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**INTRODUCTION**

**Preface**

The evaluation criteria provided in this document should be considered advisory, not comprehensive, in that these criteria provide guidelines for evaluation of performance within the global field of music and in the many specialized fields within that category. It should be understood that allowances must be made for the emergence of new specializations as well as interdisciplinary creative, research, and performance possibilities when these apply to a faculty members interests. At the time of this writing, for instance, research-creative work and performance opportunities include, for those with specialized interests, such areas as medicine, psychology, cognitive psychology, anthropology, Latin American and American Studies, mathematics, and languages (this is not a comprehensive list) and the joining of such fields to work in music must be considered in determining a complete evaluative review of any faculty member’s work. Moreover, the methods of delivery are rapidly changing and credence must be given to what may now appear to be non-traditional methods of dissemination. Possible media methods include such media as mobile phones, online performances and streaming (including live one-time performances), online publications (including vlogs and blogs), private gatherings and concerts, and many others. It becomes the responsibility therefore for the faculty member to make the case for the relative significance of an individual research-creative work and, in turn, for the appropriate committee and the chair to clarify that same significance to those outside the field of music who will also be making evaluations based on less familiarity with the scope of both the general and specialized fields.

**Statement of Performance Expectations**

1. **Unit expectations:** It is the expectation of the Department that the faculty shall consist of the most highly qualified persons available. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed so as to prevent the Department from acting within Regents, University, and College guidelines and policies in pursuit of this objective. Department of Music faculty members are expected to teach loads as assigned by the Chair, in accordance with the faculty load policy. Some faculty members will teach a combination of studio and academic classes as assigned by the Chair, and in accordance with the faculty load policy. Faculty members are expected to provide guidance to students as needed. Moreover, faculty members are expected to maintain a distinctive program of research and/or creative activity that brings them national, and perhaps international, recognition in one or more areas of endeavor. Service is also an important component for Department of Music faculty members, who are expected to contribute in appropriate capacities to their areas, the Department, College, University of New Mexico, and in their professional fields. While personal characteristics have less weight than the above criteria, the essential quality of “demonstrated collegiality” and the ability to “work harmoniously with others” (see Faculty Handbook) also play a role in all performance decisions. These criteria and procedures are to be used in conjunction with the appropriate sections of the Faculty Handbook and the College of Fine Arts Tenure-Promotion Policy. These sources should be consulted for additional pertinent information concerning the topics discussed in this document.

The future distinction of the Department of Music depends in large part upon the quality of the judgment exercised in making tenure decisions. For this reason, and because the awarding of tenure represents a commitment of substantial resources on the part of the University, each recommendation will be made with the greatest possible care and will be the result of thorough and rigorous scrutiny of all relevant information. The extended commitment inherent in the granting of tenure requires an established record of past achievement and the potential for future achievement. It is expected that each person awarded tenure will have demonstrated a meritorious level of achievement in the areas of teaching, research/performance/creative activity (hereafter referred to as “research”), and service. It is further expected that each candidate will show clear evidence of the potential to achieve the rank of full professor.

2. **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty[[1]](#footnote-1):** Tenured faculty in the Department of Music must maintain an acceptable standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching and research interests and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the University. An annual evaluation rating for an already tenured faculty member of at least good (on a scale of excellent, very good, good, marginal, poor) must be achieved to indicate an acceptable level of performance. If a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a rating of good or higher in teaching, research, or service, the faculty member in conjunction with the Chair will develop a plan to address the areas of concern. Continued failure (after tenure) to achieve an acceptable level of performance will result in a review by the Personnel Committee and the forwarding of a recommendation to the Chair of the Department of Music. This expectation is in accordance with the criteria for evaluation and promotion and tenure found in this document and related University documents including but not limited to the Faculty Handbook and the College Promotion and Tenure Policies. The Personnel Committee has access to the information provided in the annual review but is only involved at the time of the decision for promotion to Full Professor.

3. **Differential Allocation of Effort:** Each full-time member of the Department of Music faculty is expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. The expectation is that under normal circumstances, each faculty member will adhere to a general norm of 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service allocation of effort. The Chair in consultation with the faculty member will determine exceptions to these percentages of effort. The evaluation of all faculty members is simplified with as many as possible using the 40/40/20 allocation of effort, and by maintaining these percentages the Department of Music recognizes the importance of all three components in our joint work.

**ANNUAL EVALUATION**

**Overview:** Annual Faculty Evaluation is the regular review process for assessing the work and professional accomplishments of faculty members. Results of Annual Faculty Evaluations are used to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary increases. Each faculty member will submit a portfolio of prescribed materials to the Chair on the first day of classes in January. The Annual Review-Merit Committee will conduct the review. Given the early timelines for such decisions, annual evaluations will follow the ***calendar year***.

**Annual Review-Merit Committee:** The Annual Review-Merit committee will be comprised of five faculty members with a roughly equal representation of performance and academic faculty as follows**:**

1. One full professor.
2. One associate professor.
3. Three at-large tenure-track or tenured professors.

Faculty members on this committee will serve two-year terms, staggered to preserve continuity from year to year. Tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department elect the Annual Review-Merit Committee on an annual basis. All Assistant Professors are eligible to serve on the committee. The Chair may appoint one additional member to the committee if and only if the Chair perceives there is a lack of representation on the committee of a specific area (e.g., music education is not represented or an ensemble director is not serving on the Committee),.

The Chair, Associate Chair, and any music faculty serving the College in an administrative appointment of Dean, Associate, or Assistant Dean will not be eligible to serve on the Annual Review-Merit Committee. Committee members will serve two-year terms and no faculty member may serve more than two consecutive terms.

**Annual Faculty Report**: All faculty members will prepare an Annual Faculty Report as detailing all related activities. All relevant achievements should be duly documented in this Report as it is the single most important document for Annual Faculty Evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to include a narrative for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) describing the most important accomplishments during the time period being evaluated. In addition faculty members are encouraged to incorporate self-reflection into the narrative in order to define their annual accomplishments qualitatively for those who are not conversant with their respective fields. An addendum of possible questions for the narrative appears at the end of this document.

**Annual Evaluation Portfolio:** It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit materials (including student evaluations) in the Annual Evaluation Portfolio that accurately and effectively document the member’s activities in teaching, research/performance/creative activity, and service for the ***calendar year*** under consideration.

The Annual Evaluation Portfolio will include the following:

• Annual Faculty Report (including Narrative)

• Current CV (following the College Tenure-Promotion template)

• Student Course Evaluations

• Course Syllabi

• Peer Teaching Evaluations (tenure-track faculty only)

• Other Supporting Materials

Each item of the Annual Evaluation Portfolio should be submitted as a single document attached to an email. Files should be labeled with the faculty member’s name and what the document is (i.e., Annual Faculty Report, CV, etc.). Although not required, faculty members may submit electronic copies of miscellaneous documents they feel are important in a single file labeled “Other Supporting Materials.” Materials documenting research productivity (i.e. – articles, books, musical scores, audio/video recordings, etc.) should not be included in this file.

**Peer Teaching Observation**: For faculty members in tenure-track positions, peer observation of teaching will be included in the evaluation of Teaching. Peer Teaching Evaluations will consist of written reports by two tenured colleagues appointed by the Chair in consultation with the faculty member, area, and Annual Review-Merit Committee. Evaluations should address overall effectiveness and organization of the observed instruction. Although there is no prescribed format, reports should include critical and constructive comments, and also clearly identify any concerns of the reviewer. The Chair will inform all parties of observation assignments well in advance of deadlines so that reviewers can arrange a mutually agreeable observation time. After the teaching evaluation is submitted to the Chair, the observed faculty member will be given the option to submit a statement within one week addressing anything in the report s/he feels is inaccurate or needs clarification.

**Evaluation Report:** The Annual Review-Merit Committee will prepare an evaluation report (ratings, comments) on each respective faculty member. The Chair will share individual results with each respective faculty member. The Committee will base the evaluation of each faculty member on criteria defined in this document in the section Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Progress Toward Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure. The Department of Music will retain a copy of all Evaluation Reports. The evaluation process will be completed as soon as possible, well before merit salary deliberations. The Evaluation Report will include a single rating for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) according to the following scale:

5 – Excellent, substantially exceeds expectations

4 – Very Good, exceeds expectations

3 – Good, meets expectations

2 – Marginal, below expectations

1 – Poor, significantly below expectations

Evaluation of each category will consider, on balance, both the quantity and quality of work. An overall evaluation rating will be calculated by using the rating for each category and the percentage weightings for each faculty member’s appointment (usually 40-40-20). Example: for a faculty member achieving ratings of 4, 3, and 5 in Teaching, Research, and Service respectively, the calculation would be [(4 x 40) + (3 x 40) + (5 x 20)] = 380 (maximum possible score = 500). There will also be a brief narrative included in the Evaluation Report for each category, justifying the assigned rating. The Personnel Committee may also choose to include a summary paragraph with suggestions/commendations. The Evaluation Report will also assess the following for each faculty member in comparison to other faculty members with similar specializations in the field: a) heaviness of teaching load, b) overall quantity of research productivity, and c) overall quantity of service obligations. This assessment will identify one of three comparative levels for each category: 1) significantly higher/more than the median for all faculty, 2) at or about the median for all faculty, or 3) noticeably lower than the median for all faculty. Although not used in determining evaluation ratings, this information may be used in considering merit-based salary increases.

**Outcomes:** All ratings of “3 – Good” or above (according to the ratings defined above) require no special action or sanction. A rating of “2 – Marginal” or “1 – Poor” in any category is considered to be failing to meet academic responsibilities and requires further corrective steps described below. A faculty member will either 1) accept the Evaluation Report, or 2) appeal the results of their individual evaluation. Appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Chair within one week of receiving the Evaluation Report. Appeals must clearly explain the rationale for challenging the determination of the Annual Review-Merit Committee.

**Appeals Process:** A three-person Judicial Committee appointed by the chair will consider the appeal. The committee members shall be tenured, disinterested music faculty members who have not had previous involvement in the Annual Review process that year (and therefore are not serving on the Annual Review-Merit Committee). This Judicial Committee will use the written appeal of the faculty member, as well as the Evaluation Report and assessment by the Associate Chair, to determine the final numeric rating for the appealing faculty member. After the appeal is complete, the Judicial Committee will present its findings, including the final rating(s) and any comments it determines to be appropriate, to the Chair. The Chair will deliver the findings of the Judicial Committee to the appealing faculty member. Any further disputes will be subject to the scrutiny of the College of Fine Arts Dean and/or the Dean’s representatives (Associate Deans, College Personnel Committee).

Each faculty member has the option to meet annually with the Chair to discuss his/her productivity, evaluation, and expectations for the future. Such meetings are required for all tenure-track faculty members as part of the annual review process.

**Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities**

If the Chair ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, reassignment of duties, or a change in teaching assignments. The chair may call upon the College administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities based on articulated performance criteria is a basis for dismissal. If a faculty member has been informed that his or her overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the Department or College. The Annual Review-Merit Committee will issue a nonbinding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the chair. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the Committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the Committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the Department of Music and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department Chairs shall consult annually with the Dean, and Deans shall consult annually with the Provost, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities.

**GENERAL CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE**

**Overview:** Mid-Probationary (3rd Year), Tenure-Promotion (to Associate Professor), and Promotion (to Full Professor) are all part of the review process that tenured faculty oversee. In addition to the responsibility for each tenured faculty member to vote on and evaluate every candidate for tenure-promotion, the tenured faculty annually elect a Personnel Committee to make extensive recommendations on tenure-promotion candidates in a report to the chair that includes a summation and interpretation of the faculty vote as well as a report of their own considerations and evaluation of each tenure-promotion candidate.

**Personnel Committee:** The ideal Faculty Personnel Committee will be comprised of five faculty members with a roughly equal representation of performance and academic faculty as follows**:**

1. Two full professors. These professors make recommendations on all tenure and promotion decisions. Their two-year terms are staggered in such a way as to preserve continuity while encouraging turnover.
2. Two associate professors. These professors make recommendations on all tenure and promotion decisions to associate professor. Their two-year terms are staggered in such a way as to preserve continuity while encouraging turnover.
3. One at-large associate or full professor. This professor will serve a two-year term.

The tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department elect the Personnel Committee on an annual basis. The Chair may appoint one additional member to the Personnel Committee if and only if the Chair perceives there is a lack of representation on the Committee of a specific area (e.g., music education is not represented or an ensemble director is not serving on the committee) – such an appointment must be made with the written approval of the Dean of the College of Fine Arts. The Personnel Committee may choose to elect a chair of the committee as a matter of efficiency.

The Chair, Associate Chair, and any music faculty serving the College in an administrative appointment of Dean, Associate, or Assistant Dean will not be eligible to serve on the Personnel Committee. Committee members will serve two-year terms and no faculty member may serve more than two consecutive terms.

**GENERAL EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL EVALUATIONS, ANNUAL AND TENURE-PROMOTION**

Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation, progress toward tenure review, and promotion and tenure shall be based on the record of the faculty member in teaching, research/creative activity (hereafter referred to as research), and service.

**Teaching**

It is expected that each member of the faculty will excel in teaching. All faculty must demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible.

**Research**

Research may include any of a wide variety of activities depending upon the field of specialization and the interests of the faculty member. It is expected that each faculty member will pursue research or professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization and will achieve national recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity.

**Service**

Service refers to activities that utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member.

Each member of the faculty is expected to render appropriate service to one or more of the following:

(1) the Department of Music, (2) the College; (3) the University, (4) the profession, or (5) the public at large.

Under normal circumstances, service cannot substitute for appropriate success in teaching or productivity in research or other creative activity.

**THE CRITERIA**

It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under any of the following categories. Neither is it expected that a faculty member will be equally active in each of the three categories. The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity. Prestige and/or scope of the publication or presentation venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity. Finally, the lists below in each category are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of creative-research work and teaching as these emerge over time. The Personnel and Annual Review-Merit Committees, making evaluations based on the criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution.

**Teaching**

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of teaching shall include, but not be limited to, Student Evaluations and Peer Evaluations. Generally speaking, faculty in academic areas will evaluate other academic faculty as part of their annual review. Likewise, faculty in the performance areas will evaluate other performance faculty. The Personnel and Annual Review-Merit Committees should therefore distribute such classroom visits accordingly among the committee. Peer Evaluations will consist of a class visit (for the full time period) and a written report in the prescribed format.[[2]](#footnote-2) The Associate Chair will place the peer evaluations in the faculty evaluation portfolio.

Evidence must include:

1. Level of achievement and success of current students; and/or

2. Level of achievement and success of former students.

3. Demonstrated appropriate studio size and quality as well as efforts to achieve and maintain the expected size and quality of the studio.

Other evidence may include:

1. Written statements by colleagues;

2. Written statements by former students;

3. Development of new courses, instructional programs, teaching materials, or teaching techniques.

**Research**

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research activity will be examined according to quantity and especially quality of productivity. Such evidence may include:

1. **For studio faculty:**

a) Significant public performance. The significance of public performance, like that of the kinds of public exposure described in other areas, will be evaluated on the basis of location, nature of the audience, quality, quantity, and critical review, if any. Such public performance might include recital appearances as a soloist or as a member of a chamber ensemble, guest solo appearances off campus, or participation in professional performing ensembles.

b) Presentations at workshops, seminars, conferences, and contributions to professional journals.

c) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.

2. **For conducting faculty:**

a) Performances with university student groups that exhibit exceptional activity;

b) Guest conducting appearances;

c) Preparation of performances or papers for professional societies;

d) Scholarly publications such as articles, editions, and arrangements;

e) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.

3. **For composers:**

a) Commissions, performances, or publication of musical compositions or arrangements;

b) Publication of books, articles, reviews, chapters in books, monographs, or substantial electronic media;

c) Presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional societies;

d) Presentation of workshops or master classes;

e) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.

4. **For musicologists, music theorists, and music education faculty:**

a) Publication as the author, co-author, editor, or translator of books, chapters in books, articles, reviews, monographs, scholarly editions, or substantial electronic media;

b) Presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional associations;

c) Appearances as a guest lecturer or seminar leader on other campuses.

5. **Creative-Research Work in multiple areas:**

It is understood that a faculty member in any particular area is not limited only to the research activities listed in that area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, write, edit, compose, publish, consult, record, and participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, each faculty member’s primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her appointment.

**Service**

Service is an essential aspect of faculty evaluation. Because of the visibility the Department of Music seeks to maintain in the state, region, and nation, the service component is significant.

1. A satisfactory and nurturing environment for teachers and students within the

Department of Music requires the development and maintenance of studios, ensembles and classrooms with sufficient quality and quantity to support the Department’s performance and academic programs. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attract and retain qualified music majors. Evidence of developing and/or supporting recruitment and retention programs may include:

a. Active and ongoing communication with prospective students by letter, telephone or e-mail,

b. Developing opportunities to work with prospective undergraduate and graduate students,

c. Active contact with public school and private instructors,

d. Active involvement in the recruiting activities of the Department of Music (providing information for databases, festivals, All-State, Institutes, Festivals, etc.),

e. Participating in the regularly scheduled audition days,

f. Mentoring and coaching student groups.

2. Other evidence to be considered in the evaluation of service may include:

a. Active participation, elective or appointive leadership roles in professional associations, or attendance at professional meetings;

b. Student advising;

c. Serving on committees of the Department, College and University;

d. Administrative duties, including division director and workshop or institute organizer;

e. Utilization of the professional abilities and expertise of the faculty members on behalf of continuing education in music or in the service of government agencies, citizens groups, educational or religious institutions, or charitable organizations at any level;

f. Editorial boards of juried publications;

g. Conference workshops.

**Criteria for Classifying Music Research as Major or Minor**

In assessing research during the annual faculty evaluation process, progress toward tenure review, and when a faculty member applies for promotion and tenure, it is necessary to classify research accomplishments as major or minor. The following criteria are to assist in making that determination.

**Music Composition**

One must consider many variable and subjective factors when evaluating the artistic merits of a musical composition, but the following criteria should *usually* be considered when ranking works as having greater or lesser significance.[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Major research by a composer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:**

1. A composition in any medium that requires substantial creative time and effort by the composer (performance length and/or artistic merit may possibly be considered in an evaluation);

2. An arrangement\* or transcription\*\* in any medium that requires substantial creative time and effort by the composer (performance length and/or artistic merit may possibly be considered in an evaluation);

2. A commission for a major work in any medium by a highly respected and widely known performance ensemble, conductor, or individual performer;

3. Publication and/or recording of a major work;

4. A successfully completed research grant for composition from a national or international foundation or agency;

5. A successful entry in a national or international, impartially refereed composition contest;

6. A performance of the composer's composition, especially at nationally or internationally prominent venues or performed by performers of national and international prominence.

**Minor research by a composer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:**

1. A composition of smaller proportion or of lesser difficulty, requiring less time and creative effort to complete;

2. An arrangement\* or transcription\*\* of smaller proportion or of lesser difficulty, requiring less time and creative effort to complete;

3. A commission for an original work by local performers or smaller organizations (e.g., faculty member, high school band director).

4. Original incidental music of smaller proportion.

\* Especially in the field of jazz or commercial music, arranging is, at its most professional level, a reconstruction and, oftentimes, a total transformation of an existing melody and/or harmonic progression. As much creativity can be involved in this process

as in the majority of original composition.

\*\* Transcribing is a process whereby one transliterates as closely as possible existing music by another composer, or, more rarely, one’s own composition, from one performing medium to another. This process requires careful craftsmanship, knowledgeable taste, and considerable skills as an orchestrator, but it does not normally require the proportional amount of creativity involved in arranging.

**Music Performance**

In the field of music performance, public performance is equated with publication. When classifying music performance as major or minor, the factors of difficulty of repertory, performance venue, and the performer's role in a given performance should be considered.

The factor of quality pervades all music performance and does not change the classifications of major and minor presented here. A major performance can be unsuccessful; a minor performance can be flawless, but still be considered a minor performance.

**Major performances typically fit at least one of the following criteria:**

1. Solo performance with a large ensemble or leading role in a vocal production;

2. Solo recital or collaborative performance as part of a concert series;

3. Recital as a member of an established professional small ensemble in a university setting or as part of a professional ensemble;

4. Concert in a major city as a member of a professional ensemble;

5. Performance at a professional music symposium, conference, or institute;

6. A solo recording or a recording as a member of an ensemble with some possibility of peer review, such as a review published in a major professional journal, web site, or equivalent.

**Minor performances typically fit at least one of the following criteria:**

1. Performance as a member of an ad hoc ensemble;

2. Minor role in a vocal production;

3. Performance as assisting artist in a recital;

4. Solo performance or collaborative performance in an informal setting;

5. Performance as a member of a community or semi-professional ensemble;

**Scholarly Research**

Scholarly research in music usually results in publication or the presentation of a paper, lecture, or work in electronic media. The classification of the results of research as major or minor is based on several factors: the topic being considered and its relative scope and importance; the length, form and style of the final product; and the audience for whom it is intended.

**Major publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:**

1. Book, monograph, textbook, book chapter or work in electronic media of substantial significance and scope;

2. A substantial scholarly edition of extant music;

3. A scholarly article published in a refereed journal;

4. A lengthy, scholarly article based on original research written for a major music dictionary or encyclopedia. [[4]](#footnote-4)

**Minor publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:**

1. A relatively brief monograph, textbook, or work in electronic media;

2. A scholarly or performing edition of a relatively brief composition;

3. An article on a less substantial topic, published in a magazine or regional journal; a brief article based on widely available materials, written for a general dictionary or encyclopedia;

4. A review of a book, edition of music, or work in electronic media.

**Major papers or lectures typically fit at least one of the following criteria:**

1. A substantial, scholarly paper or lecture selected by committee, presented at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional society;

2. A substantial, invited paper or lecture presented at a meeting of a professional society or at another university.

**Minor papers or lectures typically fit at least one of the following criteria:**

1. A paper or lecture of lesser significance, presented at a state or regional meeting;

2. A paper or lecture presented at a university function or an invited guest lecture in another department of the university.

**Funded grants that may be considered major research** are typically large, externally funded grants made available to the faculty member by a state, national or international agency.

**Funded grants that may be considered minor research** are normally smaller, internally funded grants from within the university.

**Conducting**

A conductor's performance should be assessed on the musicality and artistic quality of performances.

**Major conducting performances typically fit into at least one of the following criteria:**

1. Conducting regular university ensembles that exhibit exceptional activity:

a. Premieres, professional recordings or interdisciplinary projects;

b. Performances with soloists that demand a high degree of interaction between soloist and ensemble;

c. Off-campus performances, such as invited appearances at meetings of professional societies and at other important venues, and important performances during tours of an ensemble.

2. Guest conducting. Invitations for guest appearances are a measure of a conductor's professional recognition. Relative importance may be measured by the stature and visibility of the inviting organization. Major guest appearances include:

a. Invited appearances with professional ensembles;

b. Invited appearances with ensembles at other universities;

c. Invited appearances at all-state festivals or professional music societies.

**Minor conducting performances** are typically somewhat less demanding musically and technically; they are often performances in a pedagogical environment or performances that serve as an adjunct to some other activity. Performances of this type typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. Performances as guest conductor with public school groups and regional music festivals;

2. Brief performances with university ensembles at local and regional off-campus events;

3. Serving as guest conductor on a recital with other faculty members.

**ADDENDUM**

**SOME CORE QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR WORK**

Feel free to use some or all (or none) of the following questions to inform a narrative that you write regarding your work in the previous calendar year.

1. As you reflect on the previous calendar year, relate a story about one or two of the highpoints.
2. When did you feel most successful in terms of your contributions to the University?
3. The mission of the Department of Music is “to provide the highest quality musical education, and to make a substantial contribution to the cultural life of its region and the world by reinforcing the integral value of music in society.” Thinking about the mission and your contribution to the mission, what have you done to make the biggest difference this year?
4. Were there times this year when you were thinking to yourself “this is working, this is working!” What was happening during those times?
5. What has kept you going and focused on your work and what was nurturing to you?
6. What are the most outstanding moments or stories from the Department of Music’s past that make you proud to be a faculty member in the Department?
7. If you could transform the ways in which you do your work, what would it look like and what would it take to make it happen?

1. The following paragraph addresses annual review standards after the faculty member has earned tenure. The continued failure to meet standards being judged by the annual review-merit committee requires the Chair and Personnel Committee to become involved. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Format to be determined on approval of this document. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The difficulty of assessing a major work in composition can be complicated. It’s entirely possible that a graphic musical score may still require considerable complicated effort on the part of the composer (and performers), the instructions for which may have taken many months to determine. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The determination of the quality of major or minor with respect to scholarly research, as in composition, is necessarily subjective. For this reason, only one of the criteria listed must be satisfied. The idea of length in an article must be weighed against the general length of articles in the journal in which the research appears. For instance, a review in Music Library Notes may be short as a standard for that journal. The idea of length should only come into play where there is a question of the substance of research in the publication and then only if the specific publication appears to be comparatively minor by comparison with other contributions to the same journal. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)