

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC

ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 4/13/07)

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

(Approved by Faculty Vote on 9/29/06)

REVIEW DATE FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES *(WHICH INCLUDES THE CHRONIC LOW ACHIEVEMENT STATEMENT AND THE PROFESSORIAL PERFORMANCE AWARD): **4/2012**

REVIEW DATE FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES*: **9/2011**

Gary Mortenson, Department Head

Date signed: 4/13/07

Steve White, Dean

Date signed: 4/25/07

M. Duane Nellis, Provost

Date signed: 5/01/07

**Each academic department is required by University Handbook policy to develop department documents containing criteria, standards, and guidelines for promotion, tenure, reappointment, annual evaluation and merit salary allocation. These documents must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty members in the department, by the department head or chair, by the dean concerned, and by the provost. In accordance with University Handbook policy, provision must be made to review these documents at least once every five years or more frequently if it is determined to be necessary. Dates of revision (or the vote to continue without revision) must appear on the first page of the document.*

KSU Department of Music

Merit, Promotion, Tenure, Minimum Standards, Mid Tenure Review, Professorial Performance Award

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Merit Salary, Promotion and Tenure | Page 1 |
| C2 Teaching | Page 2 |
| C3 Research and Other Creative Endeavor | Page 3 |
| C6 Non-directed service | Page 4 |
| Statement of Collegiality | Page 5 |
| Minimum Performance Standards | Page (6) |
| I. Introduction | Page (6) |
| II. Minimal Performance Standards | Page (6) |
| 1. Teaching | Page (6) |
| 2. Creative/Research | Page (6) |
| 3. Service | Page (7) |
| 4. Collegiality | Page (7) |
| III. Procedures | Page (7) |
| Mid Tenure Review | Page (9) |
| Professorial Award Guidelines | Page (10) |
| Criteria and Evaluation Procedures | Page (10) |

KSU Department of Music
Merit Salary, Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, p. 1

I: C3

The KSU Department of Music
MERIT SALARY, PROMOTION AND TENURE CRITERIA DOCUMENT

The KSU Department of Music faculty face a challenge brought about by the geographic location of the university. Most major universities are located near larger metropolitan areas which allow them to draw upon professional performing musicians as adjunct teachers for the various applied areas. As this is not an option for KSU, many of our faculty must assume several roles and must function in more than one discipline of our art. When an applied music instructor must also teach music theory is it reasonable to expect that person to be able to maintain a practice schedule that would allow development of a national reputation as a performer? Or on the other hand, can the music theorist who must also teach ten contact hours of piano lessons in addition to the theory classes each week be expected to maintain a level of scholarship that would result in consistent publication in the most prestigious professional journals? This kind of complexity of responsibilities makes it impossible to establish exact equivalencies across academic disciplines.

Additional evaluation issues have been articulated by an interdisciplinary Task Force in the Arts (*The Work of Arts Faculties in Higher Education*. Report of the Interdisciplinary Task Force. 1993. p. 7):

Institutions provide significant support to the work of arts faculty. However, the nature, scope, and availability of creative and research opportunities must be factors in considering productivity within a discipline. For example, the disparity between external research funding available to the arts and humanities in comparison to the sciences is beyond the control of institutions, academic units, or faculty members. Disparities can also occur with respect to release time and to opportunities for peer review when work cannot be distributed and studied in print form.

Values concerning the role and purpose of teaching in cultural development have particular impact on the arts because work in the arts disciplines profoundly influences the cultural context that envelops and affects decisions and events. Since all work in the arts disciplines has multiple connections with education and cultural formation, teaching assumes particular importance. Evaluation policies and procedures should account for this fact, so central to the nature and function of the arts within academe and in society as a whole.

KSU Department of Music
Merit Salary, Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, p. 2

Modern public relations techniques make it possible to substitute fame for achievement, to confuse source or place with quality, and to confuse technical production features with content. Association with images of achievement is not achievement in and of itself, images of quality are not a substitute for quality. Important work in the arts is not always immediately appreciated. Concepts such as "national recognition" need to be defined and used with care, since meaning may vary among disciplines, subdisciplines, institutions, and academic units.

These issues must be and are considered by the faculty when dealing with merit, promotion, and tenure evaluations of their colleagues. It is hoped that the same considerations would be applied by colleagues outside of the discipline.

In the following paragraphs the sections in italics are from the Faculty Handbook (1993) and Music Department explanations follow.

C2 Teaching. Efforts to assist undergraduate and graduate students in gaining knowledge, understanding, or proficiency; for example, planning and teaching courses, advising undergraduates, or supervising graduate students.

The primary mission of the Department of Music at KSU is teaching. Each faculty member has a major portion of their load assigned to instruction and most to advising as well. In addition, the department serves an essential role in the general education component for the entire university. Contributions by faculty members to this departmental role are valued responsibilities and, as such, are given consideration in the evaluation process. As a result of the importance placed on teaching, research, and scholarship related to teaching is given equal significance with research and scholarship in the discipline of music.

Evaluations of teaching effectiveness will be made annually in January by the Head of the Department and a committee of three full-time, tenured professors, with a minimum of one full professor, elected by the faculty during the fall term. Criteria will be those listed in "Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion," a portfolio, and student evaluations. Controls for student motivation and other possible bias in their evaluations, such as those in the TEVAL and SPEAK forms should be included. In order to be considered for promotion to the rank of assistant professor, an individual must maintain an average effectiveness rating of 3.5 on the 5-point scale arrived at by the Department Head after consultation with the Merit Salary Evaluation Committee (criteria for teaching evaluation can be found in the Department of Music's "Evaluation Procedures".) In order to be considered for promotion to the

KSU Department of Music
Merit Salary, Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, p. 3

ranks of associate or full professor, an individual must maintain an average rating of 4.0 on that 5-point scale.

C3 Research and other Creative Endeavor. Efforts to make original intellectual or artistic contributions through scholarship; for example, original research, creative artistry, interdisciplinary scholarly work, guiding graduate students; research, or the use of specialized knowledge to address significant social or professional problems.

Because of the various specializations within the Department, the terms "research" and "creative endeavor" need clarification.

For performance faculty: The presentation of recitals and concerts before local, regional, national, and international audiences is the primary form of creative endeavor. While repeated performances of the same music are certainly meritorious, they will not be given the same weight as additional performances of different literature. It should also be recognized that the preparation of "new" music for public performance frequently involves considerable research that is never published in the usual sense. At the same time, some members of the performance faculty will publish their research in journals or, by invitation, through the presentation of workshops, sessions at professional meetings, or master classes. Such invited presentations may be considered of comparable value to articles published in state, regional, or national journals.

The normal expectation for performance faculty is at least one public presentation each year (unless precluded by reason of health) - Therefore, more than one performance each year would be expected for merit increases and promotion. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, some performances must have been presented before a regional audience. For promotion to full professor, at least one performance must have been given at a significant venue to establish a national reputation. (Regional and national meetings of college music teachers may satisfy these conditions, as well as several performances at various locations throughout the region or nation.)

Public performance as the conductor of an ensemble must be considered apart from solo or chamber music performance. On campus and community performances which are an expected outcome of an individual's teaching responsibilities should be considered only as part of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Out-of-town performances would receive recognition in relation to their public and institutional service value. Appearances by invitation, to conduct performances at state, regional, and national venues of resident ensembles, or performances of festival groups, ensembles at other universities, or workshops of conductors and teachers would receive merit recognition as a creative endeavor.

KSU Department of Music
Merit Salary, Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, p. 4

For the composition faculty, publication, commissions, and/or performances of works before regional and national audiences are the usual expectations for promotion and merit increases. However, some individuals may also engage in traditional types of research and publication.

For the musicology and music theory faculty, research and publication in the traditional sense is the normal expectation. Guest lectures at other universities or for professional arts organizations and participation in state, regional, national, or international conferences as a lecturer or panelist would receive merit recognition as a creative endeavor.

Members of the music education faculty will, in some instances, engage in traditional research and publication activities, and would thus be evaluated on the same basis as musicology and music theory faculty. In other instances, the "research and creative endeavors" are comparable to those of the performance faculty, i.e., publication of the results of research and creative endeavor take the form of invited workshop presentations at state, regional, national, and international levels. In a sense, the activities of some music education faculty and some performance faculty may be considered more closely related to the activities of extension faculty.

C6 Non-directed service. There are three categories:

Profession-based service. Work that is directly related to the function of the unit and that provides leadership and service to the faculty member's profession or discipline; for example, holding office in a professional association or service on an editorial board of a professional journal.

"Meaningful participation in the activities of professional societies" obviously implies more than membership and attending an annual meeting. Local, state, regional, national and international levels of participation would be weighted differently. In approximate order of increasing importance, the following may be considered as a partial list of examples:

- selection as presiding chair for one session;
- selection for participation in a panel discussion;
- appointment to chair a panel discussion, including selection of panel members and coordination of topics;
- appointment to membership on an active standing or ad hoc committee;
- appointment to chair of standing or ad hoc committee;

**KSU Department of Music
Merit Salary, Promotion and Tenure Criteria Document, p. 5**

- selection as member of editorial committee for journal;

- election to office.

Institution-based service. Work that is essential to the operation of the University; for example, contributing to the formulation of academic policy and programs, serving on the Faculty Senate, the Graduate Council, and committees of the department, college or University, or acting as advisor to student organizations.

Public-based professional service. Efforts that are not Directed Service but that are the application of knowledge and expertise intended for the benefit of a non-academic audience; for example, serving as an expert witness, developing programs and providing training, or providing consultation.

STATEMENT OF COLLEGIALITY

Faculty members are evaluated on their record of teaching, scholarship, and service. Additionally, they will be evaluated on their ability to participate in the life of the department:

Attend faculty meetings, use facilities appropriately, be available to colleagues and students, be willing to engage in meaningful professional dialogue, be respectful of other divisional programs within the department when scheduling events, and respond favorably to reasonable assignments. Their demeanor should reflect positively upon the university and the department.

This document was developed by the Ad Hoc Committee on Promotion and Tenure: Ed Brookhart, Al Cochran, Jana Fallin, Virginia Houser, and Mary Ellen Sutton (chair). The document was accepted by faculty vote in October of 1990. First revision was in September of 1993. Revision of the 1993 document was accepted by faculty vote in November of 1995 and in December of 1996. Revision of the 1995-96 document was accepted by faculty vote November 18, 2002. Revision of the 2002 document was accepted by faculty vote September 29, 2006.

MINIMUM PERFORMANCE STANDARDS
Kansas State University
Department of Music

I. INTRODUCTION

Although the primary mission of the Department of Music at Kansas State University is teaching, our faculty must include:

- performers and conductors who excel in their chosen art and who exhibit, through artistic and creative endeavors, high standards of professional excellence
- members who are active in music education research, since the majority of the department's majors pursue degrees in music education
- specialists in musicology and music theory.

Collectively, our faculty's teaching, creative efforts and research are important to the reputation and image of the department at a local, regional, national and international level. With a small faculty of but twenty-four full-time and three part-time individuals, many find their duties and responsibilities to be in more than one area. The realization of this necessity is important and was considered in the formulation of the *Minimal Performance Standards* for the Department of Music.

II. MINIMAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

1. Teaching. Minimal Performance Standards include:

being well versed, and remaining current, in one's subject area, being present, and punctual, for scheduled class meetings; for studio teachers, providing make-up lessons in case of the teacher's absence, providing clearly-stated goals and objectives for the course of study through syllabi, course overviews, and other handouts, delivering instruction that is based upon the stated goals and objectives and is geared to students achieving them, being accessible to students to answer questions and provide guidance, and providing thoughtful and considered advising is part of the assigned responsibility, (most, but not all, Department of Music faculty advise students).

2. Creative/Research: Minimal Performance Standards include:

being well-versed, and remaining current, in one's subject area,

KSU Department of Music
Minimum Performance Standards, p. 2 (7)

maintaining appropriate creative/research efforts, articulating goals and objectives in accordance with departmental policy, and demonstrating ongoing efforts to achieve them through regular and consistent practice, study and/or reflection, and disseminating the results of one's work through public performances, recitals, lectures, workshops, symposia, conferences or publications.

3. **Service:** Minimal Performance Standards in this area are threefold, being (a) profession-based, (b) institution-based and (c) public-based. Faculty members are expected to make contributions in one, or more, of these areas, as outlined in the departmental document, "Merit Salary, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria." Minimally, faculty members should:
 - contribute positively to the department through attending faculty meetings,
 - accept appropriate committee assignments, and
 - assist with appropriate outreach activities of the department, including recruiting new students.

4. **Collegiality:** Minimal performance standards are that faculty members should make a good-faith effort to adhere to the department's Statement of Collegiality.

III. PROCEDURES

Faculty Handbook paragraph C31.6 requires faculty input in decisions regarding problems associated with chronic low achievement. The Department of Music fulfills part of this through its elected Personnel Evaluation Committee and Merit Salary Evaluation Committee, which have important charges related to evaluation of faculty productivity, reappointment, and tenure considerations. The Department Head receives pertinent input from these committees.

Faculty Handbook paragraph C31.5 prescribes specific action to be taken by the Department Head if a faculty member's performance does not meet minimal standards, including written notification of the deficiency to the individual and a specific course of action to improve deficient performance.

When a faculty member's deficiencies in one, or more, area are of sufficient egregiousness, as determined by the Personnel Evaluation Committee, the Merit Salary Evaluation Committee, and the Department Head, provisions of *Faculty Handbook* paragraph C31.5 will be implemented. Thereupon, the Department Head shall convene a special committee, apart from those committees, to assist in drafting the requisite letter to the faculty member suggesting

**KSU Department of Music
Minimum Performance Standards, p. 3 (8)**

specific action to improve the substandard performance. Another option should be reallocating the faculty member's duties, if possible, as outline in Faculty Handbook paragraph C31.7.

Memberships of the committee shall be five tenured faculty members to include (a) the Department Head, (b) three individuals of equal, or higher, rank as the individual in question, appointed by the Personnel Evaluation Committee, and (c) one person designated by the faculty member in question. If the faculty member does not designate such person, the Personnel Evaluation Committee shall appoint another individual. (A smaller committee is acceptable if there are not sufficient members of equal, or higher, rank available.) This committee shall have access to all pertinent documents, load reports, and other information.

Faculty members whose performance is deemed below the minimal performance level shall have opportunity to present a rebuttal to the committee. If this is successful, the process should be stopped and not pursued further.

Because the Department of Music's primary mission is teaching, most faculty members will have this criterion as the primary portion of their individual work loads and assignments. Deficiencies in this area could be catastrophic, potentially, to one's evaluation. Therefore, special care should be taken to make sure that the load allocations are as accurate as possible.

This document was approved by the faculty on 17 February, 1997. The document was revised in November, 2002, and approved by faculty vote on November 18, 2002. The document was revised in September, 2006, and approved by faculty vote on September 29, 2006.

**KSU Department of Music
Evaluation Procedures, Mid-Tenure Review, p. 1 (9)**

**EVALUATION PROCEDURES
Mid-Tenure Review**

- The faculty member under consideration is asked to complete Sections III through VI of the “Promotion and Tenure Documentation” packet. This material, along with the Department Head’s description of the faculty member’s responsibilities and a current vita, is made available for review by the Merit Salary Evaluation Committee. This committee makes recommendations regarding the strengths and/or weaknesses of the candidate’s materials to the Department Head. The Department Head then meets with the faculty member under consideration to transmit these recommendations and suggestions from the committee. The materials are then made available to the entire faculty for review.

- Tenured faculty members are asked to write a narrative concerning the candidate’s reappointment, including a positive or negative recommendation, and to provide a written statement concerning the candidate’s progress toward tenure.

- The Department Head writes a recommendation on reappointment and a one-paragraph statement on progress toward tenure. This, together with the candidate’s materials, is forwarded to the Dean’s office.

Approved 9/1993
Revised 9/2006

**KSU Department of Music
Professorial Performance Award Guidelines, p. 1 (10)**

**KSU DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC
Professorial Performance Award Guidelines**

III. Criteria and Evaluation Procedures for the Professorial Performance Award

The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process (*University Handbook* Sections C.49.1 & C.49.12). The award is not a promotion but a salary performance award. The Professorial Performance Award is part of the annual evaluation process and is based on the Department Head's recommendation to the Dean.

Consistent with Sec. C49.2 of the *University Handbook* the department's criteria for the award are based on the following guidelines:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in the highest rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion Or Professorial Performance Award;
2. The candidate must show evidence of *sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review*;
3. The candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, creative activity/research and service in this period of six or more years must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards (Department Faculty Handbook, IB)

Eligible candidates for performance review must compile and submit to the Department Head a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years. The file will be reviewed by a committee

Professorial Performance Award Guidelines, p. 2 (11)

composed of full professors who will provide a recommendation to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established along with a recommendation for or against granting the award. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

Each candidate who is eligible for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Each candidate has the opportunity to submit a written statement of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head and to the Dean.

The Department Head will submit the following items to the Dean:

- a. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award.
- b. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation.
- c. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation.
- d. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis for adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As in annual evaluation, a candidate may appeal to the Dean for a resolution. For details see Sec. C49.8 through Sec.C 49.11 of the *University Handbook*.

**KSU Department of Music
Professorial Performance Award Guidelines, p. 3 (12)**

The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the faculty in the department, by the Department's Head, by the Dean, and by the Provost. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to full professor change.

-- Approved by Department of Music faculty vote: May 5, 2006
- Revision of 2006 document was accepted by faculty vote April 13, 2007