Department of Design Standards for Contractual Evaluation

I. Departmental Overview

The faculty of the Department of Design is evaluated by the contractual standards established between the AFT and the Board of Trustees. The faculty is expected to contribute to the mission of the university through its teaching, scholarship, professional activities, and service to either the university or the community. This document provides examples of the types of contributions that will be credited towards the faculty's evaluation, and is framed within the context of current academic and professional practices in the field of design.

II. General Considerations for all Contract Renewals, Tenure, and Promotions

The types of items that will be counted within each of the categories of evaluation are listed below. Individuals will submit an item in no more than one category, although certain aspects of a project may be listed under different categories. Accomplishments counted for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor will not count for the rank of Professor.

In the field of Design, terminal qualifications are defined as a Master of Fine Arts or similar appropriate professional degrees. Consideration will also be given to candidates who have demonstrated exceptionally strong professional experiences that may be considered equal to terminal academic qualifications.

A. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising

Successful, quality teaching is the basic requirement for continued employment in all academic positions. Faculty members are evaluated on, and asked to provide evidence of, an established record of sound classroom teaching made evident by thorough assignments and regularly updated syllabi. They should follow the mission of the department and the goals of each *option* (an area of study: Digital Media, Graphic Design, Illustration, Photography). Evidence of effective instruction should be found in student work and will be judged by the thoughtfulness and skillful execution of their projects. Classroom activities and syllabi should demonstrate: historical and/or contemporary awareness of the subject matter; proficient technical skills in the media of study; demonstrable experience in professional practice; creative scholarship; and an ability to adapt coursework to professional, theoretical, formal and technological changes. All faculty members are required to provide quality advising to their assigned students. In addition, they are required to provide student evaluations, which will be carefully considered by the FEC and chair.

The numerical guideline provided below indicates how many teaching and advising activities a faculty member is expected to perform in order to earn a certain level of evaluation. Yet, the Design Department recognizes that excellence in teaching and advising cannot always be determined by counting the number of activities a person performs. The FEC and department chair reserve the right to depart from the

numerical guidelines below if the quality of teaching and advising warrants it. Qualitative evaluation can be determined by a combination of factors, including but not limited to:

- level of teaching excellence documented by peer review of teaching in classroom, written self-reflection on teaching methods, or equivalent means;
- level of innovation in teaching based on syllabi, assignments, and lectures, documenting a comparison between candidate's coursework to theoretical, technical, or other relevant issues in the field or in teaching methods related to the field.

1. Excellent
   Meets standards for satisfactory plus 5 of the following (or comparable) activities:
   - Act as a main thesis advisor for grad student(s);
   - Actively work with a grad student as a secondary advisor, or as a mentor/advisor/supervisor outside the classroom;
   - Participate in Graduate Reviews
   - Supervise Independent Study, Directed Study or Experiential Learning projects;
   - Develop new courses;
   - Regular updating and improvement of established courses;
   - Receive student course evaluations with a rating of Very Good or Excellent;
   - Leadership in advising and developing advising materials and methods;
   - Participation in activities or programs to improve teaching;
   - Participation in programs or grant writing related to education or the classroom;
   - Prize or award for teaching excellence or innovation;
   - Presentation or publication of material designed to help others improve teaching;
   - Presentation or publication of material on pedagogical methods or innovations;
   - Integrate Service Learning or Undergraduate Research into the classroom;
   - Participation in interdisciplinary, team-taught courses;
   - Documented application of knowledge and skills developed through professional and creative scholarship in the classroom

2. Very Good
   Meets standards for satisfactory plus 4 of the activities listed above.

3. Satisfactory
   - Teaches assigned courses in accordance with published descriptions and curriculum;
   - Meets the objectives of the Design department's or option's overall curriculum;
   - Author and organize syllabi with clear course objectives and evaluation methods for each course taught;
   - Advises an assigned group of students within the option;
   - Accessible to students during posted office hours;
   - Knowledge of departmental and university degree requirements;
   - Receives student course evaluations with a rating of Satisfactory;
   - Contributes to development and execution of assessment criteria for option.

4. Unsatisfactory
   Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

The individual being evaluated is responsible for clarifying the qualitative value of each activity, and must provide all information necessary to support a supplemental qualitative evaluation.

B. Scholarship and Professional Activities

The Design Department recognizes that scholarship and professional activities are all highly valuable to our academic development and classroom instruction. Therefore, clear demonstrations of professional and scholarly accomplishments are expected from each candidate. It is recognized that faculty members work in a variety of media and on a variety of professional and scholarly projects, and it is also acknowledged that members may work in more than one area of scholarship. This requires that the candidate document their accomplishments in a clear, descriptive and concise manner. We have established a general outline to guide the evaluation process in this category. Although it is fluid by necessity, it is, nonetheless, precise, rigorous and thorough.

Documented examples of Scholarship and Professional Activities include, but are not limited to:

- Exhibition, presentation, publication
- Award: grant, residency, recognition of work
- Contracted work for a client
- Self-initiated scholarly or creative work, including professional development
- Guest artist, critic, or juror
- Curatorial or editorial duty
- Conference attendance
- Service to professional organization

External Validation

Furthermore, a portion of scholarly/creative/client-based/professional activities must be supported by *External Validation*. In a department where faculty work reaches beyond our studios in multiple ways (exhibition, presentation, publication, client-based work), we must recognize various modes of external validation. Thus, examples of external validation for exhibition, presentation and publication include the usual examples of external validation such as:

- invitational
- peer-reviewed
- juried
- awards received
- work included in field-related publications
- media coverage

In addition to the above examples, contracted work for clients can be considered

externally validated based on:

- accolades from clients or others
- reputation of client (e.g., competitive nature of securing the project)

The numerical guideline provided below indicates how many activities and external validations a faculty member is expected to receive in order to earn a certain level of evaluation. The Design Department recognizes that not all activities are equal in scope/complexity, exposure (e.g. international, national, regional), reputation in the field, or other factors. The FEC and department chair reserve the right to depart from the numerical guidelines below if the quality of activity warrants it. Qualitative evaluation can be determined by a combination of factors, including but not limited to:

- level of external validation (e.g. invitation, peer-review, review, juried, reputation in the field of reviewing body)
- level of recognition (e.g. audience, distribution, exposure, press, accolades)
- level of competition (e.g. submissions : accepted work, client, exposure)
- quality of the work (if not determined by one of the above)
- significance of contribution to the field (e.g. informs, supports, or changes)

1. Excellent
   Number of scholarly, creative, client-based, or professional activities: 3
   Number of those activities externally validated: 2

2. Very Good
   Number of scholarly or professional activities: 2
   Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 1

3. Satisfactory
   Number of scholarly or professional activities: 1
   Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 0

4. Unsatisfactory
   Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

The individual being evaluated is responsible for clarifying the qualitative value of each activity, and must provide all information necessary to support a supplemental qualitative evaluation.

C. University Service
In the Design Department, university service includes participation in activities that respond to the immediate and long term goals of the department or option, the creation and/or mentoring of student activities, participation on university, college, department, or option committees, and involvement with organizations and operations of the university.

The numerical guideline provided below indicates how many activities a faculty member is expected to perform in order to earn a certain level of evaluation. The Design Department recognizes that excellence in University Service cannot always be determined by counting the number of activities a person performs. The FEC and department chair reserve the right to depart from the numerical guidelines below if quality of service warrants it. Qualitative evaluation can be determined by a combination of factors, including but not limited to:

- level of responsibility/leadership
- quality of the work/participation
- significance of contribution/service

1. Excellent
   - Participation in Department faculty meetings
   - Compliance with contractual obligations that allow department to function smoothly; i.e. submission of faculty evaluation reports on time
   - Actively participate in 5 committees, events (e.g., open house, UMD101, transfer orientation, portfolio reviews, etc.), or other service at the Option, Department, College, or University level, and make a significant contribution on at least one of the 5.
     OR
   - Actively participate in 4 committees, events, or other service at the Option, Department, College, or University level, and make a significant contribution on at least 2 of the 4.
     OR
   - Actively participate in 3 committees, events, or other service at the Option, Department, College, or University level, and make a significant contribution on all 3 of the 3.

2. Very Good
   - Participation in Department faculty meetings
   - Compliance with contractual obligations that allow department to function smoothly; i.e. submission of faculty evaluation reports on time
   - Actively participate in 3 committees, events, or other service at the Option, Department, College, or University level, and make a significant contribution on at least 1 of the 3.
     OR
   - Actively participate in 2 committees, events, or other service at the Option, Department, College, or University level, and make a significant contribution on both of the 2.

3. Satisfactory
   - Participation in Department faculty meetings
   - Compliance with contractual obligations required for department to function smoothly; i.e. submission of faculty evaluation reports on time
     AND

- Actively participate in 3 committees, events, or other service at the Option, Department, College, or University level

4. Unsatisfactory
   Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

The individual being evaluated is responsible for clarifying the qualitative value of each activity, and must provide all information necessary to support a supplemental qualitative evaluation.

D. Public Service
In the Design Department service to the community includes participation in or initiation of activities that serve the community, and are closely related to the field of expertise of the faculty member and are performed typically without remuneration.

1. Excellent
   - Candidate serves the community by applying discipline or area of expertise to *multiple* events, projects, or objectives for one or more external organizations or individuals
     AND
   - Candidate takes a leadership role in one or more of the events, projects, etc.

2. Very Good
   - Candidate serves the community by applying discipline or area of expertise to *multiple* events, projects, or objectives for one or more external organizations or individuals
     OR
   - Candidate serves the community by taking a leadership role while applying discipline or area of expertise to an event, project, or objective for an external organization or individual

3. Satisfactory
   - Candidate serves the community by applying discipline or area of expertise to an event, project, or objective for an external organization or individual

4. Unsatisfactory
   Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

III. Standards for 3rd and 4th Year Contract Renewal
The 3rd and 4th year contract renewal package from the candidate must be submitted in September of their 2nd year. Therefore, the candidate will have only worked for the University for one year.

A. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising
1. Excellent

Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising was evaluated as Excellent in their yearly review.

2. Very Good
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising was evaluated as Very Good in their yearly review.

3. Satisfactory
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising was evaluated as Satisfactory in their yearly review.

4. Unsatisfactory
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising was evaluated as Unsatisfactory in their yearly review.

B. Scholarship and Professional Activities
   1. Excellent
      Number of scholarly or professional activities: 3
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 2

   2. Very Good
      Number of scholarly or professional activities: 2
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 1

   3. Satisfactory
      Number of scholarly or professional activities: 1
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 0

   4. Unsatisfactory
      Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

   The Design Department recognizes that *not all activities are equal in scope, exposure, reputation in the field, or other factors*. See II.B for additional information.

C. University Service
   1. Excellent
      Candidate's University Service was evaluated as Excellent in their yearly review.

   2. Very Good
      Candidate's University Service was evaluated as Very Good in their yearly review.

   3. Satisfactory
      Candidate's University Service was evaluated as Satisfactory in their yearly review.

4. Unsatisfactory
   Candidate's University Service was evaluated as Unsatisfactory in their yearly review.

D. Public Service

1. Excellent
   Candidate's Public Service was evaluated as Excellent in their yearly review.

2. Very Good
   Candidate's Public Service was evaluated as Very Good in their yearly review.

3. Satisfactory
   Candidate's Public Service was evaluated as Satisfactory in their yearly review.

4. Unsatisfactory
   Candidate's Public Service was evaluated as Unsatisfactory in their yearly reviews.

IV. Standards for 5th and 6th Year Contract Renewal

The 5th and 6th year contract renewal package from the candidate must be submitted in February of their 3rd year. Therefore, the candidate will have only worked for the University for two and a half years.

1. Excellent
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising has primarily been evaluated as Excellent in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and improvement has been documented.

2. Very Good
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising has primarily been evaluated as Very Good in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and some improvement has been documented.

3. Satisfactory
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising has primarily been evaluated as Satisfactory in yearly reviews, with no reviews lower than Satisfactory. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and some improvement has been documented.

4. Unsatisfactory
   Candidate's Teaching Effectiveness and Advising has primarily been evaluated as Unsatisfactory in yearly reviews, OR suggestions for improvement in previous reviews has not been attended to, OR if suggestions for improvement in previous reviews has been attended to, little to no improvement has been documented.

B. Scholarship and Professional Activities

1. Excellent
   Number of scholarly or professional activities: 8
   Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 5

2. Very Good
   Number of scholarly or professional activities: 5
   Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 3

3. Satisfactory
   Number of scholarly or professional activities: 3
   Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 0

4. Unsatisfactory
   Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

The Design Department recognizes that *not all activities are equal in scope, exposure, reputation in the field, or other factors*. See II.B for additional information.

C. University Service
   1. Excellent
      Candidate's University Service has primarily been evaluated as Excellent in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and improvement has been documented.

   2. Very Good
      Candidate's University Service has primarily been evaluated as Very Good in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and some improvement has been documented.

   3. Satisfactory
      Candidate's University Service has primarily been evaluated as Satisfactory in yearly reviews, with no reviews lower than Satisfactory. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and some improvement has been documented.

   4. Unsatisfactory
      Candidate's University Service has primarily been evaluated as Unsatisfactory in yearly reviews, OR suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have not been attended to, OR if suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, little to no improvement has been documented.

D. Public Service
   1. Excellent
      Candidate's Public Service has primarily been evaluated as Excellent in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and improvement has been documented.

2. Very Good
   Candidate's Public Service has primarily been evaluated as Very Good in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and some improvement has been documented.

3. Satisfactory
   Candidate's Public Service has primarily been evaluated as Satisfactory in yearly reviews. Suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, and some improvement has been documented.

4. Unsatisfactory
   Candidate's Public Service has primarily been evaluated as Unsatisfactory in yearly reviews, OR suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have not been attended to, OR if suggestions for improvement in previous reviews have been attended to, little to no improvement has been documented.

V. Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

For an appointment as an Associate Professor, a candidate must possess the appropriate terminal qualifications, and must have had considerable academic or professional experience beyond the level which would warrant an appointment as Assistant Professor; must have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars or professionals in his or her field; and must show promise of continuing professional development and achievement.

A. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising
   1. Excellent: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   2. Very Good: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   3. Satisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   4. Unsatisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract

B. Scholarship and Professional Activities
   1. Excellent
      Number of scholarly or professional activities: 15
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 10

   2. Very Good
      Number of scholarly or professional activities: 10
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 5

   3. Satisfactory
      Number of scholarly or professional activities: 5
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 0

   4. Unsatisfactory
      Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

The Design Department recognizes that *not all activities are equal in scope, exposure, reputation in the field, or other factors*. See II.B for additional information.

C. University Service
   1. Excellent: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   2. Very Good: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   3. Satisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   4. Unsatisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract

D. Public Service
   1. Excellent: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   2. Very Good: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   3. Satisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   4. Unsatisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract

VI. Standards for Promotion to Professor

These standards apply to faculty who gained the rank of Associate Professor after May 31, 2009.

For an appointment as a Professor, a candidate must possess the appropriate terminal qualifications; must have a record of achievement sufficient to have gained substantial recognition on and off campus from scholars and professionals in his or her field; and must show significant potential for continuing professional achievement.

Promotion to the rank of Professor is based upon the understanding that achievements in the areas of teaching effectiveness and advising, scholarship, practice and professional activities, and service will be at a higher level than the expectations for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

A. Teaching Effectiveness and Advising
   1. Excellent: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   2. Very Good: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   3. Satisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   4. Unsatisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract

B. Scholarship and Professional Activities
   1. Excellent
      Number of scholarly or professional activities since awarded the rank of Associate Professor: 18
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 12

   2. Very Good
      Number of scholarly or professional activities since awarded the rank of Associate Professor: 12
      Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 6

3. Satisfactory
   Number of scholarly or professional activities since awarded the rank of Associate Professor: 6
   Number of those scholarly or professional activities externally validated: 0

4. Unsatisfactory
   Does not meet standards for satisfactory performance

The Design Department recognizes that *not all activities are equal in scope, exposure, reputation in the field, or other factors*. See II.B for additional information.

C. University Service
   1. Excellent: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   2. Very Good: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   3. Satisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   4. Unsatisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract

D. Public Service
   1. Excellent: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   2. Very Good: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   3. Satisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal
   4. Unsatisfactory: as identified for fifth and sixth year contract renewal

Approved by Design FEC and Design Chair, May 2009