

Merit Document

Department of Architecture and Environmental Design

Preamble

Merit raises refer to the component of salary raises that are provided to department/school bargaining unit faculty members who meet or exceed their assigned unit performance expectations. In any given year, it is possible that all of the Bargaining Unit Faculty Members in an academic unit may be eligible for merit salary raises. Merit is calculated during spring semester based on performance during the previous calendar year. Merit salary raises are added to base salary for the ensuing fiscal year (on September 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 9-month contracts, and on July 1 for Bargaining Unit Faculty Members on 12-month contracts).

Merit eligibility for faculty members will be based on meeting or exceeding unit performance expectations for merit in the department in the following areas: Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service. Each faculty member will receive an overall merit score which will identify whether s/he did not meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit. The overall merit score will include five or more categories or rating levels to allow for greater discrimination among levels of performance; each of the categories or rating levels on the overall merit score must clearly identify whether it does not meet expectations for merit, meets expectations for merit, or exceeds expectations for merit. For example, using the minimum five categories or rating levels, the following evaluation concepts would be included: 1 = Does not meet expectations for merit; 2/3 = Meets expectations for merit; 4/5 = Exceeds expectations for merit.

Both the merit committee of the academic unit and the chair may make recommendations to the Dean for allocation of merit dollars and/or percentages. However, as provided for by Section 11.2 of Article 17 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the Dean is not bound by such recommendations and the determination of the actual merit increase is within the Dean's reasonable discretion.

1. Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and Calculation of Merit Scores

The merit criteria (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service), performance indicators and expectations for the criteria, and the calculation of the component merit scores (i.e., Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness, Research/Creative Work, and Service) are contained in Appendix A.

2. General Procedure for Faculty Evaluation and Score of Merit

- 2.1. Prior to the beginning of the calendar year, each faculty member will confirm his/her allocation of effort (e.g., 50/30/20 for teaching, scholarship, and service) with the Department Chair.

2.2. 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 of Architecture and Environmental Design 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 who are at the same or above the rank of the faculty member being reviewed.

For reviewing NTTF, the Merit Review Committee should, if possible, have at least one NTTF member. The Merit Review Committee has a chair to liaise with the Department Chair. There can be more than one Merit Review Committee if the need is justified.

In general, the number of review committee members for each faculty being reviewed shall be at least three.

2.3. Faculty members who fail to submit a merit portfolio by the deadline will receive an automatic rating of "does not meet expectations" and will not be eligible for a merit salary increase or the market adjustment from the Fixed Market Pool (Article 17, section 7.1).

2.4. The submitted merit dossier must include the following elements:

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.

2.5. The Department of Architecture and Environmental Design follows the college-wide option of Exemplar C: Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm (described in Appendix B) for determining overall merit score recommendations.

2.6. An academic unit may report its merit score recommendation to no greater than one-tenth decimal place (for example, a unit using 1-7 categories or rating levels may assign a score of 3.1 or 5.9 but may not assign a score of 3.15 or 5.975).

3. Significant Dates for Merit Consideration and Appeals

- January 31: Last date for faculty merit dossiers to be submitted to an academic unit.

The merit committee of the academic unit is urged to work informally with all faculty being reviewed to resolve any factual or interpretive issues in advance of making recommendations to the department chair.

- February 28: Academic unit faculty committee's merit score recommendation to the department chair (with a copy to the faculty member).
- March 7: Last date for faculty members to appeal the committee's recommendation to the department chair (with a copy to the committee).
- March 31: Chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copies to the committee and faculty members).
- April 7: Last date for faculty member to appeal the chair's merit score recommendation to the Dean (with copy to the department chair). The faculty member may raise in any appeal to the Dean: (i) the chair's merit score recommendation, and (ii) only those aspects of the committee's recommendation that the faculty member has previously raised in the faculty member's appeal to the department chair. Issues related to the committee's recommendation not raised previously with the department chair (where the faculty member either knew or through the exercise of reasonable diligence should have known) are not preserved for appeal to the Dean, shall not be considered by the Dean, and shall not be the basis or grounds for any grievance by the BGSU-FA.
- April 30: Dean's recommendation to the Provost. Thereafter the Provost and Dean may confer through on or about May 19.
- On or about May 20: Dean issues final determination regarding merit.

4. Special Circumstances

4.1. Consideration of Special Circumstances as Required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement

- 4.1.1. **Faculty Exchange Leave** (Article 21, Section II: subsection 1.7). Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the host institution.
- 4.1.2. **Leaves with Extramural Salary Paid through the University Payroll System** (Article 21, Section III: subsection 1.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consultation with the sponsoring government agency or private foundation.
- 4.1.3. **Unpaid Leave - 100% time** (Article 21, Section IV: subsection 5). Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 100% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Le, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.1.4. **Sick Leave** (Article 21, Section VIII: subsection 9.1). Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated for faculty members on sick leave for 40 or more days during the calendar year.
- 4.1.5. **Parental Leave** (Article 21, Section IX: subsection 3). Unit Faculty Member who takes parental leave under this Article will only be evaluated for performance during the time in which he or she was not on parental leave (including use of sick leave in addition to parental leave). Performance expectations for merit evaluations that are expressed

quantitatively shall be prorated. The Department Chair's evaluation shall include a description of the methods used for prorating.

- 4.1.6. **Partial Unpaid Leave – 50% time** (Article 21, Section X: subsection 3.3) Faculty members will not be eligible for merit in any calendar year for which 50% unpaid leave was taken that is unrelated to Family Medical Leave. If related to Family Medical Leave, performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.1.7. **Faculty Improvement Leave** (Article 22, Section 7.3.3) Faculty members shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. The merit evaluations for the faculty members will include consideration of the report submitted to the President detailing accomplishments during the FIL.

4.2. Consideration of Other Special Circumstances

- 4.2.1. **New Faculty Hires.** New faculty members whose employment begins in the fall semester shall be entitled to full consideration for merit. Performance expectations for merit evaluations shall be prorated.
- 4.2.2. The unit's faculty advisory body may also consider special circumstances not covered in 4.1 above and make a recommendation to the Department Chair. Such exceptional circumstances might include a leave without pay to take a short-term research appointment, a leave without pay to participate in professional development, or other leave without pay that enhances the productivity of the faculty member and the reputation of the institution.

5. Amendment of Merit Policy

The Department faculty may amend performance indicators, performance expectations, and the methods for combining this information into both component and overall merit scores at any time. Amendments to the merit policy must be approved by the Dean and Provost/SVPAA. Approved amendments to the merit policy shall not be applied retroactively in the calculation of the previous year's merit scores.

6. Additional Information

N/A

Approved by the Department of Architecture and Environmental Design February 12, 2015.

Approved: Wilfred H. Roudebush Date 2/12/2015
 Wilfred H. Roudebush, Interim Chair

Approved: Venu Dasigi Date 2/16/2015
 Venu Dasigi, Interim Dean of College of TAAE

Approved: Rodney Rogers Date 2/27/15
 Rodney Rogers, Provost/Senior VPAA

APPENDIX A

Merit Criteria, Performance Indicators and Expectations, and the Calculation of Component Merit Scores

Merit criteria are limited to three areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service. To determine whether faculty members have failed to meet, met, or exceeded expectations for merit, 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 Work, and Service).

The Department of Architecture and Environmental Design considers merit that represents the activities of individual faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, 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.

The three 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, and service on the scale from 1 (the lowest) to 6 (the highest). For each performance area of review, a list of expanded range of related activity components is provided (below the rubrics table) to enhance opportunity for the faculty to focus their responses on expanded or other indicator items of their choosing, thus providing conducive flexibility in meeting the Department's performance expectations.

Score Scheme

The score scheme below applies for evaluating each area of performance: Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, and Service.

<i>Rating Category</i>	<i>Possible Merit Score</i>
Exceeds expectations for merit	4.1-6.0
Meets expectations for merit	2.1-4.0
Fails to meet expectations for merit	0.0-2.0

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

1. Merit Score for Teaching (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

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

<i>Evaluation Rating Category</i>	<i>Expected levels of accomplishment on teaching performance indicators (or their equivalent)</i>	<i>Possible Merit Score for Teaching</i>
Exceeds expectations for merit	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.	4.1-6.0
Meets expectations for merit	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.	2.1-4.0
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Course design and implementation hardly accommodate NAAB Student Performance Criteria. Quantitative student evaluations significantly lower than departmental averages for similar courses, and qualitative evaluative comments are mixed and predominantly negative. 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.	0.0-2.0

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

2. Merit Score for research (to be completed by merit committee member): _____

For the purpose of evaluation, the Department of Architecture & Environmental Design 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.

<i>Significance Category</i>	<i>Research and Creative Activities Class</i>					
	<i>Journal</i>	<i>Proceedings</i>	<i>Chapter/ Monograph</i>	<i>Grant</i>	<i>Creative Work</i>	<i>Recognition Item</i>
Leading	Leading Article	Leading Paper (& presentation)	Leading Chapter	Leading Grant	Leading	Leading
Major	Major Article	Major Paper (& presentation)	Major Chapter	Major Grant	Major	Major
Standard	Standard Article	Standard Paper	Standard Chapter	Standard Grant	Standard	Standard
Modest	Modest Article	Modest paper	Modest Chapter	Modest Grant	Modest	Modest

Using the class-significance matrix, the score scheme is integrated in the research/creative activities evaluation rubrics as shown in the Table below.

<i>Evaluation Rating Category</i>	<i>Expected levels of accomplishment on research/creative activities performance indicators (or their equivalent)</i>	<i>Possible Merit Score for Research</i>
Exceeds expectations for merit	Leading journal article; major conference paper; major grant; standard award. In mode of consistent planning and following up on research initiatives.	4.1-6.0
Meets expectations for merit	Major journal article; standard conference paper; standard grant (may be continuing from previous review cycle); standard award. Active in pursuing research and grants opportunities.	2.1-4.0
Fails to meet expectations for merit	No activity or may be a modest work; not seeking research projects or grants; no recognition	0.0-2.0

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

Performance indicators include

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**

3. Merit Score for Service (to be completed by merit committee member): ___

For the purpose of evaluation, the Department of Architecture & Environmental Design 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:

<i>Significance Category</i>	<i>Representative Examples</i>
Leading Item	- University service recognition award - Chairing a university ad hoc committee with heavy work mandate
Major Item	- Chairing a university standing committee - Chairing a departmental faculty search committee
Standard Item	- Coordinating a departmental function, such as first year curriculum - Advising 20 students; - Serving on a college standing committee
Modest Item	- Volunteering acts at wide intervals, such as preview days

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 use comparison and interpolation.

<i>Evaluation Rating Category</i>	<i>Expected levels of accomplishment on service performance indicators or their equivalent (Quantity)</i>	<i>Possible Merit Score for Service</i>
Exceeds expectations for merit	Leading Item (2) Major Item (3) Standard Item (2) Modest Item (Varies)	4.1-6.0
Meets expectations for merit	Leading Item (1) Major Item (2) Standard Item (2) Modest Item (Varies)	2.1-4.0
Fails to meet expectations for merit	Leading Item - Major Item - Standard Item (1) Modest Item (2)	0.0-2.0

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

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

<i>Faculty Member</i>	<i>Merit Score for Teaching</i>	<i>Merit Score for Research</i>	<i>Merit Score for Service</i>

Appendix B

Options for Determining Overall Merit Score Recommendations

The individual component merit scores for teaching, research/creative work, and service are combined to arrive at an overall merit score. Allocation of effort is taken into account when determining overall merit score. The overall merit may include a greater number of values or rating levels than seven, but it must clearly identify whether the overall merit rating reflects performance that fails to meet expectations, meets expectations, or exceeds expectations for merit.

Three exemplars are available for adaptation and use: holistic judgment of the merit committee, a guiding rubric based on ratings in each performance area, or through the use of a simple algorithm that mathematically weights each performance criteria.

Exemplar C: Weighted Allocation of Effort Algorithm

Once the merit committee has reached consensus on component merit scores on each performance areas (Teaching, Research/Creative Work, and Service), the overall merit score is computed using a simple algorithm taking into account the weighted allocation of effort for each performance area:

$[\text{Teaching/Librarian Effectiveness Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Research/Creative Work Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] + [\text{Service Merit Score} * \text{Allocation of Effort}] = \text{Overall Merit Score}$

<i>Overall Merit Score</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
4.1-6.0	Exceeds expectations for merit, recommended for merit
2.1-4.0	Meets expectations for merit, recommended for merit
0.0-2.0	Fails to meet basic expectations for merit, not recommended for merit

