

ADDENDUM 3

Faculty Grievance re: F-APR Comments by Provost

- 1) I accept the recommendation from the Committee that the College of Architecture and Design should revisit the appropriate section of their bylaws related to faculty annual performance review (F-APR) in order to clarify and address the following elements in a revised policy:
 - i. Alignment of the current F-APR scoring rubric in the College of Architecture and Design to reflect annual faculty performance rather than the award of merit salary;
 - ii. Provision of specific examples of the types of faculty activities, metrics and/or outcomes that constitute F-APR scores corresponding to “1 – significantly below performance expectations”, “2 – not meeting performance expectations”, “3 – meeting performance expectations”, “4 – exceeding performance expectations”, and “5 – significantly exceeding performance expectations”.
 - iii. Assignment of F-APR scores based on the specific examples above should also reflect the type of faculty appointment held (i.e. T/TT or NTT), the career stage of the faculty member (i.e. rank), while also allowing disaggregation of the final overall F-APR scores to reflect performance in each specific professional area being evaluated (i.e. teaching/instruction, research/scholarship, and/or service);
 - iv. Inclusion of an explicit statement in the policy that F-APR scores generated by the faculty performance review committee are not the sole faculty performance metric/factor that may be taken into consideration by the dean in determining the award of available merit salary increments;
 - v. Provision of specific examples of metrics/factors which at the discretion of the dean may be taken into consideration when making a final decision on the award of merit salary increments.