

III. School of Music Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion

1. Candidates for tenure and promotion in the School of Music shall be evaluated in accordance with these guidelines issued by the School of Music and the current Statement of Tenure and Promotion Criteria and Policies found in the *Faculty Manual*, and those issued by the Provost and the College of Arts and Sciences. Many documents related to tenure and promotion may be found on the School of Music Share Point site. Criteria and policies may also be found on the *Faculty Manual* webpage, and the Provost's and CAS websites respectively. In case of any disagreements, the *Faculty Manual* prevails.

http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/

<http://provost.wsu.edu/manuals-forms/>

<http://cas.wsu.edu/faculty-staff/policies.html>

2. The School of Music, in harmony with CAS policy, addresses 1) classroom and individual teaching, and related curricular advising including graduate teaching and service, and chairing and serving on graduate committees; 2) professional scholarship including performance, creative activity and research; and 3) service to the profession, department, college, university and community. Additionally, the ability to interact effectively with colleagues and students, and exercise of professional ethics are valued criteria that serve as the foundation for advancement and the granting of tenure. In the absence of quantitative methods, objective and substantive evaluation of candidates should be based on expectations and standards typically associated with the profession. No single or all inclusive set of review criteria apply equally to the diverse interests, abilities, duties, loads, and responsibilities of tenure track faculty. Areas for evaluative consideration are presented as illustrative rather than comprehensive or definitive. Tenure and promotion recommendations will be objectively reviewed and weighed on substantive evidence.

A. Classroom and Individual Instruction and Related Curricular Advising

To be considered are knowledge of subject matter, breadth of scholarship, skill and effectiveness as studio instructor, lecturer and discussion leader, ensemble director, independent study mentor, the use of innovative instruction, organizational skills, the ability to motivate students, a record of curricular advising, demonstrable empathy for and fairness toward students, and flexibility related to assigned duties and responsibilities within the expertise parameters of the faculty member. Sources of evidence for evaluating teaching effectiveness and skill at the undergraduate and graduate levels typically include: peer and student evaluations, course material samples and syllabi, and past and present student accomplishments (such as recognition for performance,

competition, publishing, recording, scholarship, entry into graduate programs, and professional placement).

B. Performance/Creative Activity/Scholarship/Research

1. A high quality of artistic excellence is required of those School of Music faculty members whose primary scholarship is in the area of performance, composition and/or conducting. This artistic excellence has its own, intrinsic value. Artistic excellence is determined through the evaluation by faculty colleagues in the School and confirmed through peer-review by musical experts from around the country.
2. Faculty should share their scholarship as widely as possible. Quality and effectiveness are demonstrated by publications (which may include recordings, compositions, arrangements, orchestrations, articles, books, and book chapters), invited performances and presentations (including performances and paper presentations at professional conferences and other prestigious events), commissioned compositions and arrangements, guest conducting appearances, addresses, residencies, masterclasses, and clinics; and funded scholarly work including grants and fellowships, and other recognition of achievements including awards, both external and internal. Work which is recognized internationally or nationally carries more weight than work recognized regionally or locally; peer reviewed work carries more weight than non-peer reviewed work; and external, extramural funding carries more weight than internal funding. The writing of reviews for publication and adjudications are also of significance, although generally not considered as important as the scholarly activities mentioned earlier.
3. In collaborative work, the relative role of the faculty member in question should be made clear, although often in music, the contributions of collaborators may be given equal weight: i.e. in a recital featuring an instrumental soloist and collaborative pianist, the roles are essentially equivalent. Another example in which roles would be equal is when a faculty member premieres a composition by a faculty colleague. Additionally, in chamber music, roles are typically equal.
4. Also important is scholarship cited by others including reviews of performances, recordings, compositions, arrangements, books and other work and the inclusion of scholarly work such as compositions and arrangements on required and recommended lists of repertoire. Scholarship and research may also include development and dissemination of original work as diverse as computer programs or programming, development of codes and standards, the writing of essays and articles or reviews in non-research based periodicals, newspapers, program notes, audio and video recording liner notes, and the like.

5. For assistant professors, a regular, sustained record of scholarship is expected for success with tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor. Sustained productivity is also the ideal circumstance for associate professors aspiring for promotion to the rank of professor; however, it is also possible for associate professors who may go through a period during which they are producing less scholarship, to engage in a reinvigorated period of productivity which justifies promotion to the rank of professor.

C. Professional Activity

Faculty are expected to be active in relevant professional organizations including attendance and participation at professional meetings.

D. Service to the Profession, School, College, University, and Community

In matters of service each faculty member is expected to contribute through qualities of reliability, initiative, interaction, flexibility, collegiality, and cooperation. Service to the profession may include holding office or being a board member of professional organizations, editing professional journals, and/or helping to organize professional conferences and presiding at conference sessions. Service to the School, College and University may include musical performances at university functions and events, service on committees, development of curricula, service in university governance and planning. Evidence and extent of service may be illustrated through leadership positions, committee membership and contribution, sponsorship or advising of student organizations, and participation in music related activities of interest to the profession, state, university, college, school, and community.

E. Recruitment and Mentoring

Recruitment efforts are an integral component of program continuity, quantity and quality. Recruitment efforts should be documented. Mentoring of students may be illustrated through curricular advising, directing independent study, career development guidance, orientation to professional standards, performance and field related tours, and endeavors for student retention in an environment conducive to motivation and inspiration.

F. Interaction with Colleagues and Students

Positive interaction with students and colleagues is an enhancement to program effectiveness. Evaluative evidence may include cooperative endeavors with colleagues inside and outside the School of Music,

collaborative performance, collaborative teaching or service efforts, constructive efforts to resolve program conflicts, citing of special efforts on behalf of students and colleagues, and quality of student mentoring. The described dimensions of each category are clearly not independent, although each does address a different aspect of faculty activity. Performance within any or all of the areas is not expected to be uniform or equal among the diverse duties and responsibilities assigned to each faculty member.

IV. Criteria for Tenure

Candidates for tenure must demonstrate and provide evidence of effectiveness and potential for growth in the areas listed previously in III. Although a diverse division of expertise and requirements is unique to every music faculty position, excellence is expected in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) scholarship and 3) service. Also important are recruitment and mentoring and interaction with colleagues and students.

V. Criteria for Promotion

1. Criteria, as presented in **III** and **IV**, apply to candidates for promotion.
2. For promotion to the rank of associate professor, the candidate must also demonstrate evidence of having earned a regional or national reputation in his/her discipline.
3. For promotion to the rank of professor, the candidate must demonstrate evidence of having earned a national or international reputation in his/her discipline.

VI. Annual Progress Towards Tenure Reviews

1. The candidate is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date personal record that illustrates and documents criteria above.
2. Positive progress toward meeting tenure requirements must be demonstrated for continued appointment prior to tenure consideration. Each year "Progress Towards Tenure" reports for all Assistant Professors will be prepared by the Director in accordance with guidelines established by the *Faculty Manual*, Provost's Office and College of Arts and Sciences. The procedure for these reviews may be found on the *Faculty Manual* webpage, and the Provost's and CAS websites respectively.

http://facsen.wsu.edu/faculty_manual/
<http://provost.wsu.edu/manuals-forms/>
<http://cas.wsu.edu/faculty-staff/policies.html>

3. Annual pre-tenure reviews are intended to give faculty members feedback about their progress toward tenure. Since the criteria for tenure and promotion are the same, the same attributes and areas of performance are assessed. These reviews are, however, expected to be cumulative and they require feedback whenever possible from all tenured faculty in the unit, not just the Director. Previous progress-toward-tenure summaries are to be included in each yearly review of tenure progress where applicable. Following soliciting evaluations from the tenured faculty, the Director will prepare for the Dean, her/his own recommendation which will include a substantive description of the candidate's case, evaluating both quality and quantity of performance. The Director's evaluation will incorporate the thoughts included in the tenured faculty members' recommendations. The Director's case need not agree with the faculty's recommendations, but disparities should be explained. Tenured faculty will have the opportunity to review this summary prior to it being shared with the person under review.
4. The Director is to meet individually with each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member yearly to discuss results and implications of the evaluation. The purpose of this meeting is to aid the faculty member in understanding how tenured members view his or her performance in light of School of Music and College of Arts and Sciences criteria. A dated written summary of the discussion of these results and of the implications shall be signed by each non-tenured, tenure-track faculty member and the Director. Each faculty member being reviewed shall have the right to have a response concerning this summary permanently attached to the summary. A copy of the signed summary is to be provided to the faculty member. This summary also shall be available, upon request, to each tenured member of the department. It is the responsibility of the Director to insure that the above procedures are followed and all parties are aware of their rights and responsibilities associated with the process.

VII. Third Year Review Procedures

1. All faculty on tenure track appointments will ordinarily have a "formal tenure progress review" during their third year of employment at Washington State University.
2. If credit was given towards tenure upon appointment, the review may occur at another time, as specified in the employment agreement or as negotiated between the Director, the Dean, and/or the Provost's Office. In determining the third year of employment, leave without pay for more than one half the annual pay period does not count toward eligibility time for tenure consideration.

3. Third Year Review candidates will assemble materials in accordance with policies and procedures established by the Provost's Office and College of Arts and Sciences. These procedures may be found on the Provost's and CAS websites respectively.

<http://provost.wsu.edu/manuals-forms/>
<http://cas.wsu.edu/faculty-staff/policies.html>

4. The Third Year Review shall be conducted by the same individuals and follow the same procedures that apply to final tenure consideration. However, outside peer review is not required. In the Third Year Review process, the following steps must be included: For each candidate, tenured faculty members in the School of Music must have access to a file that includes all information relevant to assessment of progress toward tenure and promotion. After review and dialog among the faculty, each tenured faculty member in the School of Music will submit written commentary on the Third Year Progress Toward Tenure Evaluation form provided by the CAS that addresses School of Music, CAS and university criteria for progress toward tenure. When improvement is recommended for a candidate, or when performance by a candidate is unsatisfactory, suggested actions for the candidate's improvement must be included in the written evaluations.
5. The purpose of the review is to identify strengths and weaknesses with regard to progress toward tenure and promotion. The results of the third year review, made available to the faculty member by the Provost, will reflect the evaluations by the School of Music tenured faculty, the School of Music Director, the Dean, and Provost. If the candidate receives less than a positive overall evaluation, recommendations for modification will be made. Where the review reveals an unsatisfactory record, non-reappointment may be warranted. In that case, the candidate will lose tenure-track status and be offered a one-year terminal contract.

VIII. Tenure and Promotion Procedures

1. Under most circumstances, in the spring of the fifth year of the probationary period, the candidate and the Director will jointly assure that the tenure review file is complete using the tenure and promotion guidelines published respectively on the Web sites of the Provost and CAS.

<http://provost.wsu.edu/manuals-forms/>
<http://cas.wsu.edu/faculty-staff/policies.html>

2. For tenure and/or promotion review, the Director will solicit evaluations of the candidate's work from five peers outside WSU. WSU will treat these

evaluations as sensitive documents, and they will not be made generally available. However, because WSU is a public institution and because our state has a very broad public records law, confidentiality is not guaranteed. Those evaluators selected will include at least three persons not nominated by the candidate. Final selection of all external evaluators will be made by the Director. Outside evaluators selected will be asked to provide an evaluation of the quality, significance, effectiveness, potential and influence of the candidate's work within the profession in relation to College of Arts and Sciences and School of Music Tenure and Promotion Guidelines. Procedures regarding the number of outside evaluators and how they are to be selected are established by the College of Arts and Sciences and the Provost's Office. Current tenure and Promotion guidelines may be found on the CAS and Provost's websites respectively.

<http://cas.wsu.edu/faculty-staff/policies.html>

<http://provost.wsu.edu/manuals-forms/>

3. The Director will convene and chair a meeting with the candidate and the tenured faculty of the School of Music for questions, discussion, assessment and future professional plans.
4. All tenured faculty are obligated to independently review and evaluate submitted materials, including the comments of the outside professional reviewers.
5. Following the opportunity to review the candidate's file and supporting evidence, each tenured faculty will complete and return to the Director a signed recommendation on a form provided by the CAS. These recommendations will be forwarded to the Dean along with the candidate's file and the outside professional evaluations.
6. The Director will evaluate the recommendations of the faculty and outside evaluators and, incorporating the thoughts of those recommendations, will prepare for the Dean, her/his own recommendation which will include a substantive description of the candidate's case, evaluating both quality and quantity of performance. The Director's case need not agree with the faculty and/or outside evaluators' recommendations, but disparities should be explained.
7. After submission to the Dean, the tenure recommendation and consequent decision will be handled in accordance with CAS and University policies and procedures.

IX. Promotion Procedures

1. A candidate for promotion is responsible for maintaining an up-to-date personal record/file that provides supporting evidence bearing on the criteria for promotion.
2. Nominations for promotion with the Director's support will be initiated as a result of consultation between the Director and the faculty member to be nominated or as a result of other faculty members advocating a particular nomination. Documentation, including letters of evaluation from at least five outside professionals in the field, will be solicited and made available by the Director for review by faculty members above the candidate's rank. A meeting with the candidate and faculty above the candidate's rank will be convened by the Director for the purpose of discussing and interviewing the candidate. After the meeting and in consultation with appropriate faculty, if any, who advocated the nomination, the Director will determine whether or not to forward to the Dean a recommendation for promotion accompanied by supporting documentation.
3. Alternatively, a faculty member may independently assemble and submit to the Dean, via the Director, credentials without the support of the Director. In such a case, the Director is responsible for obtaining letters of evaluation from outside reviewers, but is not otherwise responsible for advocating the candidate's case. Nonetheless, in these cases, the Director is still responsible for submitting an evaluation of the candidate in question.
4. After submission to the Dean, the promotional recommendation and decision will be handled in accordance with CAS and University policies and procedures.