Faculty Development Standards

Section 1: Faculty Standards

Mission Statement
The School of Design serves the public good as a collaboration of diverse creative practices. Each discipline in the School has a studio-based curriculum rooted in graphical exploration, theoretical discovery, practical methods, and professional creativity.

The School educates students to represent and reshape a wide range of human experiences through innovative practices that solve problems through aesthetic and functional means.

The School of Design engages in research, scholarship, clinical and creative practice, design advocacy, and commercial activities. Our impact is measured in personal, social, cultural, and economic development that enriches life.

1.0 Faculty Standards

Introduction
The SDSU Faculty Handbook establishes the general expectations and standards for tenure and promotion of all faculty members at SDSU. The purpose of this document is to contextualize the university expectations and standards for tenure and promotion for the SDSU School of Design (SoD). This standards document, when used with the SDSU Faculty Handbook, will guide SoD faculty with regard to annual performance evaluation, tenure and promotion planning and recommendations, third year review and PDP development, and annual salary augmentation ratings within the parameters provided by the South Dakota Board of Regents Policy and the BOR/COHE Agreement.

The definitions of levels of performance (does not meet expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectations, substantially exceeds expectations) are broadly defined in Sections 5.2 and 5.3 of the SDSU Faculty Handbook and are not repeated or further clarified in this document. That section of the SDSU Faculty Handbook should be consulted during the PSE and salary decision processes. The standards described in this document are assumed to be relevant to minimum expectations for awarding tenure and promotion in the School of Design (i.e., rating level = 1: “meets expectations”).

This document is comprised of sections that describe School of Design Faculty Standards. Section 1.1 clarifies, where necessary, SoD performance standards related to rank and role. Section 1.2 clarifies the levels of performance typically expected for SoD Lecturer ranks (non tenure-track). Section 1.3 clarifies the levels of performance typically expected for tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor in the SoD. Section 1.4 clarifies the levels of performance typically expected for promotion to the rank of full Professor in the SoD.
1.1 Performance Standards Related to Rank and Role
The SDSU Faculty Handbook describes the general performance standards related to rank and role for all faculty members at SDSU. The purpose of this section is to clearly define, only where necessary, those performance standards and indicators as they apply to the School of Design.

Teaching and Advising
The expectations, standards of good practice and performance standards for teaching and advising found in the SDSU Faculty Handbook require no additional clarification for the School of Design.

Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities
Research, scholarship and creative activities within the School of Design are evidenced in several forms: publication of research results in peer-reviewed journals, exhibitions of creative work, competitive awards, clinical practice, including design, creative, planned and built work, professional activity within the discipline, presentation of scholarly activity at peer-reviewed regional/national/international conferences, and peer-reviewed publication/presentation of research involving students or other faculty investigators. The scholarly results expected of this work may also include the development and submission of competitive research grant proposals, both internal and external. Creative activities may potentially reach a wide audience through such venues as public and private exhibition, building, planning, installations, trade publications, special edition books, magazines, and web design projects. In scientific fields, public scholarship encompasses both dissemination through peer reviewed publication and the transfer of intellectual property into appropriate channels for the benefit of society. Appendix A lists examples (not an exhaustive list) of common journals, conferences and symposia recognized by the School of Design.

Primary performance indicators for research, scholarship and creative activities in the School of Design include:

- Published peer-reviewed journal articles
- Peer-reviewed presentations given at international, national, regional, and state conferences recognized by the profession or discipline
- Competitive research grant proposals submitted and funded (including funding level and percent responsibility)
- Invited presentations at recognized international, national, regional, and state conferences
- Peer-reviewed investigative professional practice, commissions, exhibitions, design, consulting, planned and built work (refer to “Professional Activity” section below)
- Faculty directed student research or creative work that results in peer-reviewed publication, exhibition, award, or conference presentation.

It is customary in the design disciplines for the “lead” author to list his/her name first on the list of authors of peer reviewed publications unless the co-author(s) are students working under the supervision of the faculty member. It is important for a faculty member to demonstrate competence as a lead author/PI for at least some of his/her scholarly publications. Faculty should describe the nature of their participation and their specific contribution to all collaborative scholarly and creative activities. Throughout a faculty member’s career, there should be a trajectory showing increasing competence in
his/her field of expertise through lead authorship on scholarly publications. Judgments must also address the quality as well as the quantity of scholarship.

Professional Activity and Practice

The SoD recognizes that a faculty member’s professional activity and practice may be linked directly to his/her teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activity, and encourages such activity as beneficial to students, faculty, and the university community. It remains, however, the responsibility of the individual faculty member to demonstrate activity and practice as having academic merit, through processes that should include peer review, professional recognition, commissions, extramural funding, or other recognized means.

Professional activity is related to creative, scholarly work within the discipline and for the benefit the entire faculty and university community. Professional practice is more specifically related to the faculty member’s continued work within the professional realm of the discipline. Professional practice is encouraged by the SoD as relating directly to a faculty member’s continuing education and ongoing professional development, service to the discipline, teaching responsibility, and possibly scholarship and creative activity. It is, however, left to the individual faculty member to show the creative or scholarly merits of professional practice in the context of his/her role on the faculty, and with respect for the process of tenure and promotion.

Peer Review for Professional Activity and Practice: A faculty member may seek external peer review for professional activity and practice. This type of review may be distinct from other scholarly or creative work that contains a built-in peer review process. The external peer reviewer’s focus is to provide an objective assessment of the intellectual merit, disciplinary contribution, and impact of the faculty member’s professional activity and practice. As specified in Section 12 under External Peer Review in the Faculty Handbook, a valid external review of individual work must be appropriate in several ways: sufficient in number (at least three reviewers external to SDSU); conducted by individuals who hold appropriate expertise within the disciplinary field; and from objective reviewers without conflict of interest. All letters received must be included in the review. The process for selecting external peer reviewers for an individual scholarly or creative product will be the same as that specified in Section 12 of the Faculty Handbook for selecting external reviewers for Tenure and Promotion. The use of the procedure already in place to select external reviewers for tenure and promotion dossiers is aimed at ensuring the integrity and validity of external peer reviews of individual professional activities and practice.

General Service

The expectations, standards of good practice and performance standards for general service to the department, SoD and university found in the SDSU Faculty Handbook, require no clarification for the School of Design. Service to the discipline typically takes the form of serving on professional committees and organizations specific to the design disciplines, serving as a peer reviewer for projects and research submitted for conferences or journals, and serving as a coordinator or juror for exhibitions, design competitions, and student projects. Judgments must focus as much on the quality of the service or outreach as the on the quantity. Evaluation should also be measured based on the impact of the service.
Faculty may also have assigned professional service responsibilities as defined by their job description. Some faculty will have a significant portion of their workload assigned to this area. Some examples include acting as studio coordinator, professional program coordinator, accreditation coordinator, or coordinator to professional and related trade/industry organizations. These roles should support the SoD and/or the individual department, and provide potential for teaching and student interaction.

Because the School of Design is a new unit at SDSU (established in 2015), evidence of activity in service may be more highly regarded in combination with teaching and research/creative activities. This service often supports teaching and research/creative activity, and may be assigned as such. Examples may include working to coordinate overall curriculum and course sequence, establishing SoD policies with regard to faculty, students and staff, facilities, academics, outreach and overall mission, and service in advancing or maintaining departmental accreditation.

1.2 Expectations for Promotion within Lecturer Ranks in SoD

Introduction
The process and general criteria for change of rank are described in the SDSU Faculty Handbook, specifically the section “Rank Adjustment of Term Faculty Members.” Non-tenure track faculty are issued contracts annually; therefore it is possible to change rank when a new contract is issued. This review should include input from peers and a recommendation then made to the appropriate administrator as to which rank is most appropriate. Changes in term rank are an institutional decision and do not go the Board of Regents for final approval.

Teaching
Promotion and change of rank are based on teaching performance. The expectations, standards of good practice and performance standards for teaching found in the SDSU Faculty Handbook require no additional clarification for the School of Design.

Service
General service may be assigned as a marginal part of the role of a non-tenure track faculty. Such activity remains secondary to teaching responsibilities. Service performance will normally not be emphasized for purposes of promotion and change of rank.

1.3 Expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor in SoD

Introduction
The process and general criteria for tenure and promotion are described in the SDSU Faculty Handbook. Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor normally occur simultaneously at SDSU—normally in the sixth year of successful teaching and research. Keep in mind the key question that will be asked during this process: Is it in the best interest of SDSU to promote and tenure this candidate? Thus, it is advisable for the department, the SoD, and the faculty member to ensure that clear standards of performance are delineated so there is no doubt about the answer to this question!

Tenure with promotion requires high quality performance in at least two of the three major roles performed by faculty members. In most cases for the School of Design, those two roles will be teaching and research/creative activities, with evidence of activity in service. Secondly, the faculty member must show that he/she is on a trajectory for eventual promotion to full Professor. Thus, it is important to
show evidence of this type of performance trajectory and potential at this stage of the tenure and promotion process.

**Teaching**

Teaching performance in the design disciplines are evaluated through the use of student teaching evaluations (currently IDEA evaluation), peer observation and/or department head evaluation of teaching, and evidence of a faculty member’s sustained commitment to continuously improve the process of teaching and learning.

IDEA evaluations should show a solid record of teaching across classes assigned to the faculty member during the period of performance along with a trajectory that will eventually lead to performance ratings in the range of 4.0—5.0 as an Associate Professor. It is reasonable and appropriate to interpret student evaluation of instruction with an awareness and understanding of the course objectives as well as responses to the contextual qualities of specific courses. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, IDEA data should account for no more than 25% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Peer observation and/or department head evaluation of teaching in the design disciplines follow a process designed to show performance in lecture organization, classroom lecture ability, studio/workshop teaching ability, student engagement, and student assessment. The process has been designed to be objective in nature and a fair and unbiased assessment of the faculty member by his/her senior colleagues or department head. A primary method of peer observation within the design disciplines occurs during student reviews and juries, common in studio and workshop courses. Both SoD faculty and qualified professionals should be regularly included in such reviews, and a standardized evaluation for feedback, comment and reflection may be established by the SoD or department head. Another method of peer or department head observation, using trained peer observers, follows a standardized process such as the procedure developed by the Teaching and Learning Center. Faculty performance once again should show steady initial improvement and maintenance at a consistently high level of teaching. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, peer observation should account for no more than 35% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Faculty must demonstrate a serious and sustained commitment to continuously improving the quality of the process of teaching and learning. Participation in professional development activities sponsored through the Teaching and Learning Center or other professional seminars or workshops aimed at effectively implementing high impact educational activities into teaching is one way of meeting this expectation. In some instances it will also be possible for the faculty member to show direct student performance from scholarship on teaching and learning (or other learning outcome assessment data or performance) on peer reviewed or recognized student exhibitions, awards, or presentations of creative work. Such data is appropriate as evidence for justifying tenure and promotion. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, commitment to continuous improvement should account for no more than 15% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Faculty are expected to maintain a D2L or other online presence in all courses with course syllabi and materials (e.g., course content, exercises/assignments, grading rubrics, reading material, procedures for
and results of evaluation) provided as evidence for assessment of teaching. Faculty are also expected to collect or document creative work produced by students as evidence for assessment of teaching. This is especially important in studio/workshop courses. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, D2L or other online course presence and materials, combined with a portfolio that includes a range of student outcomes should account for no more than 25% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Note: Additional materials appropriate for evaluation of teaching are identified in Section 5.4 of the SDSU Faculty Handbook.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
Research, scholarship, and creative activities in the SoD are characterized by the commonality that these activities have undergone peer review, review by jury, or some form of external professional judgment, rating, or evaluation prior to publication or presentation. It is this review by a panel of professional peers that makes judgments of the quality of the contribution possible. Research performance should be weighted according to assigned workload. Expectations of traditional research and scholarship are described in the SDSU Faculty Handbook and require no additional clarification for the SoD.

For the SoD, creative activity is regarded as the equivalent of scholarly publication or scientific research in determining the basis for appointment and advancement in rank and salary. The amount of scholarly effort devoted to creative activity varies depending on a faculty member’s role. In the design disciplines, creative activities may take the form of built work, exhibitions, technical, digital or material exploration, planning, interdisciplinary collaboration, publication of design work, invited residency, or other clinical or professional activity related to the discipline. A minimum of three significant projects, in any combination of examples suggested above, would be an indication of satisfactory progress in research, scholarship and creative activity for a faculty member with a 20% research assignment. An increased research assignment requires increased output. It remains the requirement of the faculty member to demonstrate the value of all research, scholarship and creative activity, and the quality and impact of scholarly contribution transcends the quantity of contribution.

Creative activity, professional activity, and professional practice must be externally peer-reviewed in order for credit to be given in the tenure and promotion process. Also, the activity will, in whole or in part, have been performed, published, created, presented or exhibited during the evaluation period. Such activity may be submitted to blind peer review in the appropriate discipline or to peer reviewers in academia who hold expertise in the same area, of appropriate rank, and who are employed at institutions with programs in design that are comparable in size, scope, and/or mission. Professional activity and practice may be submitted to a blind peer review in the appropriate discipline that hold professional expertise for such work. When review is not blind, external peer reviewers are selected in consultation with the department head. Faculty may submit for review a single creative project, or an entire series of projects. A juried invitation to exhibit, a juried design project, a published journal review, or an acceptance into a professional peer-reviewed venue, is considered the equivalent of external peer review.
Evidence of grantsmanship is quantified by numbers of external grants, size of the award, and percent responsibility. Internal (within the BOR/university system) grants are excellent starting points but must be considered as leverage for obtaining external funding.

Collaboration with other professionals and disciplines is evidenced through work with multiple investigators on grants and through publications, presentations, and/or exhibitions with co-authors or within a design team. The incorporation of students into the process of discovery speaks to both the process of teaching and learning, and to research, scholarship, and creative activity. Faculty should address work with students under teaching performance but may also include specific intellectual products produced through this collaboration as evidence of research, scholarship, and/or creative activity.

Service

Service performance is the third area of faculty responsibility but will normally not be emphasized for purposes of promotion to Associate Professor and tenure, unless assigned professional service or service toward the establishment of the new School of Design are made explicit by the director or department head. Service to the SoD or individual department may be assigned to support the faculty’s roles in teaching and creative activity. Where applicable, faculty should show active service to their professional organization(s) at this point in their careers. A trajectory should be apparent that indicates the faculty member is becoming increasingly engaged with professional and/or disciplinary organizations. General service to the department, the SoD, and the College should also be evident.

1.4 Expectations for Promotion to Professor in SoD

Introduction

The process and general criteria for promotion are described in the SDSU Faculty Handbook. Promotion to full Professor normally occurs sometime after five years of successful performance in the Associate Professor rank. Unlike the fixed time allotted for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, application for full Professor may be submitted later than five years in the Associate Professor rank whenever the candidate feels they are properly prepared for promotion.

The key characteristics of the full Professor is that they are at the peak of their career, are nationally or internationally recognized, and give indications of sustaining this high level of productivity. High levels of performance in all three roles of teaching, research/creative activity, and service are the hallmark of a full Professor. Those recommending promotion to full Professor believe that it is in the best interests of SDSU to do so and clearly feel the candidate has the ability and will continue to sustain this level of contribution.

Teaching

Teaching performance is accomplished in a similar fashion as promotion to Associate Professor with indications of higher quality performance. Teaching performance in the design disciplines are evaluated through the use of student teaching evaluations (currently IDEA evaluation), peer observation and department head evaluation of teaching, and evidence of a faculty member’s sustained commitment to continuously improve the process of teaching and learning.
IDEA evaluations should show a solid record of teaching across classes assigned to the faculty member during the period of performance that will show improvement or maintenance at a consistently high level in the range of 4.0—5.0 as a full Professor. It is reasonable and appropriate to interpret student evaluation of instruction with an awareness and understanding of the course objectives as well as responses to the contextual qualities of specific courses. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, IDEA data should account for no more than 25% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Peer observation and/or department head evaluation of teaching in the design disciplines follow a process designed to show performance in lecture organization, classroom lecture ability, studio/workshop teaching ability, student engagement, and student assessment. The process has been designed to be objective in nature and a fair and unbiased assessment of the faculty member by his/her senior colleagues or department head. A primary method of peer observation within the design disciplines occurs during student reviews and juries, common in studio and workshop courses. Both SoD faculty and qualified professionals should be regularly included in such reviews, and a standardized evaluation for feedback, comment and reflection may be established by the SoD or department head. Another method of peer or department head observation, using trained peer observers, follows a standardized process such as the procedure developed by the Teaching and Learning Center. Faculty performance once again should show improvement and maintenance at a consistently high level of teaching. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, peer observation should account for no more than 35% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Faculty must demonstrate a serious and sustained commitment to continuously improving the quality of the process of teaching and learning. Participation in professional development activities sponsored through the Teaching and Learning Center or other professional seminars or workshops aimed at effectively implementing high impact educational activities into teaching is one way of meeting this expectation. In some instances it will also be possible for the faculty member to show direct student performance from scholarship on teaching and learning (or other learning outcome assessment data or performance) on peer reviewed or recognized student exhibitions, awards, or presentations of creative work. Such data is appropriate as evidence for justifying tenure and promotion. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, commitment to continuous improvement should account for no more than 15% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Faculty are expected to maintain a D2L or other online presence in all courses with course syllabi and materials (e.g., course content, exercises/assignments, grading rubrics, reading material, procedures for and results of evaluation) provided as evidence for assessment of teaching. Faculty are also expected to collect or document creative work produced by students as evidence for assessment of teaching. This is especially important in studio/workshop courses. As evidence of the quality of the process of teaching and learning achieved by the instructor, D2L or other online course presence and materials, combined with a portfolio that includes a range of student outcomes should account for no more than 25% of the evaluation of teaching performance.

Faculty must demonstrate a leadership role in their teaching that includes a range of activities including but not limited to accreditation self-study, assessment, curriculum coordination etc. These activities must meet national professional standards and/or peer review.
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities

Research, scholarship, and creative activity performance is accomplished in a similar fashion as promotion to Associate Professor (Section 1.3 above) with indications of higher performance and the ability to sustain this level of contribution. The full Professor level is characterized by continued peer-reviewed scholarly publications, presentations, exhibitions, and grantsmanship that reflect national/international recognition in the faculty member’s field of expertise. Evidence of leadership and in directing research and creative activity should be increasingly evident.

In the SoD, creative activities may take the form of built work, exhibitions, technical, digital or material exploration, planning, inter-disciplinary collaboration, publication of design work, invited residency, invitations to exhibit or provide design expertise, or other clinical or professional activity or practice related to the discipline. Research performance should be weighted according to assigned workload. The quality and impact of scholarly contribution transcends the quantity of contribution. Evidence of ongoing and sustained research productivity must be present for promotion to full Professor. Leadership, professional reputation and national visibility should be evident, and is more significant than any quantifiable list or accounting of projects. In addition, promotion to full Professor will consider the total body of work completed since the last promotion. A longer period suggests a greater amount and/or impact of scholarly contribution, just as an increased research assignment requires increased output. Performance takes place over the entire time frame in which the work occurs. It remains the requirement of the faculty member to demonstrate the value of all research, scholarship and creative activity.

Grantsmanship performance should be indicative of a well-developed research program that has also attained national/international recognition.

Multidisciplinary collaboration should be evident in both publications and grantsmanship through work with coinvestigators and co-authors outside of the department, SoD and College. These collaborations may also be used to justify national/international recognition.

Service

Service performance is more important at the full Professor level to show national or international stature and service to one’s profession or discipline. Key roles may include reviewing journal articles, editorial board member, journal editor, leadership positions in professional organizations (administrative board members, session organizer, conference organization, etc.) and national/international memberships on key advisory boards and committees.

Leadership in service within the SoD should be evident. Because the School of Design is a new program at SDSU (established in 2015), evidence of internal service activity to the individual department and SoD may be more highly considered. This service often supports teaching and research/creative activity, and may be assigned as such. It may also include oversight and coordination of accreditation, development of policies, self studies and other reports, and outreach to the professional community.
Service to the college and university should also be evident. This service should support college and university committees, the faculty senate, task forces, and other initiatives. Evaluation of service activities are based on the impact of the service.
Appendix A: Most common peer-reviewed technical journals and conferences/symposia for recognized scholarly work

The following lists are not exhaustive but do reflect respected peer-reviewed journals and conferences in the design disciplines:

Peer-reviewed journals:


Peer-reviewed conferences/symposia:

- Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA), Council of Educators in Landscape Architecture (CELA), Interior Design Educators Council (IDEC), National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD)
- University and College Designers Association (UCDA)
- College Art Association (CAA)
- Foundations in Art: Theory and Education (FATE)
- National Conference on the Beginning Design Student (NCBDS)
- Environmental Design and Research Associations (EDRA)
- Design Communication Association (DCA)
- International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation (ICERI)
- Professional conferences: AIA, ASLA, ASID, AIGA, USGBC, etc.
- technical and trade conferences: digital, software, fabrication, construction techniques and processes