

APPENDIX A

Procedures for Tenure and Promotion Mission Statement and Appropriate Faculty Activities *[revised by the SOM faculty, 2/14/01]*

Mission of the School of Music

The Texas Tech University School of Music provides a professional environment that stimulates the highest standards of excellence in music education, research, performance, creativity, and service.

Faculty activities to promote the mission

The activities of the faculty that are necessary to promote the mission of the School of Music fall into three categories: teaching, professional activity, and service. To qualify for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and/or to receive annual performance evaluations of “meets expectations” or better, a faculty member should contribute significantly in all areas.

Music faculty and the doctorate

Many academic areas expect the possession of the doctorate as a prerequisite for entry into university teaching. In the performing arts, many outstanding musicians choose other routes to the achievement of musical eminence. The experience and qualifications of each candidate in the School of Music will be evaluated on an individual basis.

Definitions

Teaching

Teaching represents the most important single responsibility of faculty in the School of Music. It is expected that each member of the faculty will excel in teaching. Enthusiasm for teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest levels possible are important attributes of the faculty member. Specific to faculty personnel actions and annual faculty evaluation, “teaching” refers to undergraduate and graduate courses and activities within the School of Music, the Fine Arts Doctoral program, and the Honors College.

Teaching activities: 1) courses carrying load credit, 2) courses/labs carrying no credit, 3) special studies/theses or dissertation direction, 4) advising, 5) graduate committee work, and 6) performance/conducting as part of teaching assignment.

Activities directly related to teaching: 1) class preparation, 2) class assessment, 3) proficiency examinations/juries, 4) student recitals/hearings, 5) individual help to students, 6) attending concerts of one’s own students.

Activities closely related to teaching: 1) recruiting and retention, 2) new course development, 3) program development, 4) unassigned student advisement, 5) recital committee, 6) professional development related to teaching, 7) grant activities related to teaching, 8) other activities approved by the Director.

Research and creative activity

Professional activity is an important means by which faculty establish credibility and gain respect within the professional and academic ranks. It is expected that each member of the faculty will pursue professional activities appropriate to his/her field of specialization. For academic faculty whose area of specialization is music history, music theory, music education, and music technology, these activities approximate, but are not limited to, traditional research. For performance faculty and composers, professional activity includes performance and other forms of "creative activity." Creative activity may include compositions, arrangements, pedagogical presentations, guest conducting appearances, adjudication nationally or internationally, and other activities not falling under the definition of teaching or service. The following are examples of research and creative activity in the School of Music:

Publication: 1) book (monograph or text) or music edition, 2) published recording/video, 3) article in a refereed professional journal, 4) book or music review, 5) computer software. Electronic publications are recognized as being appropriate.

Research: 1) award or grant of significance to the university, 2) presentation of a paper at a local, state, regional, national, or international meeting, 3) publication of study or survey relating to faculty member's area of specialization.

Composition/Arrangement: 1) receipt of commission or prize, 2) performance by a major musical organization or soloist, 3) performance at another university, at an established arts organization, or at a festival, 4) publication of composition/arrangement, 5) local performance.

Conducting: 1) with major musical organization outside region, 2) at another university, 3) within state but outside local area, 4) with high school honor groups/ensembles in public schools, 5) local conducting other than as required part of teaching.

Performance: Public performance of music relevant to a faculty member's assignment within the School of Music is defined appropriately as professional activity. Commercial music performances are not considered relevant except when directly related to a faculty member's area of specialization. Performance activities include: 1) international/national performances, 2) regional/state performances, 3) primary local performances which include solo or chamber music performances, and 4) secondary local performances which include those with larger ensembles and other less significant presentations. Primary local performance is considered more significant than secondary local performance and receives more credit in tenure and promotion considerations. No amount of local performance on its own constitutes enough professional activity to justify tenure or promotion.

Pedagogical presentations: 1) international, national, regional, state, and local presentations intended to deliver instructional methodologies or techniques, or 2) teaching activities at other universities, schools, or conservatories outside the local area.

Adjudication: international or national level competitions.

When a faculty member has teaching assignments in two or more different areas, professional activity in his/her primary specialization is most important and is required for tenure and promotion. Professional activity in a secondary specialization is optional. It is not uncommon for some faculty to have professional activities in more than one of the three designated categories (Research/Creative Activity/Performance). Faculty members are evaluated on both quantity of work and quality of the publication/performance/presentation venue. Also considered is the sphere of influence (location, nature of audience) and critical review if any exists.

Preparation for and research done to support the normal teaching load of the faculty member is not considered Professional Activity. Actual on-campus performances with and conducting of ensembles assigned as part of the faculty member's teaching load are not considered in this category.

Expectations for research and creative activity: academic faculty

Research and publication are essential for faculty positions in music history, music theory, music education, and music technology. Both quantity and quality are to be considered, but special emphasis is placed on quality and originality. Work in progress also may be assessed. The research/publication accomplishments should be significant contributions to scholarship and a steady record of productivity is essential. Refereed publications are given the most credit, although non-refereed publications also may be considered. It is understood that some academic faculty perform, write, edit, compose, consult, produce professional recordings, and participate in a wide variety of other professional activities. However, each faculty member's primary efforts should be directed toward those activities expected in the area of his/her appointment.

Music history: 1) publication of books, monographs, chapters in books, computer software, 2) publication of refereed articles and reviews, including those in electronic journals, 3) presentation of papers or participation on panels at professional society meetings or other campuses, 4) editor of journal or scholarly edition of music, 5) research grants, and 6) musical performances, commissions, professional recordings, video presentations informed by the candidate's scholarly research.

Music theory: 1) publication of books, monographs, chapters in books, computer software, 2) publication of refereed articles and reviews, including those in electronic journals, 3) presentation of papers or participation on panels at professional society meetings or other campuses, 4) editor of journal or scholarly edition of music, 5) research grants, 6) musical performances, commissions, professional recordings, video presentations informed by the candidate's scholarly research, and 7) publication of compositions or arrangements.

Music education: 1) publication of books, monographs, chapters in books, computer software, 2) publication of refereed articles and reviews, including those in electronic journals, 3) pedagogical presentations at seminars, workshops, and conferences, 4) editor of journal or scholarly edition of music, 5) research grants, 6) musical performances, commissions, professional recordings, video presentations informed by the candidate's scholarly activity, and 7) publication of compositions or arrangements.

Music technology: 1) publication of books, monographs, chapters in books, computer software, 2) publication of refereed articles and reviews, including those in electronic journals, 3) pedagogical presentations at seminars, workshops, and conferences, 4) editor of journal or scholarly edition of music, 5) research grants, 6) musical performances, commissions, professional recordings, video presentations informed by the candidate's scholarly activity, and 7) publication of compositions or arrangements.

Expectations for research and creative activity: performance faculty

Studio faculty: 1) significant public performance as a soloist and/or chamber musician, 2) other performance at the local, regional, national, or international level, and 3) pedagogical presentations at workshops, seminars, and conferences. Contribution to professional journals is also encouraged.

Ensemble conductor/director: 1) guest conducting appearances, 2) performances at professional meetings with TTU student ensembles, 3) pedagogical presentations at workshops, seminars, and conferences, and 4) other as approved by the Director of the School of Music. Scholarly publications such as articles, editions, and arrangements are encouraged.

Composers: 1) commissions, 2) performance of works, 3) new compositions, and 4) publications.

Professional service

Service utilizes one's professional expertise in the School, College, University, local community, and professional arena. Performances for most religious services and for events of lesser artistic importance are considered service. Clinics of a non-pedagogical nature and adjudication at the local and state levels are considered service. The following are examples of professional service:

Departmental, College, University service: 1) area chair, 2) committee chair/project director, and 3) committee member.

Clinics/workshops/presentations: 1) local/area music organizations and all public schools, 2) hosting/organizing symposia, clinics, recitals, and guest artists, and 3) other non-pedagogical events.

State/regional/national professional organizations: 1) officer in an organization, 2) referee for journal or member of an editorial board, 3) chair/member of a committee, 4) member, and 5) attend meeting.

Adjudication: 1) local 2) state 3) national 4) international

Public service in a professional capacity: 1) member of community arts organization, 2) performance/lecture at service club, 3) performance with church music programs, 4) recital/chamber music performance in public schools, and 5) other performances on campus.

Performance: 1) religious service or funeral, 2) recruiting activity, and 3) other performance of a service nature.

Criteria and procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure **University-wide criteria and procedures for personnel actions**

General criteria and procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure are set forth in the Texas Tech University [Faculty Handbook](#). Additional criteria for the School of Music are outlined in this Handbook. There are also criteria and procedures for the College of Visual & Performing Arts, which are available online, or in the School of Music or Dean's offices. See Appendix D for specific web addresses related to Promotion & Tenure Standards and Procedures.

School of Music criteria for reappointment and promotion

Assistant Professor [reappointment]

1. Evidence of excellence in teaching. Documented evidence will be required, including evaluation by peers and students.
2. Evidence that there is potential for achieving a position of leadership in the profession as a scholar, performer, composer, or pedagogue.
3. Evidence of service to school, college, university, or profession.

Associate Professor [promotion/comprehensive performance evaluation]

1. Continuing evidence of excellence in teaching.
2. Clear indication that the candidate has achieved some degree of national recognition and stature through publication of significant scholarly works or instructional materials, or through significant performances or compositions.
3. Evidence of service to school, college, university, or profession.
4. Evidence of significant contributions to the university's graduate programs through such activities as teaching graduate courses, service on thesis or dissertation committees, or supervising graduate students.
5. Promise for future growth.

Professor [promotion/comprehensive performance evaluation]

1. Continuing evidence of excellence in teaching.
2. Documented evidence that the candidate has achieved a position of distinction in the profession as scholar, through major publications; as an artist-teacher, through performances having national or international significance and the ability to attract outstanding students to the studio; as a composer or theorist, through compositions of major significance or scholarly works in analysis; or as a pedagogue, through the development of nationally used teaching material and national prominence as a lecturer, consultant, or workshop director.
3. Evidence of a clear and continuing record of significant involvement in the University's graduate programs through such activities as teaching of graduate courses, service on thesis or dissertation committees, or supervising graduate students.
4. Evidence of service to school, college, university, or profession.

School of Music criteria for tenure

1. Evidence of excellence in teaching. Documented evidence will be required, including evaluation by peers and students.

2. Clear indication that the candidate has achieved some degree of national recognition and stature through publication of significant scholarly works or instructional materials, or through significant performances or compositions.
 3. Evidence of service to school, college, university, or profession.
 4. Evidence of significant contributions to the university's graduate programs through such activities as teaching graduate courses, service on thesis or dissertation committees, or supervising graduate students.
- Promise for future growth.

At every level, evidence of excellence in teaching is required; however, teaching ability unsupported by professional growth as demonstrated by significant publications, performance, or compositions will not be adequate to justify promotion.

Professional service is a valued component in the overall assessment of a candidate's activities. Service alone, however, would rarely, if ever justify tenure or promotion to a higher rank.

At no level will length of appointment alone be considered adequate justification for promotion.

Faculty members applying for both tenure and promotion must receive a separate vote on each issue; one vote for tenure and a separate vote for promotion.

Instrument for evaluation

Candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure are evaluated on the standards outlined in the previous section of this document (i.e., "School of Music Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion," or "School of Music Criteria for Tenure." Within the School of Music, candidates first will be evaluated by a peer review committee (Formal Evaluation Committee [FEC]), then by the full eligible faculty, then by the Director. Specific activities will be evaluated as follows:

Teaching: Peer review committee members should visit the class, lessons, or rehearsals at least two times. When making an evaluation of teaching of courses, the following items should be considered: 1) organization of the presentation, 2) communication skills (including written and oral), 3) knowledge of subject matter, 4) appropriateness of method, 5) teacher responsiveness to students, and 6) enthusiasm and energy. When reviewing other activities classified as teaching, the committee member should rely upon documentation presented by the candidate and student interviews.

Research and creative activity: Evaluation of professional activity must take into consideration the amount of work and the quality of the work. Evaluators should look for an established record of creative output over the course of time. Quality of written activity might be established by considering the publishing house used, the reputation of a journal, whether or not the journal is juried in its article selection, and the value of the work to the field. Quality of work in the performance area might be determined by documented reviews, recordings, established performance record over time, and quality and reputation of performance venues. Peer review committee members should consult appropriate citations in this document for other indicators of performance in the area of professional activity. Peer evaluation committee members should read the publications of a candidate. Performance faculty should provide a recording of recent performances for peer committee and other faculty review.

Professional service: Evaluation of service activities might vary with each faculty member under consideration. Each job demands different types and levels of commitment to service. The

committee member should consider the types of service appropriate for each position and evaluate the impact of this service upon the department and the University.

School of Music
Mentor System and Evaluation Committee Structures
(Approved by faculty - Fall semester 2004)

Mentoring System

:

Faculty mentoring is designed to guide the new faculty member logically toward a positive tenure decision. The first two steps (Mentoring of New Assistant Professors; Primary Unit Evaluation Committee), will benefit the new assistant professor in the following important ways:

- * Enhances collegiality between tenured and untenured faculty.
- * Provides written documentation of a candidate's yearly progress in teaching, service, and research beyond the student evaluations and annual faculty report.
- * Provides feedback to the candidate early in the review process.
- * Assists the untenured faculty in incrementally preparing materials for the promotion and tenure dossier.
- * Helps to eliminate the potential of "surprises" during the tenure-track process.
- * Increases the likelihood that all candidates will be observed by a faculty member from their Area, as well as assisting in developing awareness among non-tenured faculty of the review process.

To conduct their work, the Formal Unit Evaluation Committee will have available from step one and step two: quality, reliable information and data derived from the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee; and a clearly developed dossier from an informed candidate.

Mentoring of new Assistant Professors

The mentoring of faculty members will be required for each tenure-track faculty member who begins employment at the rank of Assistant Professor. The mentor relationship shall be formally maintained through the new faculty member's tenure decision. New faculty hired with tenure shall be assigned a mentor who will serve for a period of two years. Visiting Assistant Professors shall be assigned a mentor who will serve during the assigned appointment period.

Mentoring in the School of Music has a single purpose--to provide a supportive and nurturing environment for discussion and informal advice--a safe environment to discuss issues of every kind.

During the first month of the new faculty member's appointment, one tenured colleague will be assigned by the Director to serve as Mentor. This Mentor will arrange for regular meetings with the new faculty member (suggest minimum one meeting per month during the academic year, and continuing through the tenure decision). The Mentor's role will be to listen and advise regarding issues and concerns that arise. The Mentor will not serve on the faculty member's Primary Unit Evaluation Committee, and no evaluative input will be formally requested from the Mentor. At any point, either party may request that the Director assign a new Mentor.

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee

The Primary Unit Evaluation Committee will consist of three tenured faculty members. Whenever possible, the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee should be representative of the Area(s) in which the candidate teaches. The purpose of the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee is to review the faculty member's work and materials and create a brief written statement according to the procedural outline presented below.

Primary Unit Evaluation Committee Procedural Outline:

During the first, second, fourth and fifth year (not during the faculty member's formal evaluation periods), each member of the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee shall:

Review a copy of the non-tenured faculty member's applied, ensemble, or class syllabi and summary of student evaluations, as provided by the Director's Coordinator of Admissions and Administration.

Review the candidate's updated vitae and faculty report for the areas of service, research, and creative activity.

Observe one class, applied lesson, ensemble coaching, master class, concert and/or faculty recital as arranged by the untenured faculty.

Meet with the non-tenured faculty to discuss the syllabi, formal observation, curriculum vitae, annual faculty report and student evaluation summaries. Any other issues or concerns may also be addressed at this time.

The committee member and candidate should feel free to discuss any questions or observations they may have regarding the candidate's research, teaching, and service, and the committee member should feel free to offer guidance and suggestions where appropriate.

Provide a brief written statement to the untenured faculty, which assesses strengths and areas in need of improvement, and submit a copy of the statement to the Director.

During the first, second, fourth and fifth years (not during formal evaluation periods), the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee will develop no formal conclusions, and no votes will be taken.

The Formal Unit Evaluation Committee

In the faculty member's third year, a Formal Unit Evaluation Committee will be appointed and will consist of five tenured faculty members. The three Primary Unit Evaluation Committee members will form the nucleus of the Formal Unit Evaluation Committee, and the Director will appoint two additional tenured faculty members. If a candidate has a split appointment in more than one area of teaching, each area must be represented on the committee. Additional committee members will be appointed as appropriate and will be related to the candidate's specialty area. The Director will appoint a committee chair. The Formal Unit Evaluation Committee will conduct a formal review in both the third year and the tenure/promotion year.

Should a new faculty member apply for tenure/promotion early (before year six), the Formal Unit Evaluation Committee will be developed at that time.

Review by Formal Unit Evaluation Committee

The Formal Unit Evaluation Committee will report and make a recommendation to the faculty and Director of the School with a copy forwarded by the School of Music office to the candidate. The report will include specific reasons for the committee's recommendation and will include the committee's vote tally. The Director will present the report and recommendation to the faculty at a promotion/tenure special faculty meeting.

The Chair of the committee, in consultation with the Director, will set a review schedule appropriate for timely forwarding of materials to the College.

Candidate Responsibilities

Contact the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee members (or Formal Unit Evaluation Committee members) to schedule observations. For new faculty, a minimum of two observations should be requested during the fall semester thereby allowing the Primary Unit Evaluation Committee written statements to be considered as part of the Director's annual review.

Provide Primary Unit Evaluation Committee members (or Formal Unit Evaluation Committee members) with copies of updated vitae and annual faculty report.

Review by the Director of the School of Music

Upon recommendation by the Formal Evaluation Committee and the faculty, the Director will provide an independent recommendation to the candidate's file.

Procedures for review by the Director is covered in the College of Visual & Performing Arts "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion."

Documentation required for recommendations concerning tenure and promotion

Documentation required is outlined in the College of Visual & Performing Arts "Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion," and in the University Operating Policy & Procedure Manual.

External Letters of Evaluation

Outside letters of evaluation are required in the School of Music. At least five outside letters of evaluation will be solicited when considering a candidate for promotion and/or tenure. Following consultation with the Formal Evaluation Committee, the candidate's area chair(s) and subsequent approval from the Director, the Director will contact the outside evaluators requesting their professional service. External evaluators should hold at least the same rank for which the candidate is applying, and except in unusual cases, will not have been the candidate's major professor.

Consideration for reappointment

The same guidelines and procedures used for consideration for tenure and promotion will rule consideration for reappointment to the faculty with the exception of external evaluations. The Formal Evaluation Committee will make a recommendation to the full faculty who in turn votes to make a recommendation to the Director.

Normally, the reappointment process is the third-year review. Further documentation required for personnel decisions is outlined in the Texas Tech University Faculty Handbook and the College of Visual & Performing Arts “Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion.”

Merit Evaluation

Annual faculty report

Each faculty member will submit an Annual Faculty Report to the Director. The report should be in the standard format as outlined by the Director. Information shall be provided in Digital Measures. Self-evaluation shall be mandatory for all faculty members on Annual Faculty Reports.

Student comments will be reviewed as part of the merit evaluation process. A faculty member’s teaching, research and creative activity, and service will be evaluated in like fashion to one’s consideration for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Faculty of similar rank will be evaluated concurrently.

Failure on the part of any faculty member to submit the necessary evaluation material may result in a recommendation to deny consideration for a salary increment based on merit. Each faculty member will be given written notice of the merit level for which he/she has been recommended, accompanied by a rationale for the evaluation. Appeals will be made directly to the Director.

The Director will consult with the Executive Committee before setting salary increments or percentages for each merit level. A number of special awards may be given by the Director for exceptional contributions to the profession and/or the School.

Weighting of faculty activity

In order to make the most accurate and fair evaluation given the disparate types of activities and job descriptions of the faculty, relative weighting of the three areas of evaluation should be made in accordance with the needs of the School of Music and the interests of the individual faculty member. Each faculty member may, in consultation with the Director, agree on relative weighting of each of the three evaluative areas. The ranges of percentage weightings are:

Teaching 50-70%
Research and creative activity 20-40%
Professional service 10-20%

While these weightings may be negotiated with the Director, faculty members are reminded that the university expects some contributions from all faculty members in each of the areas of evaluation. The weightings used for merit evaluation purposes do not alter a faculty member’s teaching load or the normal expectations set for tenure and promotion (see Appendix A).

Director guidelines for annual faculty evaluations

For annual faculty evaluations, the Director will rate each of the three faculty activities in one of the following five categories. Each faculty member is also given an overall evaluation using the same five designations.

Far Exceeds Expectations

Teaching

Evidence of:

- *outstanding peer evaluations.
- *students performing exceptionally in TTU ensembles or in other performance settings such as recitals, recital class, accompanying.
- *successful recruiting and retention in the studio.
- *students participating actively and successfully in competitions.
- *student success in juries and recitals.
- *a heavy load by School of Music standards.
- *student evaluations in the highest category (with consideration given to typical evaluations for the type of course taught).
- *a full studio load of music majors.
- *testament pertaining to the quality of teaching and advising (letters, awards).
- * national recognition as a leading teacher in his/her field.
- *student success after graduation (e.g., into graduate programs, success in the professional performance or educational fields).
- *a teaching award from a recognized organization or the University.
- * consistent course development and updating.

Research and creative activity

Evidence of:

- *appropriate ongoing professional activity that contributes significantly to knowledge in the field.
- *high quality professional activity that enhances the teaching of the faculty member.
- *professional activity that is primarily on a national or international level.
- *professional activity that is reviewed positively and/or evaluated externally (consideration will be given to the quality of musical venue and/or to the reputation of a publisher or professional organization).

Professional service

Evidence of:

- *service that is beneficial to the School, College, University, and/or the community.
- *participation as a leader in appropriate professional organizations.
- *successful recruitment of students (where appropriate).
- *service that is not an assigned part of the load.
- *recognition by service awards from the University or community.
- *service as an officer in a significant professional organization.

Exceeds Expectations

Teaching

Evidence of:

- *positive peer evaluation.
- *outstanding student performance in TTU ensembles or in other performance settings

such as recitals, recital class, accompanying.

- *applied students who are among the highest quality in the school.
- *students being active and successful in competitions.
- *an appropriate number of music majors in the studio.
- *student evaluations that are primarily in the highest category (with consideration given to typical evaluations for the type of course taught).
- *maintaining at least an average load by School of Music standards.
- *student success after graduation (entrance to graduate programs, success in the professional performance or educational fields).
- *courses that are updated consistently.
- *testament to the success of teaching and advising.
- *student success in juries and recitals.

Research and creative activity

Evidence of:

- *professional activity that is ongoing and balanced; more than local in nature, but not international.
- *professional activity that reinforces the teaching of the faculty member and is judged to be of high quality.
- *professional activity that is reviewed and/or evaluated externally (consideration will be given to the quality of musical venue and/or to the reputation of a publisher or professional organization).

Professional service

Evidence of:

- *service that is beneficial to the School, College University, and/or the community.
- *service in appropriate professional organizations.
- *successful recruitment of students (where appropriate).
- *service that is not an assigned part of the load.

Meets Expectations

Teaching

Evidence of:

- *peer evaluation that is positive.
- *student activity in TTU ensembles or in other performance settings such as recitals, recital class, accompanying.
- *applied students who are at least of average quality in the School.
- *student evaluations that are at least in the middle to upper categories (with consideration given to typical evaluations for the type of course taught).
- *an appropriate number of students in studio.
- *an average load by School of Music standards.
- *student success in juries and recitals.

Research and creative activity

Evidence of:

- *professional activity that is ongoing and balanced.

- *professional activity that contributes regionally.
- *professional activity that reinforces the teaching of the faculty member.
- *professional activity that is judged to be of high quality.

Professional service

Evidence of:

- *service that is beneficial to School, University and community.
- *service in appropriate professional organizations.
- *successful recruitment of students (where appropriate).
- *service that is not an assigned part of the load.

Does Not Meet Expectations

Teaching

Evidence of:

- *student evaluations that have a majority of negative comments.
- *students not succeeding in TTU ensembles or in other performance settings such as recitals, recital class, accompanying.
- *applied students who are among the least prepared in the school.
- *student evaluations that are primarily in the lower categories (with consideration given to typical evaluations for the type of course taught).
- *an inappropriate number of music majors in the studio.
- *a less-than-average load by School of Music standards.
- *students who are not successful in juries and/or recitals.

Research and creative activity

Evidence of:

- *professional activity that is sporadic and unstructured and does not contribute locally.
- *professional activity that is only local in nature and is judged to be of less than high quality.
- *a lack of professional activity entirely.

Professional service

Evidence of:

- *a lack of service on committees in School, College, University.
- *a lack of service in professional organizations.
- *a lack of contribution to the community.
- *not meeting School enrollment goals (where appropriate).

Unsatisfactory

Teaching

Evidence of:

- *student evaluations dominated by negative comments.
- *negative peer evaluation of teaching.

- *students who are poorly prepared and unsuccessful in courses, recitals, and performances.
- *student evaluations in the lowest ranges.
- *a less-than-average load.
- *an inappropriate applied studio load.

Research and creative activity

Evidence of:

- *a lack of creative work or research.
- *professional activity judged to be of inferior quality.

Professional service

Evidence of:

- *a lack of service to school, university, or community.
- *a lack of professional participation.

Arbitration Committee School of Music Approved 4/27/05

The Arbitration Committee will evaluate any disputes that arise between an individual faculty member and the Director of the School of Music concerning an Annual Review. A total of 5 tenured faculty will be elected to the Arbitration Committee by the full faculty. Only 3 will serve on any single dispute. Selection of the 3 to serve will be made by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the Director. The election will take place at the first faculty meeting each academic year.

In the event that a faculty member's work is deemed unsatisfactory, a written program of development must be established. A written program of development is normally determined by the Director. When requested by the faculty member involved in the dispute the Arbitration Committee, in conjunction with the Director, will take part in the process of formulating the written program of development.