FEBRUARY 16, 2015

OSU DEPARTMENT OF DESIGN   SP 2015

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA   NO. 06

Present: M.A. Beecher (presiding), Peter Chan, Scott Denison, Chris Edbrooke, Carol Gill, Polly Graham, Rebekah Matheny, Noel Mayo, Susan Melsop, Paul Nini, Maria Palazzi, Alan Price, Liz Sanders, Scott Shim, Brian Stone, Gabe Tippery, Roozbeh Valamanesh

Absent: Jeff Haase

ACHIEVEMENTS

Mary Anne Beecher and Maria Palazzi received a $15,000 *Arts & Humanities Larger Grant: Continuing and Completion* from the OSU College of Arts and Sciences for "From Mediated Experience to Sense of Place: Seeding the Campus Environment to Reveal Hidden Stories."

Accepted for publication: Lavender S., Sommerich C., **Sanders, E.B.-N**., Patterson E.S., Evans K., Park S., Li J., Umar R. (2015) Hospital patient room design: Understanding the issues facing 23 occupational groups who work in medical/surgical patient rooms, *Health Environments Research & Design Journal.*

One of Alan Price's recent works, *The Conspirators*, will appear in the second edition of the book *Digital Character Development: Theory and Practice*, by Rob O'Neill. Two of Alan's earlier works, *Empire of Sleep* (2009) and *Tartarus* (2006) will also appear as they did in the first edition, with illustrations and overviews of the works in a chapter on case studies of interactive digital characters.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Update on fundraising efforts/development initiatives

- Lighting upgrade proposed:
  - The department is seeking funding from Lutron to support the control systems for new lighting on Rooms 211, 222, 130 and 105. Noel Mayo and Rebekah Matheny have both been very helpful in developing the plans/proposal for an upgrade in lighting and control systems for these spaces.
- Alumni:
  - Give names to Mary Anne of any alumni you might suggest to join an Alumni Advisory Board.
- 50 for 50 campaign: Opportunities for giving will be highlighted more heavily on our web site
- Other web site updates:
  - Alice Grischchenko has taken a website content editor course and is working with Mary Anne and Gabe on updates to our website. Alice has been looking at other university's websites. She has been taking photographs and will be working with faculty members to video-record statements about their research. Please continue to send photos and notifications of photo opportunities.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

- Search Committee update – A final phone interview will be held this Wednesday and then the committee will deliberate about the final short list of persons to be invited to campus
- Graduate Program Committee update (update on phone interviews)
  - Polly will contact applicants to set up interviews that will begin by the end of the week.
  - A basic list of questions will be formed prior to the interviews.
- Peer Review of Teaching Committee
  - Reviews will include a review of teaching materials, a class visit and a discussion with the faculty member and the reviewer. This is an addition to last year's process.
  - If you want an extra review outside of the pre-set schedule, please let Liz Sanders know so that the committee can try to accommodate the request. If additional reviewers are needed, please let Mary Anne know.
- Promotion and Tenure Committee re: application for promotion
  - This year's college deadline for receiving notification of faculty members going up for promotion and a list of external reviewers for those faculty members is March 23, 2015.
  - We will use the term "Screening" to differentiate the pre-review with the committee from the actual non-mandatory review (the promotion review itself).
  - Alterations to our APT document will be proposed by the P&T committee and Mary Anne based on confusion that this process has raised this year.
  - Please realize that by requesting a screening, you are committing to going up for a promotion review next year if the screening result recommends that you do so.

NEW BUSINESS

- Re-framing the "first year review"—what and when
  - A change to the review process was discussed at length. Some of the issues raised centered on how this new process would interface with the role of the two persons who have worked with each student, and ultimately, how it would interface with the advisor and thesis committee; how we would establish the outcome and what terms we should use to describe the outcome; how we should collect submissions from students in advance and much time we should allow for each student's presentation; how results would be communicated to the students; how the process might differ for students in the two tracks; and whether or not the timing of the subsequent presentation dates is appropriate.
  - We agreed that this process can support the role of the two-person committee by providing constructive feedback to students in writing that could reflect perceptions of strengths and weaknesses in their proposed work; that once the feedback is in

the hands of the students and their advisors, it would be up to the advisors to oversee how the issues are addressed; that outcomes should be framed in terms of "satisfactory progress," "progress needs improvement," and unsatisfactory progress;" that satisfactory progress would be determined by whether or not the students receive the support of 2/3 of the faculty members; that we will collect submissions using a Buckeye Box instead of Slideroom and that presentations will be 15 minutes each with 15 minutes of dialogue with each student; that results of the review will be communicated in writing along with constructive feedback summarized by the Graduate Program Chair; that students in the DAIM program will make a presentation at the end of each of the their first two years; and that subsequent presentation dates should be pushed back to October and January to ensure that students have the help of their advisors during September prior to resubmitting.

- The discussion revealed many diverse perspectives on the role of the review and how it should be administered. A majority of the faculty voted in support of trying this new model this year with the amendments agreed upon. We will assess its success after trying it.

- Fee proposal update/technology audit plan discussion
    - The department administration is preparing a program or course fee proposal for submission to the college.
    - We have collected data about what other design programs charge as program or course fees.
    - A survey has been distributed to the undergrad students and 75% are in support of considering a fee, although most prefer the idea of fees attached to specific courses instead of a program-wide fee.
    - Some students have commented that the tech fee they pay now is not providing adequate technology. Many of our computers and printers are not performing reliably.
    - Students favor having access to fewer better printers that they would have to pay to use.
    - Mary Anne will have Darwin oversee a technology audit in our spaces and asks that students identify equipment that is not working with a sign.
    - The goal is to be more strategic with how we are expending our fee money so that we are meeting students' needs (and instructional requirements).

- Foundations Program delivery model discussion
    - The two goals for considering change are to be able to accommodate more students (especially major-changers and transfer students) and to expose a broader number of students to our foundations courses in order to attract the very best students to the majors.

- One way of addressing this is to have the minor and foundations courses be more integrated.
- Another is to broaden the range of students who can try to study design. Gabe made the point that there are many students who never get the chance because of the rigidity of our entry sequence and the size restriction of the program.
- While it is alright to consider the role a portfolio might play in evaluating students for admission, it might be more productive to think about what we can teach them in one or two semesters that will reveal their potential as successful designers.
- Interviewing incoming students could be a future option.
- Nothing can be done for this coming academic year, but we need to start thinking now about whether making further changes to the foundations program would yield advantages we don't currently enjoy.

- Undergraduate curriculum issues: Design Research undergraduate sequence/delivery options
  - We will discuss the Design Research undergraduate sequence/delivery options at the next meeting.
  - DSN 4200 has been broken into two sections but we need to figure out how to deliver the content of 3200 and who would do it.

Rebekah Matheny requested meetings with representatives of Visual Communication Design and Industrial Design so that the new materials library can attempt to acquire samples of materials that each disciplines would like to see represented. She is being assisted with this project this term by a GTA and much progress has been made on organizing the space and setting up some procedures for its use. It also has a new scanner for digitizing samples.

UPCOMING MEETINGS and EVENTS
2/23   Graduate Studies Committee Meeting
3/9   Department Faculty Meeting
3/23   Graduate Studies Committee Meeting

ADJOURNMENT
Roozbeh Valamanesh motioned to adjourn meeting, Susan Melsop seconded at 12:00 PM