

Department of Design

Faculty Evaluation Plan

Approved by the Faculty of Design on May 10, 2013

INTRODUCTION

The traditional goals of higher education are the generation of knowledge through research, the transmission of knowledge through teaching, and the use of knowledge through service. The primary goal of the Department of Design, located in the School of Architecture, Design and Planning, is the education of students who will receive a nationally accredited professional degree in one of five areas, Environmental Design, Illustration & Animation, Industrial Design, Photo Media or Visual Communication Design.

Except in highly unusual cases, promotion to any professorial rank is made only after the completion of the appropriate terminal degree. Any exception to this policy will be considered for endorsement by the department only in the instance of outstanding merit.

SECTION 1: STATEMENT OF PERFORMANCE EXPECTATIONS

Unit Expectations

Faculty members in the Department of Design must engage in the three traditional areas of academic endeavor: teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work, and service. A primary function of the department is to provide an outstanding education to its students. Each faculty member is therefore expected to conduct classes wherein deep understanding and emergent knowledge are conveyed in clear and engaging ways, but also to supervise student inquiry, mentor and advise students, and engage in other teaching-related activities outside of the classroom. Scholarship encompasses not only traditional academic research and publication, but also creative/professional work and any other products or activities accepted by the academic discipline or profession as reflecting performance for purposes of promotion and tenure. Service includes scholarly service to the discipline or profession, service within the university, and public service at the local, state, national, or international level.

The Department of Design adheres to the traditional faculty workload distribution ascribed by the University of Kansas wherein tenure-track faculty members are expected to allocate their time and effort in the following percentages: 40% teaching, 40% scholarship/creative/professional activities and 20% service (40-40-20 formula).

Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, “the University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and, within those principles, to the system of tenure. Tenure is an important part of academic freedom, but does not accord freedom from accountability.” As such, once a faculty member has been awarded tenure, it is expected that s/he will continue to engage in teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work, and service and to do so in a manner that is aligned with the mission of the Department, the School, and the University. The following have been established as defining the substandard level of performance in regard to teaching, scholarship, and service, any one of which will initiate the process for failure to meet academic responsibilities.

Teaching

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in teaching include the following:

1. Refusal by the faculty member to negotiate a teaching assignment in any given semester.
2. Failure to attend the regularly scheduled class periods or have multiple unexcused absences from assigned classes. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to inform the Department Office in the event of the inability to attend classes and failure to make such notification will be defined as an unexcused absence.
3. Failure to meet acceptable levels of teaching performance in a calendar year as demonstrated through performance measures. These measures may include:
 - a. Instruction Evaluation Reports for courses.
 - b. Perceptions of advisees, recent alumni, and faculty peers. Peer evaluations are an important component of the assessment of faculty teaching.
 - c. Other evidence, including peer evaluation of course syllabi, experimental teaching formats, the development of model teaching techniques, and similar activities.

Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in scholarship/creative/professional work include the following:

1. Refusal and/or failure by the faculty member to engage in a specific, ongoing program of scholarship/creative/professional work.
2. Failure by the faculty member to have her/his scholarship/creative/professional work accepted or acknowledged through external review at least once every three years.
3. Failure to meet one of the indices of scholarly/creative/professional competence as defined in Appendix B, Section 4 in any given calendar year.

Service

Threshold levels that indicate substandard performance in service include the following:

1. Refusal by the faculty member to engage in any form of service as defined in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment.
2. Failure to perform negotiated service duties in any given calendar year.

Differential Allocation of Effort

Recognizing that not all faculty members are the same, the department permits the crafting of one's workload and the pursuit of one's strengths in a way that is aligned with the mission and needs of the department and in accordance with School and University policy. The Department recognizes its role as part of the State of Kansas' flagship research university, but also places high value on the quality of instruction and on the provision of service. The following paragraphs seek to guide faculty and

administration in achieving the larger mission of the department while recognizing faculty individuality and promoting faculty excellence.

Differential allocation of workload may be negotiated at each annual review. Both teaching and scholarship components may not be negotiated to less than 20% of allocation and service may be no less than 10% and no more than 40% (except as described in Appendix B, Section 5). As the University of Kansas Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations states, "Teaching and scholarship should normally be given primary consideration, but the particular weight to be accorded each component of a faculty member's activities depends upon the responsibilities of the faculty member." In promotion decisions, the weighting of teaching, scholarship and service shall be proportional to the faculty member's workload allocation.

In addition to teaching in the accredited professional degree program, faculty could be assigned to teaching and advising in independent study and/or graduate study in design. Faculty members may elect to accept membership on graduate theses or doctoral program committees from other appropriate disciplines. The following is a documentation of the policies on how these efforts are to be counted toward the fulfillment of an individual faculty member's teaching obligation.

Advisement of Undergraduate Projects and Master's Theses

Whereas all faculty members are expected to advise students taking their classes, mentoring independent projects or graduate theses constitutes a greater time commitment than typical extracurricular interaction. Such mentoring should include disciplinary expectations for scholarly excellence. The Department acknowledges the extra time commitment of individual mentoring, and the advanced complexity of graduate work is recognized as requiring greater faculty commitment than undergraduate advising. Individual faculty members hold responsibility for indicating the extent and workload of all advising efforts.

Extra-Departmental Collaboration

Departments function when faculty members dedicate their time and energy to the core mission, but disciplines grow and evolve by pushing the limits of inquiry into new realms within the profession and beyond traditional disciplinary boundaries. The Department of Design does not require but acknowledges and values faculty participation in extra-departmental efforts, such as contribution to interdisciplinary research, creative productivity, and teaching. Individual faculty members hold responsibility for indicating the extent and workload of extra-departmental efforts.

The department is also open to negotiating offset loads wherein the instructional load of a faculty member may be higher in one semester than another. Faculty can bank their course loads in consecutive years to meet their usual course load required every two academic years. In any negotiation of offset load, the higher instructional loads shall be met in the earlier semesters, except in exceptional circumstances. As with workload reallocation, offset loads will only be negotiated in keeping with the mission and needs of the department.

SECTION 2: ANNUAL EVALUATION SYSTEM

For annual evaluation, the Department of Design utilizes the Statements of Performance Expectations outlined in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment.

Annual evaluations of faculty performance will be made on behalf of the department by the Merit Review Committee and the Chair. Assessments of faculty performance in each of the three areas of teaching, scholarship and service will be based on evaluations from multiple information sources and using diverse methods as outlined in Sections 3, 4, and 5 of Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. The purpose of this diversity of evaluation methods is to ensure a balanced and comprehensive view of the individual's contribution to the mission of the Department, School, the University, and the larger community. The annual evaluation process has multiple outcomes including establishing goals and allocation of effort for the following year, providing data for merit salary decisions, and developing plans for faculty development.

Each faculty member will, in negotiation with the Department Chair, establish on an annual basis the relative degrees of emphasis he or she will place on the three areas of teaching, research and/or creative activity, and service.

It is also recognized that the primary missions of higher education are teaching and research/creative activity, and in no instance shall the area of service be evaluated at a level greater than forty percent except as noted in Appendix B, Section 6. The candidate's performance in regard to teaching research/creative activity and service will be weighed according to the allocation of effort the faculty member was assigned during that calendar year.

Annual evaluations are conducted on the basis of two calendar years, and thus cover the spring semester and autumn semester of two years (as well as summer if the faculty member is on appointment). The Chair is responsible for disseminating to faculty the annual report form by the end of the fall semester of the calendar year being evaluated. Faculty members are to submit complete annual reports to the Chair by February 1st of the subsequent year for distribution to the Merit Review Committee. Following evaluations from the Merit Review Committee to the Chair, the Chair completes the final evaluation and disseminates draft versions of evaluations to faculty no later than April 1st. All tenure-track faculty members must meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation. Tenured faculty members have the right to request a meeting to discuss the evaluation with the Chair.

Annual Report Preparation

The annual faculty review process is viewed as an opportunity for the faculty member to update and clarify his/her academic career objectives, and data collected as part of the annual review that should become part of the member's cumulative academic record and will be used in the promotion and tenure process. Faculty Annual Reports include a completed annual report form along with an updated curriculum vitae and all course syllabi, evidence of scholarly/creative/professional activities and any other supplemental information they seek to have inform the annual evaluation. Evidence appropriate to inform the annual evaluation is from the evaluation calendar year only. Guidance for submission of evidence relevant to the evaluation of teaching is available at <http://www.cte.ku.edu/documenting/evaluating/index.shtml>.

Faculty members do not need to submit the results of Student Surveys of Teaching. Copies will be provided by the Office of the Chair to the Merit Evaluation Committee.

Annual Report Evaluation

The Merit Review Committee and the Chair are to review all relevant evidence of the performance of each faculty member in regard to teaching, research/creative activity and service. Each area of effort shall receive its own assessment and the overall evaluation of faculty annual performance shall be based on a weighting of those three assessments according to the faculty member's allocation of effort for that year. A "poor" evaluation in any area of effort shall automatically result in a report from the Chair to the faculty member that suggests ways to correct this substandard level of performance for the subsequent calendar year. The Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty above identify the thresholds for substandard performance and therein identify the definition of "poor performance" within each area of effort.

Teaching

Teaching shall be evaluated in regard to the indices of teaching competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. In addition, the Merit Review Committee and the Chair shall endeavor to assess the degree of alignment between departmentally identified learning outcomes and the evidence of teaching submitted by the faculty member as well as consider the results of Student Surveys of Teaching distributed to the department. The Chair may consider mediating variables such as teaching overloads, status of first-time course offerings, alignment of teaching load to faculty expertise and the like in the assessment of teaching.

Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work

The Merit Review Committee and the Chair shall evaluate scholarship/creative professional work in regard to the indices of competence identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. Of particular value is scholarship/creative/professional work that adds to the body of knowledge in the field, work that is disseminated in externally reviewed venues and those that bring recognition to the School and University.

Service

The Chair shall evaluate service in regard to the indices identified in Appendix B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment. It is expected that tenured faculty members will serve the University at multiple levels and, in addition, engage in service to the community and/or profession at local, national or international levels. It should be noted that membership in an organization is not the same as providing service to an organization.

Annual Evaluation Feedback Process

The Chair is to disseminate draft written summaries to the faculty by April 1. This summary shall note: The allocation of effort for the year evaluated, and suggest an allocation of effort for the following year; an assessment of performance in regard to each area of effort, an overall assessment of performance, and expectations for the subsequent year. Suggestions regarding progress toward promotion and/or tenure, and/or strategies for improvement/renewal are to be provided as deemed necessary. The written summary must inform the faculty member of the opportunity to discuss the evaluation. Tenure track faculty must discuss the evaluation with the Chair. Tenured faculty members have the right to request a meeting to discuss evaluation with the Chair. Copies of all written summaries shall be retained by the Office of the Chair.

Conflict Resolution Process

In the event that a faculty member disagrees with the Department Chair's annual evaluation and subsequent discussions between the Chair and faculty member do not resolve the issues, the faculty member may request an administrative review by the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee. At that time, the faculty member may provide additional information to the Committee for its consideration. This committee shall issue a non-binding recommendation to the Chair along with any additional information submitted by the faculty member relevant to their decision. Regardless of the Chair's decision to retain or change the evaluation, the report of the Department Committee shall become part of the faculty member's official file. If the faculty member is dissatisfied with the result at the Department level, s/he may appeal at the School level according to the By-laws of the School of Architecture, Design and Planning. Similarly, recommendations for dismissal may also be appealed at the School level according to the By-laws of the School.

Outcomes of the Annual Performance Evaluation

The Department of Design views the annual faculty evaluation process as a comprehensive process yielding multiple outcomes. These outcomes include, but are not limited to, the initiation of discussions influencing a faculty member's career and departmental planning, identification of faculty development or renewal activities, data for merit salary determination, documentation for special recognitions, and cumulative data supporting personnel decisions, such as progress toward tenure or promotion, reassignment of responsibilities, and risk for failing to meet performance expectations.

If a faculty member is evaluated as failing to meet performance expectations in an annual evaluation, the Chair, with advice from the Area Coordinator, shall provide a written evaluation that is specific in describing those areas and ways for improving performance in each such area. Based upon the performance trajectory of the faculty member, the Chair, following consultation with the Area Coordinator, may propose differential allocation of effort away from problem areas to areas where performance is more satisfactory, subject to the necessity for the unit to meet its teaching, scholarship/creative/professional work and service obligations and the need for all faculty members to contribute appropriately.

If a faculty member is evaluated as failing to meet performance expectations in any area of effort for two consecutive years, the Chair, in consultation with the faculty member and the Area Coordinator, shall develop a written Plan for Academic Performance to improve the faculty member's performance. The Chair shall give the faculty member 20 days to respond to the first draft of the plan, and seven days to any subsequent plan draft. Failure of the faculty member to consult with the Chair within those timeframes shall constitute a default acceptance of the proposed plan. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as departmental and/or area mentoring, campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, or for other appropriate interventions, such as counseling, medical leave, or a change in teaching assignments. The plan shall present specific benchmarks and timeframes aimed at improving the faculty member's performance. Failure to meet any benchmark within its assigned time frame shall represent a failure to meet performance expectations and shall be reported as such in the appropriate annual evaluation.

If a faculty member is evaluated by the Chair as failing to meet the performance expectations of a Plan for Academic Performance, subsequent to having previously been assessed as performing below the threshold of substandard performance for two consecutive years, this shall by definition constitute a sustained overall

failure to meet academic responsibilities. Given that determination, the Chair shall recommend to the Dean that the faculty member be dismissed and the By-laws of the School of Architecture, Design and Planning shall be followed.

SECTION 3: FACULTY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Faculty development is defined as a continuous process in which the School, the University, and the individual faculty member work together to insure that the personal goals of the member and the missions of the School and University complement and enrich one another. Faculty development begins with the first academic appointment through the assignment by the Department Chair of a mentor to assist the new faculty member during the latter's preparation for promotion and tenure. Faculty development continues throughout the member's career through such institutions and programs as sabbatical leaves, leaves without pay, faculty exchanges, scholarly travel and research/creative activities, and teaching innovation and development funds and workshops. In addition, the Department Chair will make opportunities available (on a semester-by-semester basis) to the faculty member through reduced teaching, research/creative activities, or service loads in order to allow the member time to develop his/her academic career or address specific performance deficiencies. These opportunities will be subject to current resource availability and will be made at the discretion of the Department Chair. It will be the responsibility of the Department Chair to apprise the faculty member of development opportunities, while the faculty member will be responsible for initiating and completing the requirements of the various development programs to further and/or improve his/her academic effectiveness.

APPENDIX A: Instrument Used for the Student Evaluation of Teaching

The Department of Design utilizes the most recent Student Survey of Teaching made available to departments by the University.

APPENDIX B: Criteria and Procedures for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment

SECTION 1: Introduction

The University strives for a consistent standard of quality against which the performance of all faculty members is measured. Nonetheless, the nature of faculty activities varies across the University and a faculty member's record must be evaluated in light of his/her particular responsibilities and the expectations of the discipline. Teaching and scholarship/creative/professional activities should normally be given primary consideration. The Department of Design typically recognizes the 40-40-20 formula for weighting teaching research, and service.

Criteria and procedures that are to be used in conjunction with the School of Architecture, Design and Planning By-Laws, University Handbook of Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff, and the Senate Rules and Regulations governing issues of evaluation. In all instances, University and Regents rules and procedures shall take precedence over guidelines outlined in this section. Special attention is drawn to the following regulations:

Article VI of the KU Faculty Handbook (Promotion and Tenure)

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/FSRR.htm#ArticleVI>

KU Intellectual Property Guidelines

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/IntellectualPropertyPolicy.htm>

KU Consulting Activities

<http://www.provost.ku.edu/policy/faculty/handbook1986/d.shtml#28>

KU Faculty Appeal Procedures

<https://documents.ku.edu/policies/governance/FRBProceduresforAppealsPandT.htm>

SECTION 2: Evaluation Procedures

All procedures and guidelines for promotion and tenure established by the School of Architecture, Design and Planning shall conform to the various provisions outlined in the latest edition of the University Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff and the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations. The procedures used by the Department of Design in promotion and tenure evaluations shall be in accordance with the promotion and tenure procedures outlined in the School of Architecture, Design and Planning By-Laws, Article IV. Section 3.

SECTION 3: Teaching Performance Expectations

Teaching refers to classroom instructional activities or to individual or small-group activities directly related to classroom instruction. At the graduate level, instructional activities must be extended to include supervision of theses, supervision of individual studies, and evaluation of activities such as preparation of written examinations and participation in oral examinations, both preliminary and final.

Indices of Teaching Performance

1. National, University, or School awards for teaching excellence, including awards and competitions won by students under the direct supervision of the faculty member.
2. Assessment of student opinions relating to an individual faculty member's instructional performance including communication abilities.
3. Solicited or unsolicited statements regarding teaching by students and alumni.
4. Statements by peers (both inside and external to the School of Architecture, Design, and Planning) relating to an individual faculty member's instructional performance, her/his depth of understanding in the field of specialization, and her/his ability to relate it to other areas.
5. Statements by the candidate's Department Chair regarding her/his instructional competency.
6. Participation on undergraduate research project committees and graduate thesis, dissertation and examination committees.
7. Evidence of student work as fulfilling of approved course syllabi and excellence through exhibitions, competitions and presentations external to the university.
8. Developing and evaluating experimental teaching formats, teaching techniques, and new course development.

9. Fulfilling an academic advising role in a positive way (as assigned and/or informal) as evidenced by peer, student, staff and/or administrator feedback.
10. Supervision and mentoring for sponsored or service learning projects.
11. Academic and professional advising for undergraduate and/or graduate students.

Evaluation of Teaching

It is recognized that teaching can be measured effectively only through the evaluation of a number of indices. It is imperative that a variety of indices of teaching performance be considered. Documented student assessments and peer statements are both essential parts of this evaluation process. External statements (peer and alumni) and formal recognition of the candidate's teaching as well as through internal or external teaching awards. The degree to which the candidate has fulfilled the curricular mission of the Department, School and University, based upon the evidence of student work, shall be part of the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate effective teaching as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom. While not expected, awards related to a faculty member's teaching are further evidence of highly effective performance.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom. Teaching awards are further evidence of a successful teaching record.

SECTION 4: Scholarship/Creative/Professional Performance Expectations

Scholarship/Creative/Professional Work is that which contributes to the generation of knowledge, activities that further the faculty member's research agenda and those that reflect the faculty member's productivity. The faculty member shares her/his work with her/his professional peers and in so doing subjects these to external evaluation and criticism. The faculty member extends both her/his own knowledge and the knowledge of others.

Scholarship/Creative/Professional activities within the Department of Design cross broad major disciplines including environmental/interior design, illustration & animation, photo media, industrial design, visual communication design, interaction design and design management. Creative and professional work by designers may include design for products and their production, analyzes of systems relating to users' needs, communication venues in publication (digitally/electronically), space planning, furniture and lighting design, exhibitions, workshops and competitions. Scholarly output would include publication of papers, books, presentations and published conference papers.

Indices of Scholarship/Creative/Professional

1. National, regional, local or University awards and competitions won for excellence for scholarship/creative/professional work.

2. Dissemination of scholarship/creative/professional work results in juried and/or externally-reviewed publication.
3. Award of funds to conduct scholarship/creative/professional work.
4. Establishment of a reputation as an international or national authority in a recognized area of scholarship/creative/professional work that contributes to the knowledge base in that field.
5. Reviews of scholarship/creative/professional work by recognized authorities in the faculty member's field of specialization.
6. Contribution to the knowledge base in the faculty member's field of specialization through invited and/or externally-reviewed presentations.
7. Evidence of significant contributions to the design and/or execution of professional work whether as a sole practitioner or in the context of a professional practice.
8. Externally juried/editorially reviewed exhibits/presentations/publication of creative work.
9. Acquisition of work in private, corporate and/or public institutions or collections.
10. Minor indices of performance for purposes of the Promotion and Tenure process include the following: (a) Submission of scholarship/creative/professional work for external review for possible exhibit/presentation/publication or as a competition entry; (b) Submission of a proposal for funds to support scholarship/creative/professional work. Either may be acknowledged as an index of professional activity for purpose of the Annual Review process.

Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative/Professional Work

Quality and dissemination of knowledge are primary concerns. In all evaluations, a sustained body of work over a period of time is measured by both quantity and quality so that different combinations of effort can be measured equally. The evaluation and relative weighting of the indices of scholarship/creative/professional performance are defined generally as follows: In order to be considered major works, there must be external evaluation of the creative and professional work and evidence of significance to any venue of publication or production. Minor work may be considered as work done more locally if evidence is not provided to demonstrate significance or work requiring less time and research to produce and may not have external review.

1. Creative and professional work will receive more weight if produced for a national client or one with a national or international reputation. External evaluation will be required for the work to be considered major.
2. Work completed for a commission will be weighted according to prestige of grantor and significance and scope of the project.

3. Likewise, exhibition venues will be weighted more heavily if it is a national or international venue though local or regional venues may be considered depending on the prestige of the venue. External review of an exhibition is required to be considered a major work. Acceptance to group exhibitions will be more heavily weighted if juried and the selection process is rigorous (number of entrants, for example); invitational and one-person exhibitions will be weighted according to prestige of venue and may be more heavily weighted than group exhibitions. External review of juried group or one-person exhibitions is required in order to be considered a major work. Exhibition awards will also be considered as evidence of quality of professional or creative work.
4. Scholarly work that appears in publications with a national or international readership will generally be weighted more than publications with local or state readerships.
5. Unless the candidate is a co-author, providing illustrations or photographs, for example, for another's publication will be considered as a major work only if evaluated and reviewed separately.
6. For projects or products that require long periods of time to complete, considerations will be given to the importance of the work and to the demonstration of reasonable progress which has been made at the time of evaluation for promotion.
7. Consultations completed for national clients or those with a national or international reputation will be considered as an indicator of professional expectations for quality.
8. Expert witness activities will likewise be considered as representing indicators of professional expectations for quality.
9. Grants, fellowships, residency and visiting artist positions will be considered depending on the selection process, the prestige of the grantor or agency and funding.

For the award of tenure and./or promotion to the rank of associate professor, a Design faculty member's record must demonstrate a successfully developing scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as the quality and quantity of publications, product or other scholarly activities, external reviews of the candidate's work by respected scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate's regional, national, or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda.

For the award to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of scholarly, professional and creative activities, external reviews of the candidate's work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the candidate's discipline, the candidate's national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career.

SECTION 5: Service Performance Expectations

Service is an important responsibility of all faculty members that contributes to the University's performance of its larger mission. Although the nature of service activities will depend on a candidate's particular interests and abilities, service contributions are an essential part of being a good citizen of the University.

Service includes all forms of activities which cannot be properly defined as teaching, research or creative activity. All faculty members are expected to perform such service.

Indices of Service Performance

1. Involvement in national, University, and School committees that contribute to the faculty member's academic and/or professional discipline.
2. Leadership in service organizations and committees that contribute to the faculty member's academic and/or professional discipline.
3. Participation through presentations, editorial boards, grant review boards and/ or active membership in service organizations that help to disseminate new knowledge in the faculty member's academic and/or professional discipline..
5. Establishment of programs and formal structures that promote the missions of The University and the School.

Evaluation of Service Performance

In all evaluations of service, the degree to which the faculty member contributes to the missions of the University, School and Department is the primary consideration. Information concerning remunerated as well as unremunerated service activities will be reported to the University as specified by the guidelines established by the Provost.

For the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor, the record must demonstrate a pattern of service to the University at one or more levels including departmental and school, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the larger community.

For promotion to the rank of professor, the record must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the University at one or more levels (department, school) to the discipline or profession, and/or to the larger community.

SECTION 6: Administration/Service Performance Expectations

It is recognized that some faculty members are employed to work primarily in an administration/service area. For promotion in academic rank of persons whose primary assignments are in an administration/ service area, the determination must be made on the same basis and criteria as those used for persons who are engaged in normal teaching assignments. However, scholarly/creative/professional work productivity should be considered and evaluated in accordance with the amount of time allowed for such activity. This assumes that all persons holding academic rank, including administrators, have at least a minimal teaching assignment.

SECTION 7: Multi-year Lecturers

A multi-year Lecturer position is limited to the area of teaching assigned. There is no expectation for continuous engagement in a design discipline although such will be acknowledged by the Chair during Annual Evaluation. There is an expectation that multi-year Lecturers will demonstrate above-average

outcomes in their teaching responsibilities. Multi-year Lecturers are evaluated annually by the Chair using the performance expectations outlined in Section 2.

In the case of multi-year Lecturers, several conditions apply. First, the Lecturer shall adhere to the faculty codes of rights, responsibilities and conduct. Second, there is no automatic renewal implied at the end of a contract term. Third, the multi-year Lecturer may be dismissed at any time for poor performance, misconduct, budgetary reasons, program changes, enrollment declines, or because the department determines that the position would be better filled by another individual.

SECTION 8: Reappointment of Professors of the Practice

Professors of the Practice are non-tenure track faculty who possess the expertise and achievements to provide professional instruction in a manner that brings distinction to the Department of Design, the School and the University. Responsibilities of Professors of Practice include teaching, engaging in service both within and outside the university, maintaining professional credentials and continuing activity in the profession, and/or other duties that the appointing dean determines are consistent with this definition. A Professor of the Practice shall hold the terminal professional degree or have significant experience and a distinguished and contemporary record of achievement in the one of the design disciplines. The Department of Design does not assign an academic rank with this appointment as the intent of the position is to bring active, distinguished professionals onto the faculty that would merit appointment as a Professor of Practice.

In the case of Professor of Practice, several conditions apply. First, the Professor of Practice shall adhere to the faculty codes of rights, responsibilities and conduct. Second, there is no automatic renewal implied at the end of a contract term. Third, the Professor of Practice may be dismissed at any time for poor performance, misconduct, budgetary reasons, program changes, enrollment declines, or because the department determines that the position would be better filled by another individual.

The Chair, both annually as well as in the final year of their contract term, evaluates Professors of the Practice. The University responsibilities of the position include both teaching and service and thus the performance expectations outlined in Sections 3 and 5 will apply equally to Professors of the Practice with the exception that Professors of the Practice may neither serve on committees nor participate in faculty votes pertaining to tenure issues (e.g. hiring, promotion and tenure). Additionally, a continued record of achievement in the profession meritorious for the title is requisite for reappointment.