculation of Overall Merit Score
The individual component merit scores for TTF are based on teaching, research/creative work, and service, except for NTTF, which is based solely on teaching and service. The individual merit score in each performance area is determined by four categories: exceeds expectations, meets expectations, fails to meet expectations, or unacceptable performance. Once the merit committee has reached consensus on a merit score for each performance area, the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance area</th>
<th>Allocation^</th>
<th>Individual Merit Scores</th>
<th>Total Merit Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Insert numerical score</td>
<td>Total score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Insert numerical score</td>
<td>Total score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Insert numerical score</td>
<td>Total score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Merit Score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Multipliers are adjusted for faculty with alternative allocations effort

\[
\text{Overall Merit Score} = \frac{[\text{Teaching Effectiveness Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Research/Creative Work Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Service Merit Score} \times \text{Allocation of Effort}]}{3}
\]

To calculate a three-year rolling average that will be used to recommend merit increases, the merit rating of the merit period under consideration is averaged with the merit ratings from the previous two merit periods. The three-year rolling average is calculated as follows:

3-Year Average Merit Score = \[\frac{[\text{Overall Merit Score AY 1} + \text{Overall Merit Score AY 2} + \text{Overall Merit Score AY 3}]}{3}\] divided by 3
The Department's Merit Review Committee and the Chair may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. Recommending or not recommending merit is based on the overall merit score as interpreted in Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Merit Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1-6.0</td>
<td>Exceeds expectations for merit, recommended for merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1-4.0</td>
<td>Meets expectations for merit, recommended for merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1-2.0</td>
<td>Fails to meet basic expectations for merit, not recommended for merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Unacceptable performance, not recommended for merit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Academic Unit Merit Policy Information**

**SUMMARY FORM** (to be completed with agreement reached by all members of the merit committee):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member</th>
<th>Merit Score for Teaching</th>
<th>Merit Score for Research</th>
<th>Merit Score for Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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