

## **Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy**

### **Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes**

#### **Academic Unit: Music Education**

##### **I. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six**

**Annual Performance** will be assessed by the Chair who will consider the quality of instruction delivered by the NTTF and the NTTF's participation in service activities. Quality of instruction will be assessed using several indicators, including, but not limited to peer evaluations, and quantitative and qualitative student evaluations. Performance is considered satisfactory in the event that NTTF receive positive peer evaluations (minimum of 2), quantitative evaluation scores that are comparable to or exceed department averages for comparable courses, and qualitative responses do not raise significant concerns that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations that indicate the NTTF is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching an appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive. Peer evaluations that include constructive feedback may still be viewed as positive evaluations. For instructors whose quantitative student evaluations fall substantially below a 3.0, the Chair may consider additional evidence such as course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, etc.) and peer evaluations of teaching to determine whether the instructor is performing adequately. In the event that the instructor is not performing adequately, the Chair may provide guidance on how the NTTF can improve his/her performance or recommend to the Dean that the NTTF not be renewed.

**Enhanced Performance Review** criteria parallel those guiding APR's but span the past three years of performance and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness and service. NTTF will not only be evaluated on their student evaluations and peer classroom evaluations but also on the quality of teaching and service philosophy statements and course materials. Strong candidates will have quantitative teaching evaluation scores that are in alignment with or exceed department means for comparable courses. Peer evaluations of their teaching indicate that they engage and communicate effectively with students. Strong candidates will have implemented course materials such as syllabi, assignments, and supporting materials, that are rigorous, yet at an appropriate level and aligned with the department's curriculum. NTTF will also be evaluated on their service activities, which should include participation on a department or college committee every year as well as some service to the university. Regional or national level service is desirable but not required at this review. The EPR will encompass overall performance during the past three years.

For the **Enhanced Performance Review**, the faculty member must earn a minimum overall rating of "meets expectations" per the teaching and service rubrics, as applied to the portfolio submitted. No additional performance indicators are required for the EPR process. NTTF teaching and service rubrics are located on pages 5 - 8.

## II. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

- A. For APR's, the NTTF faculty member will submit a Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Chair review.
- B. Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) shall require that the NTTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:
- Teaching philosophy
  - Evidence of effective teaching (i.e., quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations for the past three years, peer evaluations, sample teaching materials, and self-appraisals of teaching)
  - Evidence of instructional development (e.g., continuing attention to refinement of course syllabi, improvement of instruction, responsiveness to feedback from students, improvements of students' learning progress).
  - A demonstrated record of professional development (e.g., activity in professional organizations, attendance at professional conferences).
  - A service philosophy and a record of service to the department, college, and/or university.
  - NTTF candidates may offer additional supporting materials to help define the faculty member's contribution to the department and college, but are not required to do so.

The candidate must upload the appropriate documents into the university electronic system for review by the Voting Faculty and Chair. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

## III. Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair in accordance with this reappointment policy.

## IV. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

### **A. Criteria for Promotion from Instructor to Lecturer**

Promotion to Lecturer in the Department of Music Education requires at least a Master's degree from an accredited college or university; typically at least six years of full-time service at the rank of instructor at BGSU; evidence of successful teaching; and service to the department, college, university, and community.

Successful candidates for promotion to Lecturer will have earned generally positive evaluations from students on both quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, primarily positive peer evaluations of teaching, and demonstrated success in at least **two additional performance**

**indicators** used in the evaluation of instructional development and service (a detailed list is provided in section V below) in the most recent six years as Instructor. In terms of service effectiveness, the candidate should provide clear evidence that s/he has regularly, promptly, and cooperatively fulfilled his or her expectations for service effectiveness during the six most recent years, including annual department committees as well as a minimum of **at least two** college or university committees or the equivalent.

For **Promotion to Lecturer**, NTTF must earn a minimum overall rating of "meets expectations" per the teaching and service rubrics located on pages 5 - 8, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

#### **B. Criteria for Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer**

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer in the Department of Music Education requires at least a Master's degree from an accredited college or university; typically at least six years of full-time service at the rank of Lecturer at BGSU; evidence of successful teaching; and service to the community, department, college, and university. Eligible candidates may submit their materials for promotion to the Chair at their discretion typically after six years at the rank of Lecturer.

Successful candidates for promotion to Senior Lecturer will have earned generally positive evaluations from students on both quantitative and qualitative student evaluations, primarily positive peer evaluations of teaching, and demonstrated success in **at least four additional performance indicators** used in the evaluation of instructional development and service (a detailed list is provided in section V below) in the most recent six years as Lecturer. In terms of service effectiveness, the candidate should provide clear evidence that s/he has regularly, promptly, and cooperatively fulfilled his or her expectations to service effectiveness during the six most recent years, including annual department committees as well as a minimum of **at least four** college or university committees and evidence of regional, national, or international service to the profession, or the equivalent.

For promotion to **Senior Lecturer**, NTTF must earn a minimum overall rating of "meets expectations" and demonstrate leadership in teaching and service per the teaching and service rubrics located on pages 5 - 8, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

### **V. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials**

**A. Promotion Reviews** shall require that the NTTF member compile a teaching and service dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:

- Teaching philosophy
- Evidence of effective teaching and leadership in the field (i.e., quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations for the past three years indicating improving scores, peer evaluations, sample teaching materials, and self-appraisals of teaching)
- Evidence of instructional development (i.e., continuing attention to refinement of course syllabi, improvement of instruction, responsiveness to feedback from students, improvements of students' learning progress).

- A demonstrated record of professional development (e.g., activity in professional organizations, attendance at professional conferences).
- A service philosophy and a record of service to the department, college, and/or university and regional, national, or international service to the profession as appropriate.

#### **Additional Performance Indicators**

Additional performance indicators in teaching and service, as listed below, are required. See Teaching and Service rubrics (pgs. 5 – 8) for specific requirements for promotion to lecturer and senior lecturer.

#### **Teaching**

- Evidence of new courses developed or existing courses improved
- Evidence of effect use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning;
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside of the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, honors thesis advisor, graduate thesis advisor or committee member, etc.);
- Teaching awards
- Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise;
- Mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy;
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities designed to improve teaching;
- Presentations at regional, national, or international conferences related to music performance, music teaching, or music pedagogy

#### **Service**

- Documentation of work with student organizations;
- Service at local, regional, national, and international levels within the music discipline
- Faculty initiated external recruitment and/or community activities as a representative of the College of Musical Arts

The candidate may submit other evidence that in their judgment documents the quality of his or her teaching and/or service, which may be considered by the committee.

The candidate must upload the appropriate documents into the university electronic system for review by the voting faculty and Chair. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

## NTTF Teaching Rubrics

NTTF (Promotion to Lecturer) – Teaching and service evaluations must fall in the “**meets or exceeds expectations**” category on the scoring rubrics below. The candidate must submit a minimum of **one additional performance indicator** in teaching, with a minimum combined total of **two additional performance indicators** in both teaching and service from the lists below.

NTTF (Promotion to Senior Lecturer) – Teaching and service evaluations must fall in the “**meets or exceeds expectations**” category on the scoring rubric below. The candidate must submit a minimum of **two additional performance indicators** in teaching, with a minimum combined total of **four additional performance indicators** in teaching and service from the lists below.

Required Teaching Submissions	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
Quantitative ratings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent (ratings generally in the good to outstanding range)</li> <li>• Good (ratings generally in the good ranges)</li> <li>• Fair (ratings generally in the fair to good range)</li> <li>• Poor (ratings generally in the poor to fair range)</li> </ul>	
Student open-ended written feedback – based on a representative sampling and overview of themes and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly positive</li> <li>• Positive</li> <li>• Neutral</li> <li>• Negative</li> <li>• Not included in portfolio</li> </ul>	
Peer evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly positive</li> <li>• Positive</li> <li>• Neutral</li> <li>• Negative</li> <li>• Not included in portfolio</li> </ul>	
Teaching Analysis of teaching performance (incl. teaching philosophy, narrative, and evidence of instructional development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In depth, thoughtful, shows improvement where needed, involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Thoughtful analysis, implementation of efforts to improve; involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Some analysis and awareness of need to improve; plans for involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Limited analysis; no evidence of needed improvement efforts under way; no planned involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• No analysis of teaching perf.</li> </ul>	

**NTTF Teaching Score Rubric**

Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative Justification
<b>Exceeds Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
<b>Meets Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
<b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

**NTTF Service Scoring Rubric**

Service Effectiveness	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty member fulfills expectations to service effectiveness regularly, promptly and cooperatively</li> <li>• Faculty member participates in required number of and variety of committees</li> <li>• Clear Philosophy presented in portfolio</li> <li>• Demonstrates leadership to college, university and/or the profession through organizing and/or chairing committees.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfills all categories – <b>Exceeds Expectations</b></li> <li>• Fulfills most categories – <b>Meets Expectations</b></li> <li>• One or more areas are noted as significantly incomplete or lacking – <b>Fails to Meet Expectations</b></li> </ul>	

<b>Additional Performance Indicators - Teaching</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>	<b>Narrative Justification</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of new courses developed or existing courses improved</li> <li>• Evidence of effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning;</li> <li>• Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside of the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, honors thesis advisor, graduate thesis advisor or committee member, etc.);</li> <li>• Teaching awards</li> <li>• Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise;</li> <li>• Mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy;</li> <li>• Evidence of participation and leadership in professional development activities designed to improve teaching;</li> </ul> <p><i>Additional indicators are not required for the EPR process</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level – submits greater than the required level of activity</li> <li>• Acceptable level – submits the required level of activity</li> <li>• Submits fewer than the required level of activities</li> <li>• No submission in required areas</li> </ul>	
<p><b>*Other</b></p> <p><i>The candidate may submit other evidence that in their judgment documents the quality of his or her teaching and/or service, which may be considered by the committee.</i></p>	<p>Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor</li> </ul> <p>performance in teaching and teaching-related activities</p>	

Additional Performance Indicators - Service	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Organizations</li> <li>• Professional Service Outside of the University</li> <li>• Faculty initiated external recruitment and/or community activities as a representative of the College of Musical Arts</li> </ul> <p><i>No additional performance indicators required for EPR</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 or more indicators successfully included</li> <li>• 2 indicators are included</li> <li>• 1 indicator is included</li> <li>• No indicators are included</li> </ul>	
<p><b>*Other</b></p> <p><i>The candidate may submit other evidence that in their judgment documents the quality of his or her teaching and/or service, which may be considered by the committee.</i></p>	<p>Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor performance in service.</li> </ul>	

## VI. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

**Annual Performance** will be assessed by the Chair who will consider the quality of instruction delivered by the TTF, research/ creative activity (ongoing and completed), and the TTF's participation in service activities. Quality of instruction will be assessed using several indicators, including, but not limited to peer evaluations, and quantitative and qualitative student evaluations. Performance is considered satisfactory in the event that TTF receive predominantly positive peer evaluations (minimum of two), quantitative evaluation scores that are comparable to or exceed department averages for comparable courses, and qualitative responses do not raise concerns that could indicate the instructor is not meeting minimal standards in the classroom. Peer evaluations that indicate the TTF member is engaging students in the classroom and is effectively teaching an appropriate curriculum will be deemed positive. Peer evaluations that include constructive feedback may still be viewed as positive evaluations. For instructors whose quantitative student evaluations fall substantially below a 3.0, the Chair may consider additional evidence such as course materials (e.g., syllabi, assignments, etc.) and peer evaluations of teaching to determine whether the instructor is performing adequately. The chair will assess progress in research/creative activity and service. Successful candidates will demonstrate active involvement in research and creative activity (e.g., progress towards meaningful publication, performance and/or conducting activities. In years one and two, the successful candidate will serve on at least one department and/or college committee and in years four and five, the successful candidate will serve on at least two of these committees). In the event that the instructor is not performing adequately, the Chair may provide guidance on how the TTF can improve performance.



**Enhanced Performance Review** criteria parallel those guiding APR's but span the years of performance to date and include additional evidence of teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity and service. TTF evaluations of teaching will be based on peer reviews, quantitative and qualitative course evaluations, quality of the teaching narrative, philosophy statement, and development of course materials. Candidates will have quantitative teaching evaluation scores that are in alignment with or exceed department means for comparable courses. Peer evaluations of their teaching indicate that they engage and communicate effectively with students. Successful candidates will have implemented course materials such as syllabi, assignments, and supporting materials, that are rigorous, yet at an appropriate level and aligned with the department's curriculum. TTF will also be evaluated on research/creative activity conducted during the EPR period. Strong candidates will submit evidence of publications, ongoing or completed research, music performance accomplishments, and scholarly contributions to the profession as appropriate for the music discipline. TTF will also be evaluated on their service activities, which should include participation on a department or college committee every year as well as some service to the university. Regional or national level service is desirable but not required at this review. External review is not required for the EPR.

For the **Enhanced Performance Review**, TTF faculty must receive an evaluation of "very good or higher" in the Research/Creativity rubric and "meets or exceeds expectations" in teaching and service rubrics found on pages 16 - 21, as applied to the portfolio submitted.

## VII. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

- A. For APR's, the TTF faculty member will submit a Curriculum Vitae (CV) for Chair review.
- B. Enhanced Performance Reviews (EPRs) shall require that the TTF member compile a dossier consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and the following additional supporting materials:
  - Teaching philosophy
  - Evidence of effective teaching (e.g., quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations for the past three years, peer evaluations, sample teaching materials, and self-appraisals of teaching)
  - Evidence of instructional development (e.g., continuing attention to refinement of course syllabi, improvement of instruction, responsiveness to feedback from students, improvements of students' learning progress).
  - A demonstrated record of professional development (e.g., activity in professional organizations, attendance at professional conferences).
  - A research philosophy and a demonstrated record including examples of research and creative activity conducted and/or presented over the past three years.
  - A service philosophy and a record of service to the department, college, and/or university.

The candidate must upload the appropriate documents into the university electronic system for review by the Voting Faculty and Chair. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing

the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

#### **VIII. Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process**

Annual Performance Reviews (APRs) shall be conducted by the Department Chair, in accordance with this reappointment policy.

#### **IX. Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review**

TTF applying for tenure and promotion must submit a portfolio documenting their teaching, research/creative activity, and service during their time at BGSU. Candidates for tenure and promotion must submit evidence documenting that they meet the following standards:

- **APR and EPR reviews:** If any reviews indicated areas considered problematic for tenure, the tenure portfolio must address these concerns by describing progress in that area.
- **A record of successful teaching** as documented in the teaching portfolio, including evidence of teaching effectiveness judged at least to **"meet expectations"** overall.
- **A record of successful scholarship** documented in the research/creative activity portfolio and judged at least to **"meet expectations"** overall
- **A record of successful service** documented in the service portfolio, including evidence of service judged at least to **"meet expectations"** overall.

#### **Teaching**

Effective teaching for candidates seeking promotion and tenure is evidenced by primarily positive peer evaluations, quantitative teaching evaluations that are in alignment with or exceed department averages for comparable courses, and qualitative student responses indicating effective instruction. Other indicators of teaching effectiveness may include: new courses developed, documentation of substantial improvements to existing courses, evidence of effective integration of new technology or pedagogical approaches, teaching awards, mentorship of undergraduate research (e.g., honor's theses), publication of scholarship on teaching, and evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside of the standard curriculum. Successful teaching typically involves committee membership on one or more graduate student theses or comprehensive exam committees.

Successful candidates for promotion to full professor should demonstrate consistent participation and success in all categories listed above, and demonstrate recognition as an expert in the field of music education.

### Research/Creative Activity

Making significant contributions to the knowledge base or the creative practice of one's discipline is a central responsibility of all faculty members. Such contributions are important both in their own right and because they are an essential qualification for instructing others at a university. Domains used in the evaluation of research/creative activity include publications, music performances, music compositions, arrangements, or commissioned works, and dissemination of scholarly work through presentations at state, regional, national, or international professional meetings. Candidates seeking promotion and tenure should also demonstrate an established reputation in their fields. Those seeking promotion to full professor should demonstrate recognition for expertise in the field of music education.

### Service

Service contributions by faculty at department, college, and university levels are critical to the overall mission of the university. For faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion, a record that documents continuous and active involvement in service is required. The department defines service as performance of departmental, collegiate, university, and professional activities that fall into two domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance, and a professional expertise shared with the external community. Successful candidates for promotion and tenure should provide evidence of activity within each of the two domains. Those seeking promotion to full professor should indicate a significant level of participation and leadership in their service contributions.

## X. Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

### A. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

Promotion Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile dossiers for teaching, research/creative activity, and service consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials.

Supporting materials for Teaching include:

- Teaching philosophy
- Teaching narrative
- Evidence of effective teaching (e.g., quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations for the past three years, peer evaluations, sample teaching materials, and self-appraisals of teaching)
- Evidence of instructional development (e.g., continuing attention to refinement of course syllabi, improvement of instruction, responsiveness to feedback from students, improvements of students' learning progress).
- A demonstrated record of professional development (e.g., activity in professional organizations, attendance at professional conferences).

### Additional Performance Indicators for Teaching

For promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor TTF must submit a minimum of two additional performance indicators in teaching. Selections may include the following:

- Evidence of new courses developed or existing courses improved
- Evidence of effect use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning;
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside of the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, honors thesis advisor, graduate thesis advisor or committee member, etc.);
- Teaching awards
- Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise;
- Mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy;
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities designed to improve teaching;
- Presentations at regional, national, or international conferences related to music performance, music teaching, or music pedagogy

### Supporting materials for Research/Creative Activity include:

- Research/Creative Activity philosophy
- Research/Creative Activity narrative
- External letters of review indicating an emerging reputation in the discipline

Additional Performance Indicators for Research/Creative activity must be selected from the following list. Specific requirements for promotion to Associate Professor are located on pages 16 - 21 of this document.

- Author or lead co-author of a peer-reviewed research article or 2 reviewed/invited articles
- Author or co-author of a refereed/reviewed scholarly book or significant book contribution
- Author of a peer-reviewed article in a trade or practitioner journal
- Non-peer reviewed publication
- Peer-reviewed research presentation/poster in a national or international conference
- Peer-reviewed research presentation/poster in a state or regional conference
- Conductor/performer of a significant performance at a state, regional, national, or international venue
- Professional engagement as a conductor/performer in a non-academic ensemble
- Preparation and submission of grant proposals for external or internal funding for research or creative work related projects (*excluding* travel grants and speed grants)
- Preparation of research/technical reports for government, education, and/or business agencies
- Publication of an arrangement or original composition
- Conducting/Performing a commissioned work
- Other evidence, including in-progress and ongoing research/creative projects

**Supporting materials for Service include:**

- Service philosophy
- Service narrative
- Record of service to the department, college, and/or university.

**Additional Performance Indicators for Service**

For promotion to Associate Professor TTF must submit a minimum of **one** additional performance indicator in service. Selections may include the following:

- Documentation of work with student organizations
- Record of service outside of the university
- Record service at local, regional, national, and international levels within the music discipline
- Record of faculty initiated external recruitment and/or participation in community activities as a representative of the College of Musical Arts

Candidates may submit other evidence that in their judgment documents the quality of teaching research/creative activity, or service, which may be considered by the committee.

The candidate must upload the appropriate documents into the university electronic system for review by the voting faculty and Chair. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.

**B. Promotion from Associate to Full Professor**

Promotion Reviews shall require that the TTF member compile dossiers for teaching, research/creative activity, and service consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials.

**Supporting materials for Teaching include:**

- Teaching philosophy
- Teaching narrative
- Evidence of effective teaching (e.g., quantitative and qualitative student course evaluations for the past three years, peer evaluations, sample teaching materials, and self-appraisals of teaching)
- Evidence of instructional development (e.g., continuing attention to refinement of course syllabi, improvement of instruction, responsiveness to feedback from students, improvements of students' learning progress)
- A demonstrated record of professional development (e.g., activity in professional organizations, attendance at professional conferences).

### **Additional Performance Indicators for Teaching**

For promotion from Associate to Full Professor TTF must submit a minimum of **three** additional performance indicators in teaching. Selections may include the following:

- Evidence of new courses developed or existing courses improved
- Evidence of effect use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning;
- Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside of the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, honors thesis advisor, graduate thesis advisor or committee member, etc.);
- Teaching awards
- Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise;
- Mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy;
- Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities designed to improve teaching;
- Presentations at regional, national, or international conferences related to music performance, music teaching, or music pedagogy

Supporting materials for Research/Creative Activity include:

- Research/Creative Activity philosophy
- Research/Creative Activity narrative
- Evidence of an established reputation in the discipline including external letters of review. Additional indicators may include, but are not limited to: requests to serve in scholarly service roles, citation indices for publications and selectivity ratings of journals in which the scholar has published, invitations to perform or present at regional, national/international professional meetings and/or conferences.

Additional Performance Indicators for Research/Creative activity must be selected from the following list. Specific requirements for promotion to Full Professor are located on pages 16 - 21 of this document.

- Author or lead co-author of a peer reviewed research article or 2 reviewed/invited articles
- Author or co-author of a refereed/reviewed scholarly book or significant book contribution
- Author of a peer-reviewed article in a trade or practitioner journal
- Non-peer reviewed publication
- Peer-reviewed research presentation/poster in a national or international conference
- Peer-reviewed research presentation/poster in a state or regional conference
- Conductor/performer of a significant performance at a state, regional, national, or international venue
- Professional engagement as a conductor/performer in a non-academic ensemble
- Preparation and submission of grant proposals for external or internal funding for research or creative work related projects (*excluding* travel grants and speed grants)
- Preparation of research/technical reports for government, education, and/or business agencies

- **Publication of an arrangement or original composition**
- **Conducting/Performing a commissioned work**
- **Other evidence, including in-progress and ongoing research/creative projects**

**Supporting materials for Service include:**

- **Service philosophy**
- **Service narrative**
- **Record of service to the department, college, and/or university.**

**Additional Performance Indicators for Service**

**For promotion to Full Professor TTF must submit a minimum of two additional performance indicators in service. Selections may include the following:**

- **Documentation of work with student organizations**
- **Record of service outside of the university**
- **Record of service and/or leadership at local, regional, national, and international levels within the music discipline**
- **Record of faculty initiated external recruitment and/or participation in community activities as a representative of the College of Musical Arts**

**Candidates may submit other evidence that in their judgment documents the quality of teaching research/creative activity, or service, which may be considered by the committee.**

**The candidate must upload the appropriate documents into the university electronic system for review by the voting faculty and Chair. The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost.**

## Teaching and Service Rubrics

\*TTF (Promotion to Associate Professor) - Teaching evaluation must fall in the “meets or exceeds expectations” category on the scoring rubric below. The candidate must submit a minimum of **two additional performance indicators** in teaching, with a minimum combined total of **three additional performance indicators** in teaching and service.

\*TTF (Promotion to Full Professor) – Teaching evaluation must fall in the “meets or exceeds expectations” category on the scoring rubric below. The candidate must submit a minimum of **two additional performance indicators** in teaching, with a minimum combined total of **four additional performance indicators** demonstrating leadership in teaching and service.

Required Teaching Submissions	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
Quantitative ratings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Excellent (ratings generally in the good to outstanding range)</li> <li>• Good (ratings generally in the good ranges)</li> <li>• Fair (ratings generally in the fair to good range)</li> <li>• Poor (ratings generally in the poor to fair range)</li> </ul>	
Student open-ended written feedback – based on a representative sampling and overview of themes and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly positive</li> <li>• Positive</li> <li>• Neutral</li> <li>• Negative</li> <li>• Not included in portfolio</li> </ul>	
Peer evaluations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly positive</li> <li>• Positive</li> <li>• Neutral</li> <li>• Negative</li> <li>• Not included in portfolio</li> </ul>	
Teaching/Analysis of teaching performance (incl. teaching philosophy, narrative, and evidence of instructional development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In depth, thoughtful, shows improvement where needed, involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Thoughtful analysis, implementation of efforts to improve; involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Some analysis and awareness of need to improve; plans for involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• Limited analysis, no evidence of needed improvement efforts under way; no planned involvement in improvement activities</li> <li>• No analysis of teaching performance</li> </ul>	



### Teaching Score Rubric

Score (point allocation)	Definition and Description	Narrative Justification
<b>Exceeds Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the highest categories OR preponderance of ratings are in the upper-middle categories with one aspect rated as truly exceptional	
<b>Meets Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the middle to upper middle categories	
<b>Fails to Meet Expectations for Teaching</b>	Preponderance of ratings are in the lowest categories	

### Service Score Rubric

Service Effectiveness	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty member fulfills expectations to service effectiveness regularly, promptly and cooperatively</li> <li>• Faculty member participates in required number of and variety of committees</li> <li>• Clear Philosophy of service presented in portfolio</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fulfills all categories – <b>Exceeds Expectations</b></li> <li>• Fulfills most categories – <b>Meets Expectations</b></li> <li>• One or more areas are noted as significantly incomplete or lacking – <b>Fails to Meet Expectations</b></li> </ul>	

**Additional Performance Indicators in Teaching and Service**

<b>*Additional Performance Indicators - Teaching</b>	<b>Evaluation Guidelines</b>	<b>Narrative Justifications</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of new courses developed or existing courses improved</li> <li>• Evidence of effective use of instructional technology and other resources to promote student learning;</li> <li>• Evidence of other contributions to student learning that fall outside of the standard curriculum (e.g., independent studies, honors thesis advisor, graduate thesis advisor or committee member, etc.);</li> <li>• Teaching awards</li> <li>• Scholarly or creative activities that contribute to teaching expertise;</li> <li>• Mentorship of graduate students in teaching and pedagogy;</li> <li>• Evidence of participation in or leadership of professional development activities designed to improve teaching;</li> </ul> <p><i>Additional Indicators are not required for the EPR process</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level – submits greater than the required level of activity</li> <li>• Acceptable level – submits the required level of activity</li> <li>• Submits fewer than the required level of activities</li> <li>• No submission in required areas</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Other</b></p> <p><i>Other evidence that, in the judgment of the candidate, documents the quality of his or her teaching and/or service may also be considered by the committee, but is not required.</i></p>	<p>Evaluation of additional evidence submitted shows evidence for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superior</li> <li>• Good</li> <li>• Fair</li> <li>• Poor</li> </ul> <p>performance in teaching and teaching-related activities</p>	

Additional Performance Indicators - Service	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Organizations</li> <li>• Professional Service Outside of the University</li> <li>• Record of service and/or leadership at local, regional, national, and international levels within the music discipline</li> <li>• Faculty initiated external recruitment and/or community activities as a representative of the College of Musical Arts</li> </ul> <p><i>No additional indicators required for EPR</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 or more indicators successfully included</li> <li>• 2 indicators are included</li> <li>• 1 indicator is included</li> <li>• No indicators are included</li> </ul>	



Additional Performance Indicators	Evaluation Guidelines	Narrative Justification
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Author or lead co-author of a peer-reviewed research journal publication</li> <li>2. Author or co-author of a refereed/reviewed scholarly book or significant book contribution</li> <li>3. Author or co-author of a peer-reviewed article in a trade or practitioner journal</li> <li>4. Non-peer reviewed publication</li> <li>5. Peer-reviewed research presentation/poster in a national or international conference</li> <li>6. Peer-reviewed research presentation/poster in a state or regional conference</li> <li>7. Conductor/performer of a significant performance at a state, regional, national, or international venue.</li> <li>8. Professional engagement as a conductor/performer in a non-academic ensemble</li> <li>9. Preparation and submission of grant proposals for external or internal funding for research or creative work related projects (<i>excluding</i> travel grants and speed grants)</li> <li>10. Preparation of research/technical reports for government, education, and/or business agencies</li> <li>11. Publish an arrangement or original composition</li> <li>12. Conducting/Performing a commissioned work</li> <li>13. Other, including in-progress and ongoing research projects</li> </ol>	<p><b>Superior.</b> 5+ examples, with at least 2 from categories 1, 2 or 7, or the equivalent</p> <p><b>Excellent.</b> 4+ examples, with at least 1 from categories 1, 2, 7, or 8, or the equivalent</p> <p><b>Very Good.</b> 3+ examples, at least 1 of which is from categories 1, 2, 3, 7, or 8, or the equivalent</p> <p><b>Good.</b> 2+ examples from any of the categories 3 through 13</p> <p><b>Fair.</b> 1 example</p> <p><b>Poor.</b> No activity to report</p>	

*Research and Creative Activity evaluation is completed for TTF only.*

Approved by electronic vote, May 24, 2018.

Approved: Elizabeth Menard Date: 6-12-2018  
Elizabeth Menard, Chair, Music Education Department

Approved: W.S. Mathis Date: 6/12/18  
William Mathis, Dean, College of Musical Arts

Approved: John M. Fischer Date: 6/27/18  
John M. Fischer, Provost/Senior Vice-President