

**Department of Music
Faculty Recognition Document**

February 2007

Table of Contents

Philosophy.....	3
Criteria for Faculty Recognition in Music	4
General Procedures	5
Sabbatical Year/Semester Procedures.....	6
Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Procedures	7
Chronic Low Performance.....	10
Instructional and Student Related Activities Evaluation	11
Teaching Activities	13
Scholarly/Creative Activities	16
Service Activities	17
Time Line for Annual Faculty Merit Evaluation and Review for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure	19

Philosophy

The Department of Music follows the criteria for the evaluation of faculty as outlined by the Emporia State University Faculty Handbook. These guidelines have been constructed to work in accordance with Regents and University guidelines and policies regarding faculty recognition.

Music is a unique discipline because its product is one that most commonly exists in an ephemeral state between the creator and his/her audience (receiver). Nevertheless, music in higher education may be evaluated within the broad categories of instructional and student related activities, scholarship/creative activities, and service, to make determinations in matters of faculty recognition (i.e., promotion, tenure, retention, and merit salary adjustments).

It is the policy of the Department to promote and foster excellence in all the above listed criteria. The future excellence of the Department greatly depends upon the quality of judgment exercised in making equitable and intelligent decisions in matters of faculty recognition. Therefore, recommendations from the department to the Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences are made only after a thorough, comprehensive scrutiny by all involved in the evaluative process.

Criteria for Faculty Recognition in Music

Department faculty members have established that at least 50% of the total evaluative weight in faculty recognition matters in music be assigned to instructional and student related activities, at least 20% to scholarly/creative activities, and at least 10% to service. Each faculty member may elect, by January at the beginning of the annual evaluative period, to have the remaining 20% of the evaluation weight put into any of the above categories. If a faculty member does not elect the option he/she will be evaluated 60% instructional and student related activities, 20% scholarly/creative activities, and 20% service. It is important, however, to recognize that appropriate balance of activities for a given faculty member should be discussed with the Department Chair and Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and, if necessary, appropriate readjustments will be given to individual cases as merited. The quality of the contributions within each evaluative criteria is of greater importance than the quantity.

Overall quality of contribution is taken into account in the following manner:

- Recognition by peers in the field
- Meeting the needs and goals of the Department in particular and the University in general, regarding teaching, recruiting, creativity/scholarship, and service on committees (including faculty senate)
- Evidence of satisfactory progress towards individual professional and/or educational goals
- Willingness to make a positive contribution assisting colleagues, and the community at large, when needed

The above criteria for assessing retention, promotion, and tenure, are to be placed in the context of the expectations of the individual faculty member's position, his/her assignments, and his/her opportunities.

At the beginning of each annual evaluative period, each faculty member will prepare a personal set of goals within the three areas of endeavor: instructional and student related activities, scholarly/creative activities, and service. These goals will be submitted to the Department chair and discussed as part of the annual faculty-chair conference. Each faculty member will personally evaluate his/her achievements relative to these goals in preparation for each annual retention, tenure, promotion, and/or merit review.

General Procedures

Selection of Faculty Recognition Committee and Chair

The evaluation process for faculty recognition, including matters of chronic low performance, within the Department will consist of a peer review conducted by the Faculty Recognition Committee and a peer review conducted by the Department Chair. The Department Chair will assign all full-time faculty members to the Faculty Recognition Committee on a rotational basis. The committee shall comprise five full-time faculty members. The majority of members on this committee must be tenured with separate rotations for tenured and non-tenured faculty. Appointment terms of three years will be staggered with the majority of the committee comprising carry-over members. No member shall serve consecutive terms, except in extenuating circumstances. The Department Chair will not serve on this committee. Non-tenured faculty members of the committee may be included in the discussion of tenure matters, but only tenured faculty members on the Faculty Recognition Committee may vote on matters of tenure. Non-tenured faculty members of the committee will be eligible to vote on all other matters. The majority of members on this committee must be tenured. The duties of the Faculty Recognition Committee will include making recommendations on retention, promotion, and tenure, and numerical determinations on merit salary adjustments. In the event that a faculty member is unable to serve during a particular year, his/her rotation will begin the following year and will comprise the three-year term.

The Faculty Recognition Committee shall elect a Chair Elect from among its five members to serve as Chair of the committee the following year. The committee Chair is responsible for seeing that the committee functions according to the timeline. He/she also serves as liaison between the FRC and the Department Chair and between the FRC and the rest of the music faculty.

Merit Review Procedures

The Department Chair shall convene the initial meeting of the Faculty Recognition Committee early in the fall semester for the purposes of electing a committee chair, reviewing Faculty Recognition Guidelines, and establishing a time schedule for the work of the committee. The time schedule shall be published and provided to all members of the Department.

The Department employs many part-time professionals who serve as valuable members of the faculty. These instructors are specialists in their areas, providing applied vocal, instrumental, and classroom instruction that is necessary for a Department of Music that is not covered by

tenure-track faculty. They are trained professionals, and work with the students on a daily basis. Several have years of public school teaching experience, which is very important to the instruction of future teachers. They serve on Department committees, University-wide steering committees and as advisors to student groups. Several of the faculty members are recognized at the state, national, and international levels with their work in professional music organizations. Part-time faculty interact with students and represent the University, therefore they should receive appropriate recognition for their work. They should also be evaluated with chair and peer teaching evaluations as faculty members to maintain the quality for which the Department strives.

It shall be the responsibility of all full-time faculty members to submit materials in the form of an Annual Evaluative Portfolio as determined by the Faculty Recognition Committee in his/her behalf by the date established by the committee. Materials should be submitted to the Department Chair who shall, in turn, provide them to the Faculty Recognition Committee. These materials will insure that there is a documented record of faculty performance consistent with personnel decisions.

While the Faculty Recognition Committee would not normally request an applicant for recognition to appear before the committee, it reserves the right to do so when such a personal appearance would assist the committee in reaching an objective and fair recommendation.

Sabbatical Year/Semester Procedures

Evaluation of department faculty members who participate in a semester or year sabbatical should adhere to the following guidelines.

- Teaching ratings should be based on FRC and student evaluations from the semesters taught (Spring, Summer, or Fall) in the year of the sabbatical leave.
- Service ratings should be based on service performed during the year of the sabbatical leave. When applicable, this could include service performed as part of the sabbatical leave.
- Research and Creative Activities should be evaluated based on activities performed during the year of the sabbatical leave. These activities can be during the part of the year not on sabbatical and may include applicable activities performed during the sabbatical leave itself.
- The sabbatical leave should be evaluated using the document submitted in the faculty member's annual merit review portfolio and/or a summary of research findings or the results of the project during the semesters absent during the current year. The document and/or summary would then be applied to Guidelines 1-3 above.
- If the faculty member is on sabbatical for one semester, the percentage

weighting for the year shall be a minimum of 50% creativity, 20% teaching, and 10% service. The remaining 20% shall be distributed by the faculty member. For a one-year sabbatical leave, the percentage weighting shall be a minimum of 80% creativity with the final 20% distributed at the discretion of the faculty member.

- It is recommended that the faculty member provide names and addresses of possible outside reviewers of the research or project. This could include peers in the specific field or certificates of completion of post-graduate courses, or grades, and/or other evidence of the special nature of the study.

Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Review Procedures

With regard to retention, promotion, and tenure recommendation, the Faculty Recognition Committee shall prepare separate letters on each of its recommendations, outlining its reasons for them. These letters shall be sent to both the Department Chair and the faculty member. The Department Chair will prepare his/her written recommendation and forward this to the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member will have a grace period of three working days to prepare a written response, if he/she so wishes, and to submit this to the Department Chair. In the case of chronic low performance a faculty member has five working days to respond. During this grace period the faculty member may request a meeting with the Faculty Recognition Committee and/or the Department Chair to respond to the recommendation. Following the three-day grace period, the Department Chair will submit to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences his/her recommendation along with copies of the Faculty Recognition Committee's written recommendation and the faculty member's response. The Department Chair will provide a copy of his/her recommendation to the faculty member and inform the Faculty Recognition Committee whether he/she has concurred with the committee's recommendations.

Merit Review Procedures

With regard to annual merit review, the Faculty Recognition Committee will annually prepare a written evaluation that includes a numerical rating for each full-time faculty member within the categories of instructional and student related activities, scholarship/creative activities, and service. The evaluation will be forwarded to the Department Chair. These numerical ratings will be on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest possible rating. The numerical ratings will be forwarded to the Department Chair. These ratings are equivalent to the following:

- Rating of 4 and higher: Exceptional. A rating of Exceptional indicates that the faculty member has gone beyond the expectations of their position and/or been recognized as excelling in an area. This recognition can be in the form of honors and/or awards, selection for recital or conference presentations, and publications, both regionally and nationally. Other factors that can be taken into account would include an extraordinary effort and contribution in an area, and the overall record of the faculty member in terms of his/her development.
- Rating of 2.50 - 3.99: Meets Expectations. A rating of Meets Expectations indicates that

the faculty member has met the needs and goals of the Department and the University within the context of his/her position, in teaching, creativity/scholarship, service, and recruitment.

- Rating below 2.50: Does Not Meet Expectations. A rating of Does Not Meet Expectations indicates that the faculty member is not meeting the requirements of the Department and the University within the context of his/her position. The committee and the chair will provide a written explanation of what they view as the deficiency and how it can be remedied. A faculty member receiving such a rating in a particular area, has the right, and responsibility, to seek assistance to remediate the deficiency. Continued ratings of Does Not Meet Expectations may result in an evaluation of chronic low performance as outlined below.

The Department Chair will prepare his/her independent evaluation with a numerical rating of each full-time faculty member utilizing the above rating system. In addition, the Department Chair will prepare and provide his/her and the Faculty Recommendation Committee written evaluation to the faculty member. This evaluation will include both the Faculty Recognition Committee and the Department Chair numerical rating. Each faculty member has the opportunity to respond to the annual evaluation in writing within ten working days. This written response will be placed in his/her personnel file.

Each full-time faculty member will meet with the Chair of the Department during the Spring Semester relative to the faculty member's annual evaluation. Contents of the faculty member's annual evaluation portfolio, professional goals, and teaching evaluations are reviewed and discussed. Areas where the faculty member may need assistance are determined. Professional goals for the next year and requested changes in percentage distribution of instructional and student related activities, research/creative activities, and service will also be discussed.

Chronic Low Performance

Emporia State University defines chronic low performance as follow: “Chronic low performance of a tenured faculty member is demonstrated when the faculty member fails in his or her professional responsibility as identified in annual evaluations. Continued low performance, despite all assistance provided, may be considered an adequate cause for dismissal.”

Chronic low performance of faculty members is noted if the following conditions exist in three consecutive years or four out of six years:

- Inability to create professional competent goals in each of the three evaluation categories
- Inability to adequately meet goals established the previous year in each of the three evaluation categories
- An annual rating of Does Not Meet Expectations in two categories, one of which must be teaching.

When chronic low performance is noted using the above criteria, the procedure outlined by Faculty Senate Bill 04003 will be implemented (SFB 04003 supplants SFB 96001). FSB04003 calls for the following procedures (as quoted from FSB 04003):

IV. Determination that Academic Responsibilities Are Not Being Met

A. If the [department] chair and the Evaluation Committee [the FRC] agree, after independent evaluations, that the individual failed in teaching and either scholarly activity or service, then a determination is made that academic responsibilities are not being met. Such a determination must be made on the basis of convincing evidence. If the chair and Evaluation Committee do not agree in this determination then the matter is referred to the college Performance Review Committee.

B. Within twenty class days of the referral, the Performance Review Committee will make a determination of whether academic responsibilities are being met. If the Performance Review Committee agrees that the individual failed in teaching and either scholarly activity or service, then a determination is made that academic responsibilities are not being met and this determination is submitted to the dean and Vice President for Academic Affairs. If the Performance Review Committee does not agree in this determination, then the matter is closed for the current year.

C. Department chairs shall consult with the academic dean, and the dean shall consult annually with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet his or her professional responsibilities.

V. Appropriate Interventions, Including Faculty Development Options

If the annual evaluation indicates that a tenured faculty member has failed in any of his or her professional responsibilities (i.e., teaching, scholarly activities, or service), a written plan of action to improve the faculty member's performance shall be developed as a product of mutual negotiation. This corrective faculty development plan should have the objective of raising the faculty member's performance to acceptable levels or beyond within three years. It shall respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it shall be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment. Good faith is expected from all parties, which includes a commitment to improve by the faculty member and adequate support of that improvement by the university. The plan should not require a literal fulfillment of a set of nonnegotiable demands or rigid expectations by any party, quantitative or otherwise. The FRC shall assist by offering recommendations and/or reviewing the plan. If a mutually agreeable plan cannot be developed, the faculty member may appeal to the college Performance Review Committee, the dean, or the Vice President for Academic Affairs to assist in the development, and provision of additional resources, of such a plan. Beyond appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as a sabbatical (if eligible), campus opportunities for faculty continued

renewal and development, and change in teaching assignments, or reassigned time dedicated to improvement, the plan may seek other appropriate interventions away from campus, including funding for professional travel to participate in workshops, seminars, conferences, or other opportunities that might be expected to help the faculty member develop. Non-academic options may be part of the plan when appropriate (e.g., counseling or medical leave).

The Performance Review Committee for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences shall be established through the following procedure: Before the final college assembly each spring, the Dean's Advisory Committee shall randomly select 20 tenured teaching faculty members from the college, excluding department chairs and the associate dean. These names will be announced at the final assembly in the order in which they were selected. The names of faculty serving on the Dean's Advisory Committee will be removed from the pool of eligible faculty. As a case arises the Moderator shall call the selected faculty and inform them of the name of the alleged low performer and ask if there is any reason for the person selected to disqualify himself/herself, such as conflict of interest or relationship with the alleged low performer. Should any individuals disqualify themselves, their names shall be removed from consideration for that case only. The names of tenured faculty selected by the above procedure shall be presented at a meeting held for the purpose of selecting a Performance Review Committee (PRC). Attending this meeting will be the alleged low performer and the Moderator, Secretary, and the past Moderator of the Dean's Advisory Committee.

Normally, a corrective plan should be approved by the faculty member to whom it applies, the department chair, FRC, and others who are to provide resources for such a plan (e.g., dean or Vice President for Academic Affairs). The plan normally should provide continuous faculty development for three years. The faculty member may reject an approved plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure in his or her professional responsibilities is a basis for dismissal.

In keeping with university policy on chronic low performance a faculty member has a right to due process in the event any disagreement should arise in the course of the evaluation.

VI. Recommendation for Dismissal

If the chair and either the FRC or the college Performance Review Committee determine that there has been a sustained overall failure in teaching and either scholarly activity or service (i.e., failing in teaching and at least one other area), in three consecutive years or four out of six years the department chair may recommend to the dean that a tenured faculty member be dismissed, provided the faculty member has had the opportunity for corrective faculty development for the commensurate amount of time (i.e., for three consecutive years or four out of six years). The dean may forward such recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. In making this determination, the department chair must state the nature of the failure, the reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed, the level of discernible improvement in the faculty

member's performance after being notified of any failure in performance, and the extent to which the faculty member has complied with the terms of an approved plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. If the Vice President for Academic Affairs, upon reviewing the recommendations, agrees with these recommendations, he/she may recommend to the President that the faculty member be dismissed. If the President agrees and wishes to recommend dismissal, the faculty member may proceed to the dismissal policy.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based on grounds of sustained failure, the reports of the FRC, college Performance Review Committee, the annual written evaluations concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the faculty committee charged with hearing the dismissal case and any subsequent dismissal or grievance committee.

The finding of failure must neither abuse academic freedom nor be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary, or capricious dismissal. If a dismissal or grievance committee concludes that such factors were considered in formulating the recommendation to dismiss, the committee shall recommend to the President that the proceeding to dismiss be terminated.

Instructional and Student Related Activities Evaluation

The Faculty Recognition Committee and Department Chair shall observe each faculty member teaching during the fall semester. Tenure-track faculty members will also be observed during the spring semester. Tenured faculty may request observation in the spring semester. Each faculty member will receive a summary of Faculty Recognition Committee observations and Chair observations. The results of these observations are used to assist in making fair evaluative observations regarding teaching. The results of these observations help provide information to recognize excellent teaching and/or to identify weakness, which need to be addressed.

Faculty members who are in need of assistance to address teaching concerns will meet with the Department Chair to outline strategies to address those concerns. Assistance may come in the form of further academic training, observation of excellent teaching models, ongoing teaching observation with guidance, and/or the assignment of a faculty mentor to assist the faculty member in achieving excellence in teaching.

All Department faculty members are expected to conduct student evaluations for all courses, ensembles, and applied lessons during the fall, spring, and summer semesters. Student evaluations are administered in November and April during the academic year. Summer school evaluations are done prior to the end of the summer teaching. These evaluations are norm referenced for bias. A student monitor selected by the instructor administers student evaluations. Applied lesson evaluations are conducted during the final 10 minutes of the lesson. The instructor leaves the room for the duration of the evaluation period.

The results of the evaluations are made known to faculty after grades are submitted. In addition,

the results are given to the Faculty Recognition Committee and Department Chair and are used as part of the evaluative process for retention, promotion, tenure, and merit.

Sources of Evidence for Faculty Recognition Evaluation in Instructional and Student Related Activities, Scholarly/Creative Activities and Service

A variety of sources of evidence will be used in an effort to make equitable and fair decisions in faculty recognition matters. Examples of possible sources of evidence are listed below. Although some sources of evidence are more applicable to one area of recognition than another, the diversity of the following sources of evidence will greatly assist all involved within the faculty recognition process.

- *Chair evaluation and visitation of classroom instruction, research/performance/creative, and service accomplishments
- *Faculty Recognition Committee evaluation of teaching
- Research/performance/creative, and service accomplishments
- *A current vitae
- *Completed student evaluation reports secured anonymously under standard conditions
- *Faculty statement and evaluation of annual professional goals with percentage weight for each category
- *Annual accumulative addition
- *Written evidence of course development, teaching syllabi, tests, and teaching materials;
- *Written supportive evidence of successful research, performance, and/or creative activities
- *Written supportive evidence of service activities
- Student advising evaluations (if faculty member is an advisor)
- Written supportive evidence of success by present and former students
- Written supportive statements by former students who have been graduated at least one year
- Written supportive statements by colleagues

NOTE: Items indicated by * should be included in each faculty member's Annual Evaluative Portfolio and must be submitted to the Faculty Recognition Committee.

Teaching Activities

Teaching is central to the mission of Emporia State University. It is, therefore, the expectation that each faculty member within the Department will excel in carrying out his/her responsibilities in instructional and student related activities. Excellent teaching involves the ability to share knowledge with respect for students as individuals. The successful teaching imparts knowledge based upon excellent communication skills, sound scholarship/creativity, and intellectual growth and development.

In the Department, the primary objectives consist of the teaching and making of music.

Unlike many academic disciplines, music provides a product, the performance or composition, which is put on public display for evaluation by all. These performances include presentations to audiences composed of persons ranging from experts to those with no claim to any knowledge whatsoever. This is the nature of the deliverance of the product of music to society and, therefore, it does not deviate from its academic application. Performances by students in ensembles, solo recitals, or applied examinations, provide effective vehicles by which the effectiveness of teaching can be evaluated. The academic side of the study of music, e.g., history, theory, and music education classes, is evaluated using the same standard criteria as is commonly used for classes in other disciplines.

Department faculty members are expected to recruit students in order to ensure an adequate number of students to meet the needs of applied studios and ensembles.

Significance of an activity should be weighted within the context of the expectations of the individual faculty member's position, his/her assignments, and opportunities. Regular assigned duties at ESU which comprise the foundation of evaluating the contribution in teaching, and which are evaluated by colleagues and students, include:

- Conducting ensembles
- Teaching lessons
- Teaching classes
- Student advising
- Recruitment activities
- Up-to-date syllabi on file in the office for each course by the end of the first week of each semester
- Adequate communication of course/ensemble/studio policies, procedures, expectations, and schedules to enrolled students

- Participation on undergraduate and graduate performance committees as needed, dependent upon faculty area of expertise;
- Participation on graduate program notes and thesis committees as needed, dependent upon faculty area of expertise
- Administrative duties assigned as part of the teaching load

Other non-assigned activities, depending on context of the situation, that could be considered in the category of teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Summer classes
- On-line classes
- Curriculum development
- Being invited to present a masterclass
- Being invited to teach in a workshop

Criteria for evaluation may include, but are not limited to:

- Evidence the instructor/conductor is prepared
- Evidence of teacher currency in updating course materials
- Evidence of maintaining a range of activities to enhance teaching effectiveness (i.e., reading, attendance at workshops, seminars)
- Evidence the students are suitably challenged
- Innovation in teaching
- Maintenance of an adequate studio over a period of time (overall trends should be taken into account – not just one semester)
- Evidence of progress of applied students -- performances, participation and rankings in campus and off-campus activities, etc.
- Evaluations by colleagues
- Evaluations by students
- Recognition by peers in the individual faculty member's field.

Scholarly/Creative Activities

Many academic areas within higher education, due to the nature of their discipline, focus only on research as a valid mode of accepted scholarship. However, it is commonly accepted by leading institutions in higher education and within its accrediting associations that scholarship in the arts embraces a broad spectrum of activity undertaken by those who practice an arts discipline in an educational environment. The Department's accrediting agency, the National Association of Schools of Music states in its handbook: "The creative production of performers, composers and other applied faculty should be accepted as equivalent to scholarly publication or research as a criterion for appointment and advancement." (p. 47)

Accordingly, each faculty member within the Department is expected to maintain a program of scholarship activity for consideration in retention, promotion, tenure, and merit salary adjustment evaluation.

It is important to note, however, that the type of scholarship activity deemed acceptable for each faculty member should be determined according to his/her own unique personal and educational background, field of specialization in which the terminal degree was awarded, and the nature of his/her duties within the Department.

It is understood that a faculty member is not limited only to scholarship activities listed within his/her area of specialization. Such breadth of activity is encouraged and will be recognized. It is, however, an expectation that each faculty member should contribute to an active record of scholarship within his/her field of specialization.

The weight given to any performance, research, or creative activity is directly related to the degree that evaluation by peers external to ESU is involved. Examples of activities which involve a high degree of peer evaluation would include, but not be limited to, being selected for performances by external organizations of recognized reputation, the winning of awards or competitions sponsored by external organizations, the publishing of articles in refereed journals, favorable reviews by qualified critics, and successful grant proposals administered through the university.

It is recognized that the availability of refereed journals is limited in professional/academic music fields in comparison to traditional academic/scholarly disciplines. Evaluation of a faculty member's scholarly/creative activities includes judgments on quality and importance, the amount, and the method or media in which the activities are disseminated.

Given the nature of creativity, music activities as a learning tool for students and as a cultural offering for the university, local, and surrounding area communities, faculty members within the Department of music are expected, within their areas of expertise, to include creative offerings both within on-campus and off-campus venues.

Activities that should be considered scholarly/creative include, but are not limited to (these items are not listed in ranked order -- they simply present options accepted by the Department):

- Performance of a solo recital
- Invitations to perform a solo recital off-campus (not primarily intended as recruitment)
- Performance in a chamber recital
- Collaborative performance in a solo recital
- Solo, collaborative, or chamber performance as a portion of a recital
- Invitations to perform a chamber recital off-campus (not primarily intended as recruitment)
- Invitations to present an ensemble off-campus (not primarily intended as recruitment or invitations solicited by the ensemble instructor)
- Lecture recitals
- Soloist with an on-campus or off-campus ensemble
- Membership in a recognized, professional ensemble
- Guest conducting
- Original composition, music arrangements, and scholarly editions
- Conference presentation of research, composition, or performance
- Published research in journal articles, books, textbooks, compositions, scholarly editions, and arrangements
- Recordings of performances or compositions
- Success in writing grants

Though all contributions are of worth, significance of an activity can be weighted within the context of:

- Recognition by peers in the individual faculty member's field – i.e., juried submissions of performances, articles and compositions
- Contribution to extending the knowledge in the field
- Representation of ESU;

- Presenting students with examples deemed representative by a consensus of experts in the field of literature and performance practice in the field
- The expectations of the individual faculty member's position, his/her assignments, and opportunities

Activities that are not a scholarly/creative product, but rather are the result of being a teacher and musician would include, but are not limited to:

- Conducting ensembles that are a part of a faculty member's teaching assignment or area
- Solo or ensemble tours that are primarily intended as recruitment, or that are the result of a solicited invitation, or other service - i.e. introducing young people to the various instruments of the orchestra
- Personal paid performances that are not primarily intended as a contribution to the field or to promote ESU

Service Activities

The mission of the university is enhanced when faculty members serve beyond the classroom in helping the institution to reach its short and long-term goals. Service is generally thought to encompass two areas: 1) service to the Department, college, and/or university; 2) service to the profession and community when such service is demonstrably related to the faculty member's disciplinary interests and expertise. It is an expectation that each faculty member within the Department will contribute within the area of service.

Activities that should be considered service include, but are not limited to:

- Service on Department and University committees
- Organizing ensemble tours that are not the result of unsolicited invitations
- Judging contests
- Assisting fellow faculty
- Assisting students
- Performing as a member (not soloist) of student ensembles in the Department – i.e. band, orchestra, choir, or other large ensembles
- Donating services for fund-raising
- Membership in volunteer groups that promote ESU or the general welfare of the

community

- Performances for special occasions at ESU and in the community at large
- Regular attendance (as much as possible) at student, faculty, and guest artist performances
- Services as consultant
- Professional speeches (non-research based) for area service clubs, meetings, community functions, etc.
- Membership/participation on editorial, advisory, and grant review boards
- Coordinating, hosting on-campus professional meetings, contests, workshops, etc., of professional and/or student organizations
- Sponsoring student organizations
- Maintaining/improving Department equipment, facilities, and special holdings

Though all contributions are of worth, significance of an activity can be weighted within the context of:

- Recognition by peers both regionally and nationally
- Promotion of the Department specifically and ESU generally
- Service to the Department specifically and ESU generally
- Community service

Activities not considered service, but rather are the result of being a teacher and musician would include, but are not limited to:

- Personal paid performances that are not primarily intended as a contribution to the field or to promote ESU
- Performances that are the result of regular employment by an organization or agency that is not ESU

Time Line for Annual Faculty Merit Evaluation and Review for Retention, Promotion, and Tenure

Full-time faculty members within the Department will be evaluated annually. The evaluation time period will be the calendar year, January through December. Second-year faculty members

are evaluated during the fall semester.

By October:

- Faculty vote whether peer review will be used to supplement chair review for retention, promotion, tenure, and merit. Faculty Recognition Committee Chair to schedule meetings of the FRC. Faculty Recognition Committee selects Chair Elect to serve as Committee Chair the following year. Faculty Recognition Committee meets with Department Chair.

By November:

- Preparation and notification of faculty by Faculty Recognition Committee Chair of evaluation timeline and relevant procedures and information. FRC retention review of second year faculty members.

By December 15:

- Official written notification of probationary second-year faculty members of non-renewal of appointment.

By end of the fall semester:

- Faculty Recognition Committee and Department Chair complete teaching observations.

By the 1st week of January:

- Faculty members submit Annual Evaluative Portfolio to Department Chair. Faculty members prepare and submit to the Department Chair professional goals for upcoming year and any percentage changes for evaluation.

During interim week:

- The Faculty Recognition Committee review and prepare: retention materials for 1st, 3rd, 4th, and 5th year faculty members; promotion and tenure applications; annual merit review for all faculty members.

By February:

- Department Chair completes review of tenure-track faculty, and faculty requesting promotion and tenure.

By March:

- Department Chair provides each faculty member with a written evaluation that responds to the evaluation portfolio and the Faculty Recognition Committee review.

By March 6:

- Official written notification of probationary first-year faculty members of non-renewal of appointment.

By March 15:

- Faculty member must be informed of chronic low performance. The faculty member has five days to prepare a written response.

By April:

- Department Chair meets with each faculty member to discuss the annual evaluation and professional goals for the upcoming year.