

Department of Music

Criteria for Retention, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved by Department faculty: Nov. 4, 2022

1.0 Purpose: This document describes requirements and procedures for candidates seeking tenure and promotion in the Music Department at Utah Valley University. It also provides guidelines and criteria for annual and post-tenure reviews.

2.0 References: The Music Department adheres to all University policies regarding rank, tenure, and promotion. The candidate is expected to be familiar with all university policies, especially the documents listed below, and to follow the requirements stated therein.

UVU Policy 601 *Classroom Instruction and Management*
UVU Policy 631 *Student Evaluations of Faculty and Courses*
UVU Policy 632 *Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank*
UVU Policy 633 *Annual Faculty Reviews*
UVU Policy 635 *Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities*
UVU Policy 637 *Tenure and Appeals*
UVU Policy 638 *Post-Tenure Review*
UVU Policy 641 *Salaried Faculty Workload*
UVU Policy 114 *Conflict of Interest*
UVU Mission Statement
Music Department Mission Statement

2.1 Tenure Plan

2.1.1 Within the first semester at UVU, the faculty member should meet jointly with the chair of the department Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) committee and the chair of the Department of Music to create a written tenure plan.

2.1.2 This plan will outline a set of expectations for tenure tailored to the faculty member's specific position and areas of expertise, consistent with the expectations outlined below and with UVU Policy 637 *Faculty Tenure*.

2.1.3 This written, detailed tenure plan must be approved by the RTP committee chair and department chair within the first two semesters of employment.

2.1.4 The tenure plan is signed by the faculty member, department chair, and the department RTP committee chair and placed in the faculty member's personnel file.

2.1.5 The faculty member should begin assembling representative documentation for the tenure portfolio that provides evidence of teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service. This portfolio should follow the faculty member's tenure plan and be organized in accordance with UVU policy 637. The faculty member should establish and regularly update their accomplishments on the university's electronic submission platform and maintain a current curriculum vitae.

2.1.6 During subsequent annual reviews, the tenure plan will be assessed and modified as agreed upon by the department chair and faculty member.

3.0 Midterm and Tenure Review Portfolio Composition and Criteria: Faculty seeking tenure at UVU participate in a midterm review in their third year of service and a tenure review in their sixth year unless exceptions are agreed upon at the time of hire. The candidate's primary responsibility in both reviews is to prepare and submit a portfolio for consideration. The deadline for midterm or tenure review portfolio submission is September 15. In rare cases, and only when accompanied by extraordinary performance, faculty may request a shortened probationary period allowing an early application for review if approved by the RTP committee, department chair, dean, and Provost (see Policy 637 5.11). One-year extensions to the probationary period for tenure, while rarely granted, are possible (see Policy 637 5.10).

3.0.1 Candidates for both the midterm review and tenure review will create a portfolio with documents in the order presented below. This order correlates with UVU Policy 637 5.6 *Faculty Tenure* for tenure review portfolio composition. The candidate's tenure file shall be submitted via the digital system used by the university,

3.0.2 Candidates are often inclined to put too much material in the portfolio. While a candidate's CV should contain all activities in teaching, scholarly and creative works, and service, the portfolio need not include documentary evidence of every activity. Instead, include documentation for those that are representative or particularly impressive. For example, rather than including every concert program the candidate was involved with, only two to five representative programs should be submitted.

3.0.3 Activities, such as recitals, publications, masterclasses, presentations, service, etc., should be completed by the time of portfolio submission. Progress toward uncompleted, long-term projects should be reported in Annual Reviews, but not included in narrative statements and documentary evidence for Teaching, Scholarly/Creative Work, and Service. It is appropriate to include uncompleted, long-term projects in midterm review narrative statements and documentary evidence if explicitly labeled as work-in-progress or when the candidate can make clear that peer review has already been established.

3.1 Table of Contents: This lists all documents included in the portfolio.

3.2 Informational Statement and Supporting Documents

3.2.1 A two-to-three-page statement describing the candidate's contribution to the university and profession, the extent to which departmental expectations were met, any circumstances that helped or hindered progress, and any other information the candidate believes will help reviewers evaluate the portfolio. This statement should also address efforts to diversify curricular content or create a safe space for the inclusion of diverse identities and perspectives.

3.2.2 The candidate's letter of appointment and documentation of years granted towards tenure (or other negotiated variances from policy from the time of hire), if applicable.

3.2.3 For the final tenure review: all letters from the midterm review (RTP committee, department chair, dean, provost, and, if applicable, rebuttals).

3.3 Curriculum Vitae (CV): A current, comprehensive account of professional activities. Like the portfolio, the CV should be organized with the teaching section first, scholarly/creative work second, and service last.

3.4 Teaching: Because Utah Valley University is primarily a teaching university, the principal emphasis for tenure at Utah Valley University is excellence in teaching.

3.4.1 Teaching excellence: In the classroom, rehearsal room, private studio, performing venue, or other setting, effective teaching of high quality is expected. As such, faculty members must be academically qualified and well prepared to teach the courses assigned to them. Qualification includes knowledge of effective teaching methods as well as technical knowledge within the faculty member's content area. See Policies 601 and 635 for further requirements related to teaching competency. Courses must be well-organized, well-presented, and incorporate principles of engaged learning.

3.4.1.1 Expectations: Faculty should demonstrate curricular development and pedagogical progress for each course taught. This important process of continual introspection should be communicated in detail in the narrative self-assessment. Additionally, a minimum of three significant teaching activities from 3.4.2 are required for the midterm review and an additional three are required for tenure. Because quality is ultimately more important than quantity, these guidelines are starting points and reaching these numbers does not guarantee that the quality of work will meet the tenure guidelines. To assess quality, the tenure committee will rely on the candidate's narrative self-assessment, peer teaching assessments, supervisor teaching assessments, SRI scores and comments, and supervisor annual reviews. The guidance of tenure mentors, the department chair, annual reviews, and the RTP committee will be critical to a candidate's success.

3.4.1.2 Hierarchy: Teaching activities are reported and assessed annually in supervisor reviews. Among teaching accomplishments, a hierarchy of impact exists. For example, mentoring a student or student ensemble to win a national competition is more significant than mentoring them to win a regional or local competition. Likewise, earning a Fellowship or Senior Fellowship in the Higher Education Academy is more significant than attending Office of Teaching and Learning seminars. Similarly, developing a brand-new course that has high impact for the department is more meaningful than making incremental improvements to a class already offered. Faculty should keep this hierarchy in mind as they develop their teaching, for it will guide tenure and rank advancement committees' judgments about the quality of a candidate's work.

3.4.1.3 Peer Review: A letter of peer review can substantiate the purpose, quality, and impact of teaching accomplishments. For most significant teaching activities listed in 3.4.2, a letter of peer review is highly recommended as additional supporting documentation. In these instances, the candidate can submit documentary materials to the supervisor or RTP committee chair and request that they solicit a letter of review solely addressing that significant accomplishment. In the case of a live event, the candidate can request in advance that the supervisor or RTP committee chair arrange for a peer musician-scholar to visit campus to observe and assess the candidate's teaching, whether it be in the classroom or concert hall. Peer review letters should be addressed and sent directly to the supervisor to be included in the External Review portion of the portfolio by the RTP committee chair. Reviews solicited directly by the candidate are inappropriate for inclusion as evidence of peer review. Reviews or letters of gratitude solicited

by neither the candidate nor the supervisor or RTP committee are also inappropriate for inclusion.

3.4.2 Examples of Teaching Excellence: Progress in teaching must be sustained over time. Faculty should include the sorts of activities listed below in their tenure plan, and report on their efforts in annual reviews and in the portfolio. Because activities can differ greatly in intellectual rigor, creativity, and effort required, candidates should consult with the RTP committee, department chair, and/or faculty mentor to assess the adequacy of these activities. While a minimum of three significant teaching activities from this list are required for the midterm review and an additional three are required for tenure, selections from more than one type of activity are required at each review. A wide variety of activities is highly encouraged. Examples of excellent teaching-related activities include:

- a. Design and teach a course new to the department, especially one that plays a significant role in the major curriculum or serves student success, retention, and/or completion. This can include a substantial redesign or a conversion of an existing course into an online or hybrid format. This could also be the redesign of a course to meet university attributes like GE (General Education), GI (Global Intercultural) or WE (Writing Enriched), Service-Learning, or Honors.
 - a. Documentation should include the new syllabus, or a previous syllabus paired with a revised syllabus.
- b. Design or gain approval for a new program or degree, or substantially revise an existing program or degree. These should be based on enhancing student success, retention, and/or completion.
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the program or degree.
- c. Undertake special teaching projects, i.e. collaborations, Study Abroad, or projects relating to other schools, organizations, activities, etc.
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the special teaching project.
- d. Develop curriculum based on new repertoire or research. Please note that commissioning and premiering a new work is of higher significance than simply performing a new work.
 - a. Documentation should include a description of the new repertoire or research and a narrative about what makes it innovative in the candidate's field of teaching.
- e. Write and obtain a grant for an innovative, curricular project. Normally an external grant would receive greater weight than an internal grant.
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the grant proposal.
- f. Develop or direct an interdisciplinary course or project
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the course or project.
- g. Mentor individual students in significant, extracurricular projects, such as grant applications funded and external auditions or competitions won.
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the student project, including the role of the teacher. Public articles, awards, or award letters received should be included.
- h. Secure local, regional, national, or international recognition of students and/or programs within the department
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the course or project, including the role of the teacher. Public articles, award certificates, award announcements, or award letters received should be included.
- i. Assist in finding/securing student internships or employment or mentor successful student applications for graduate study programs

- a. Documentation should include a description and assessment of student placements, including the role of the teacher.
- j. Receive special recognition for teaching through a university award or an external award related to the candidate's area of teaching expertise, such as a Fellowship or Senior Fellowship in the Higher Education Academy.
 - a. Documentation should include a summary of the award's significance, if external. A copy of the award certificate or announcement should be included.
- k. Teach a pedagogy workshop for peer educators, such as through the UVU Office of Teaching and Learning or the Utah Music Educators Association
 - a. Documentation should include the workshop program showing the candidate's contribution, and materials used in the workshop.
- l. Participate in the UVU Student Collaborators on Teaching (SCOTs) program or UVU POET (Peer Observation for the Enhancement of Teaching) Pyramid Program and demonstrate improvement following receipt of those observers' reports.
 - a. Documentation should include the SCOT observer's report or the POET group's observations and a certificate of completion. A summary of the candidate's participation in the program or details about how they improved their teaching based on the contents of the report is required.
- m. Complete an Office of Teaching and Learning High Impact Practice (HIP) certificate, such as Anti-Racist Pedagogy, Assessment and Inclusive Design, Evidence-Based Teaching Practices, Generating Vibrant Discussions, Inclusive, Intercultural, Global Pedagogy, and Online Teaching Academy.
 - a. Documentation would include certificate of completion and a summary of improvements the candidate made to their teaching.

3.4.3 Required Documents for Teaching: Candidates for tenure must keep a record of their teaching practice. Evidence of progress in teaching must be sustained and the work documented in the portfolio must build in quality as well as its quantity. The file must include the following documents:

3.4.3.1 Self-Assessment Narrative: Candidates should include a two-to-four-page self-assessment of areas of teaching success, areas of improvement, and areas in need of improvement. This should address all of the following:

- a. Concerns from past reviews (midterm, annual, peer, or student).
- b. Context for SRI scores and comments. For each course taught, candidates should document their analysis of student feedback and any teaching adjustments made based on their conclusions.
- c. Examples of pedagogical initiatives undertaken because of participation in professional development activities.
- d. Contributions that align with the University's commitment to provide accessible and equitable educational opportunities to all. The self-assessment may address, but is not limited to, issues of access, equity, diversity, inclusion, anti-racism, and social justice through the lens of the faculty member's teaching. It should explain how these concepts are implemented in the classroom in relation to students rather than a statement of philosophy.
- e. Student accomplishments if they reflect mentorship from the candidate, in which case a narrative explaining the role of the faculty member in mentoring the student is required. Examples of student accomplishments involving faculty mentorship

include students' professional or academic conference presentations, student research grant projects, competition awards, invitational festival participation, and innovative recital or concert programming.

3.4.3.1.1 Curriculum and Course Development Evidence: In support of the self-assessment narrative, candidates should include documentary evidence of active development or modification of curriculum for any course, program, or degree. This will include syllabi and evidence of incorporating educational technology.

3.4.3.2 Supervisor Assessments: Faculty shall receive one formal teaching observation annually by the department chair that includes mastery of content, instructional design and delivery skills, course management skills, and responsiveness in addressing the needs of specific classes and individual students. The chair will also review the course syllabus, course and lesson learning outcomes, and any curriculum relevant to the class they visit to confirm that the faculty member is meeting university and departmental expectations (see section 3.4.1 and Policies 601, 635). This feedback will inform the Teaching section of the Annual Review. Supervisor evaluations of teaching should follow the Office of Teaching and Learning's Teaching Excellence Model rubric and Teaching Observation Form.

3.4.3.3 Peer Assessments: Faculty shall receive one formal teaching assessment annually by a full-time UVU faculty as assigned by the department chair. This peer assessment will provide a holistic review of the faculty members' assigned teaching load. Specific feedback should include mastery of content, instructional design and delivery skills, course management skills, and responsiveness in addressing the needs of specific classes and individual students. Peer assessors should observe multiple teaching scenarios that reflect the various teaching responsibilities of the faculty member, including performance where appropriate. Peer evaluations should follow the Office of Teaching and Learning's Teaching Excellence Model rubric and Teaching Observation Form. This peer assessment should be addressed and sent directly to the supervisor, who will pass the letter to the faculty member observed. The faculty member should include all peer assessments in their online portfolio.

3.4.3.4 Student Rating of Instructors (SRI): A complete set of student evaluations for every course taught during the probationary period. (See UVU Policy 637 *Faculty Tenure* 5.6.4.1.) Candidates should additionally include a list of overall Instructor Evaluation SRI scores for every course taught, organized by course. The faculty member's reflections on SRI scores and comments should appear in the self-assessment (3.4.3.1).

3.4.3.5 Additional Documentation of Teaching: Representative documentation for significant teaching accomplishments (see 3.4.2) must be included. Documentation of professional development in teaching is required. Any teaching awards received should also be included. As documentation for any innovative or effective pedagogical practices mentioned in the self-assessment, a link to a sample video of the candidate's teaching can be included. Documentation of student accomplishments requiring faculty mentorship include research abstracts, awards, sample pages from concert programs, etc. While the candidate's CV and Self-Assessment Narrative will include a full summary of activities, include documentary evidence for only the most significant three to five activities.

3.4.4 Standards of Performance Assessment in Teaching: For the teaching section of the portfolio, simple inclusion of an activity or basic completion of a criteria does not ensure a positive tenure decision for the candidate. To earn a positive recommendation for tenure, the candidate must garner a designation of excellence as described in this section. The RTP committee members shall consider whether the evidence presented indicates that the candidate's teaching meets the Department of Music standards for excellence. Per the University mission, teaching must reach the standard for "Excellent Performance."

3.4.4.1 Excellent Performance: Exceeds Expectations. The candidate demonstrates exceptional ability and consistent practice as a teacher. Excellence in teaching is identified as:

- a. Superior content expertise, including maintaining currency in best practices in music pedagogy.
- b. Superior instructional delivery skills, including effectiveness in communicating with students, in appropriately challenging students, and in developing innovative approaches to new subject matter.
- c. Outstanding instructional design skills, including effective assessment of student learning and effective innovation in the classroom, including work with new subject matter.
- d. Consistently outstanding course management skills, including effective use of online course management resources, that reveal the candidate's ability to organize, initiate, and manage a course.
- e. Ongoing flexibility in accepting and being successful in varied teaching assignments.
- f. To demonstrate excellence in teaching, the candidate must include sufficient evidence from SRIs, narratives of peer observations on significant classroom observation, teaching materials (syllabi, assignments, grading rubrics, and other assessment tools, etc.), and other appropriate forms of evidence that document student learning.
- g. The Department of Music considers excellent SRI ratings to be consistently above 4.5. Student SRI comments which reflect significant, thoughtful improvements on those of previous semesters in the same course demonstrate excellent performance. The presence of negative SRI student comments does not automatically disqualify an instructor from receiving "exceeds expectations" in Teaching, but the candidate's teaching goals in the Annual Review and Teaching Narrative in a midterm, tenure, or advancement review should address all such comments.

3.4.4.2 Competent Performance: Meets Expectations. The candidate demonstrates consistently strong ability as a teacher. Competence in teaching is identified as:

- a. Satisfactory content expertise, including maintaining currency in best practices in music pedagogy.
- b. Competent delivery skills, including effectiveness in communicating with students in person and through online tools, in appropriately challenging students, and in developing innovative approaches to new subject matter.
- c. Competent instructional design skills, including effective assessment of student learning and effective innovation in the classroom, including work with new subject matter.
- d. Competent course management skills that reveal the candidate's ability to organize, initiate, and manage a course.

- e. Observable flexibility in accepting and being successful in varied teaching assignments.
- f. To demonstrate competence in teaching, the candidate must include sufficient evidence from SRIs, narratives of peer observations based on significant classroom observation, teaching materials (syllabi, assignments, grading rubrics, and other assessment tools, etc.), and other appropriate forms of evidence that document student learning.
- g. The Department of Music considers competent SRI ratings to be consistently above 4.0. Student SRI comments which reflect basic improvements on those of previous semesters in the same course demonstrate competent performance. The presence of negative SRI student comments does not automatically disqualify an instructor from receiving “meets expectations” in Teaching, but the candidate’s teaching goals in the Annual Review and Teaching Narrative in a midterm, tenure, or advancement review should address all such comments.

3.4.4.3 Unsatisfactory Performance: Does Not Meet Expectations. The candidate fails to demonstrate an ability to fulfill or maintain competent performance requirements in their teaching.

- a. Unsatisfactory content expertise, including not maintaining currency in best practices in music pedagogy.
- b. Incompetent delivery skills, including ineffectiveness in communicating with students in person and through online tools, inappropriately or insufficiently challenging students, and developing no innovative approaches to new subject matter.
- c. Incompetent instructional design skills, including ineffective assessment of student learning, ineffective implementation of innovation in the classroom, and not including work with new subject matter.
- d. Incompetent course management skills that reveal the candidate’s inability to organize, initiate, and manage a course.
- e. No observable flexibility in accepting and being successful in varied teaching assignments.
- f. A candidate would fail to demonstrate competence in teaching if appropriate forms of documentary evidence for student learning are absent. Such evidence would include SRI’s, narratives of peer observations based on significant classroom observation, teaching materials (syllabi, assignments, grading rubrics, and other assessment tools, etc.).
- g. The Department of Music considers unsatisfactory SRI ratings to be those below 4.0. Negative student SRI comments which are not met with thoughtful improvements in subsequent semesters of the same course demonstrate unsatisfactory performance.

3.5 Scholarly/Creative Work

3.5.1 Expectations: Music faculty should remain active in their scholarly/creative work. Faculty will be assessed on the relevance of these activities to their job description. The guidance of tenure mentors, the department chair, annual reviews, and the RTP committee will be critical to a candidate’s success. Scholarly/creative work in music encompasses published articles, presentations, concerts, compositions, recordings, and other activities as approved by the RTP committee. As a general guideline, candidates

must have a minimum of one scholarly/creative work of national-level peer review and two works of at least regional-level peer review for their midterm review. For tenure, candidates must provide an additional work of national-level peer review and two additional works of at least regional-level peer review. These guidelines are starting points and reaching these numbers does not guarantee that the quality of work will meet the tenure guidelines. To assess quality, the tenure committee will rely on both their professional experience and external peer review. Documentation of scholarly/creative work depends on the activity and can include published compositions, articles, book chapters; audio and visual recordings; programs; and other evidence of peer review.

3.5.1.1 Examples of Scholarly/Creative Work: UVU policy 635 *Faculty Rights and Professional Responsibilities* states that ongoing activity in scholarly/creative work suitable to a faculty member's discipline of hire is required. Examples of scholarly/creative work include:

- a. Peer-reviewed publications (recordings, books, articles, reviews, compositions, arrangements)
- b. Significant performances, masterclasses, presentations, lectures, premieres
- c. A pattern of recurring contracted services for professional groups (such as the Utah Symphony)
- d. Media broadcasts of recordings or performances
- e. Awards, honors, competition results

3.5.1.2 Hierarchy: In any field, a generally perceived hierarchy of prestige exists. For example, reading a paper at a national meeting is more significant than reading a paper at a meeting for a local chapter; some journals are more highly respected or selective than others; the judgment of specialists has more weight than that of people outside the field. Faculty members should keep this hierarchy in mind as they plan their scholarly/creative work, for it will guide tenure and rank advancement committees' judgments about the quality of a candidate's work.

3.5.2 Peer Review: Three to five peer reviews from colleagues at institutions with music programs of comparable size and scope will be solicited by the RTP chair.

3.5.2.1 Because faculty are specialists, and others from the same field are best able to judge their accomplishments, universities rely on professionals from the faculty's field of expertise to assess scholarly/creative work. This is known as peer review. To be claimed as scholarship or creative work in a portfolio, accomplishments must be assessed by the candidate's peers. Contracts with significant industry entities, such as respected opera houses, prestigious journal publishers, reputable businesses, etc., can demonstrate initial peer review of intended projects. A similar process selects presentations to be offered at professional conferences. But sometimes the candidate must create a way to incorporate peer review into the process. Usually this requires assistance from others. For example, one might ask the RTP chair to solicit a review for a concert that might otherwise go unassessed. Reviews solicited by or addressed personally to the performer usually carry little weight because of the obvious conflicts of interest and do not belong in an academic portfolio. However, the candidate may recommend external reviewers per section 3.9 *Solicited External Peer Reviewers*.

3.5.2.2 Many accomplishments include peer review that might not be apparent to colleagues in other disciplines. For example, a musicologist, let alone a physics professor, is unlikely to know which harp competition is the most prestigious, but the candidate can help the reviewers by

offering context. The candidate, therefore, should explain the peer review process when it is not obvious, describing for instance how the judgment of eminent professionals leads to a recording on a nationally recognized label or an invitation to perform at a prestigious institution.

3.5.3 Required Documents for Scholarly/Creative Work: Tenure candidates must keep a record of their scholarly/creative work. Evidence of scholarly/creative work must be sustained, and the activities documented in the portfolio must build in quality as well as its quantity. The file must include the following documents:

3.5.3.1 Scholarly/Creative Work Narrative Statement: A two to three-page statement describing the candidate's Scholarly/Creative Work since beginning on the tenure track. This statement specifically should articulate how the candidate has evidenced a consistently high level of Scholarly/Creative Work over and above competency. Significant activities which fulfill the standards listed in 3.5.1 should be clearly listed.

3.5.3.2 Documentation of Scholarly/Creative Work: Representative documentation for significant Scholarly/Creative Work (see 3.5.1) must be included. Evidence might include relevant pages of concert programs, the full text of a published article, a representative chapter of a published book, awards, links to performance recordings, etc. While the candidate's CV and Scholarly/Creative Work Narrative Statement will include a full summary of activities, include documentary evidence for only the most significant three to five activities.

3.6 Service: Faculty engage in both university and professional service. Because activities can differ in quality and quantity, candidates should consult with the RTP committee, department chair, faculty mentor, or peers to assess the adequacy of these activities.

3.6.1 University Service: Faculty participate in the programs and governance of the Department of Music, School of the Arts, and Utah Valley University. Attendance and participation at department faculty meetings is required. Timely and thorough completion of annual peer assessments is also required. A blend of department and school service is expected. The quality and quantity of effort required for service activities varies widely and will therefore affect the assessment of the portfolio.

3.6.1.1 Expectations: A minimum of two departmental UVU service activities listed below are required for midterm candidates; for tenure, an additional two UVU service activities are required. Letters from supervising committee chairs are acceptable evidence. A self-assessment narrative may also be included as context of service rendered. In certain circumstances, service may overlap with scholarly/creative work but may be listed in only one area. At the request of the candidate, the RTP Committee will assist the candidate in assigning the activity to the more appropriate of the two categories. Examples of university service include:

- a. Service on academic committees
- b. Special assignments made by the department chair outside typical faculty expectations listed in policy 635
- c. Organization of and active participation in official university events related to the faculty's role at UVU, such as the Scholarship Ball, Commencement, Freshman Convocation, etc.
- d. Service as advisor to UVU student clubs

- e. Advising honors theses, undergraduate research projects, independent study, Integrated Studies capstone projects, student recital committees, or other projects not included in the candidate's teaching load
- f. Service in administrative appointments such as area coordinator, committee chair, etc.
- g. Secure grants or donations that benefit the department, in coordination with Institutional Advancement

3.6.1.2 Recruitment: Annual recruitment activity is an essential part of faculty service. Frequent and direct interaction with prospective students is expected. Recruitment activities are reported and assessed in the annual review. Depending on the candidate's area, this can take many forms, however it is the faculty member's responsibility to assess the needs of the program and attract and retain Music major students to fill those needs. The candidate should discuss recruitment expectations with the department chair in the first semester of employment and should include recruitment and retention goals in the Tenure Plan. Documentation of recruitment activities and results should be included in the Service Narrative Statement (see 3.6.3.1).

3.6.2 Professional Service: Faculty participate in service to the community. Two significant community, state, or regional service activities are required for midterm candidates; for tenure, an additional two significant community, state, or regional service activities are required. National or international service exceeds expectations for tenure. Acceptable documentation may include programs, certificates, and letters from the professional organization. Examples of professional service include:

- a. Service in discipline-related professional organizations
- b. Hosting non-curricular events such as guest recitals, presentations, honors groups and ensembles, festivals, and other events
- c. Adjudication at festivals and competitions
- d. Student engagement activities within the community (pro-bono lessons, clinics, sectionals, guest conducting, side-by-side performances or rehearsals, and connecting with local teachers)
- e. Presentations or performances for charitable or school groups

3.6.3 Required Documents for Service: Tenure candidates must keep a record of their service. Evidence of service must be sustained, and the activities documented in the portfolio must build in quality as well as its quantity. The file must include the following documents:

3.6.3.1 Service Narrative Statement: A two to three-page statement describing the candidate's service activities since beginning on the tenure track. This statement should articulate how the candidate has contributed to both the university and the profession. Significant activities which fulfill the standards listed in 3.6.1.1 and 3.6.2 should be clearly listed.

3.6.3.2 Documentation of Service: Representative documentation for significant Service activities (see 3.6.1.1 and 3.6.2) must be included. Evidence may include relevant pages of concert programs, letters of recognition from supervising committee chairs, certificates, and letters of appreciation, etc. While the candidate's CV and Service Narrative Statement will

include a full summary of activities, include documentary evidence for only the most significant two to five activities.

3.7 RTP Criteria: A copy of the department RTP criteria on the date of hire. The candidate may request approval to be evaluated according to a newer criterion according to University policy 637, *Faculty Tenure* 5.1.4.

3.8 Annual Reviews: Faculty shall follow the procedures outlined in UVU policy 633 Annual Review and shall be evaluated according to the University Annual Review Performance Template.

3.8.1 Tenured and tenure-track faculty shall be evaluated annually by the department chair in the areas of teaching, scholarly/creative work, and service using the criteria outlined in this document.

3.8.2 Annual reviews for teaching are based on classroom/teaching observations, peer evaluations, trends in SRIs, student mentoring, and/or achievement of annual goals. SRIs are not the sole method for assessment.

3.8.3 The department chair evaluates teaching, scholarly/creative works, and service as either “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” “sometimes meets expectations,” “sometimes does not meet expectations,” or “does not meet expectations” (see section 3.4.4; policy 633, 4.6). Minimum measurable expectations for the midterm review and the tenure application are documented in teaching (section 3.4), scholarly/creative works (section 3.5), and service (section 3.6). In all three categories, “meets expectations” is awarded when progress towards midterm review or tenure application is in line with the quality and quantity expected in this document. “Exceeds expectations” is given when progress exceeds the quality and/or quantity of minimum measurable expectations. “Does not meet expectations” is given when progress does not meet the quantity or quality of the minimum measurable expectations.

3.8.4 The annual review for tenure-track faculty must include an evaluation of the faculty member’s progress on the goals from their tenure plan, stating whether or not the faculty member is meeting them. (see policy 637 4.4.1) Understanding that external forces can heavily impact a faculty member, the annual review shall also determine whether the plan remains realistic or whether it needs to be adjusted for the upcoming year.

3.8.5 Tenure Plan goals and Annual Reviews must be candid. Faculty members should expect constructive feedback that promotes their growth in the classroom, their discipline, and as citizens of their departments.

3.8.6 Non-tenure track faculty including lecturers, artists-in-residence, professionals-in-residence, and those advanced in rank at the same positions (i.e. senior lecturer) shall be evaluated annually by the department chair using the criteria below:

3.8.6.1 Faculty shall receive one formal teaching observation annually by the department chair that includes mastery of content, instructional design and delivery skills, course management skills, and responsiveness in addressing the needs of specific classes and individual students.

3.8.6.2 Faculty shall provide a comprehensive list of their annual activities that demonstrates currency in the field in terms of scholarly/creative work in their specialty area.

3.8.7 Faculty members must comply with UVU policies. This includes the annual Conflict of Interest form, mandatory HR trainings, and other mandated university trainings and requirements. (See policy 633, 4.3)

3.8.8 Any written reprimand from the department chair, such as a Professional Improvement Plan (PIPs) or Notice of Improvement Needed (NOINs), should be included in tenure and rank advancement portfolios. Faculty members can address those reprimands in their narrative statements to help neutralize critical SRIs or department chair/peer assessments.

3.9 Solicited External Peer Review Letters: In accordance with UVU policy 637, section 5.6.4.2, the RTP committee chair will solicit all external reviews for the candidate for midterm and tenure review. In the year preceding review, the candidate should submit a list of three external reviewers for whom no conflict of interest or close professional or personal relationship exists by March 15 to the RTP committee chair. A written explanation of the candidate's relationship with each proposed reviewer is required. The RTP committee has the prerogative to expand the list of peer reviews and has the ultimate decision about which external reviewers are selected. After the initial recommendation, the candidate may not add to the list of requested reviewers.

3.9.1 The candidate may request that the RTP committee chair or department chair solicit external review of specific, significant teaching or scholarly/creative work (see section 3.4.1.3). The department chair can also request external review of the candidate's teaching or live performance. In this circumstance, the department chair should receive nominations of external reviewers from the RTP committee. Peer review letters should be addressed and sent directly to the department chair to be included in the External Review portion of the candidate's portfolio by the RTP committee chair.

3.9.2 Materials for External Review: In the summer prior to midterm or tenure review, candidates should submit the following external review materials to the RTP chair by June 30.

- a. CV
- b. Representative evidence of scholarly/creative works from section 3.5, demonstrating the range of the candidate's activities, such as:
 - 1) Recordings should total 30-45 minutes
 - 2) Selections from publications, totaling no more than 60 pages
- c. The candidate should include evidence of teaching excellence, such as:
 - 1) Examples of student work with a short narrative of the student/ensemble and an explanation of the candidate's role
 - 2) Video of the candidate teaching

3.9 Policy: A copy of current UVU policy 637 *Faculty Tenure*.

Mid-Term and Tenure Criteria Approved November 2022

Advancement to Professor

The Department adheres to the university policy governing rank advancement to Professor as stipulated in UVU Policy 632 Assignment and Advancement in Academic Rank under section IV Procedures D.3 Minimum Qualifications for Rank Advancement as it pertains to the rank of Professor. As stated there, "The rank of Professor is reserved for individuals who are judged to be exemplary. Such individuals shall have achieved distinction clearly above that of Associate Professor." The rank of Professor shall be earned by those consistently demonstrating exemplary performance in teaching and one other area, either scholarly and creative works or service, and strong performance in the remaining category. Candidates for advancement to the rank of Professor must produce a faculty portfolio providing evidence of the following minimum standards:

- Terminal degree or equivalent as determined at the time of hire. Terminal degrees offered by educational institutions in the United States and many foreign institutions in music are the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) and the Doctor of Musical Arts (DMA). Some foreign institutions offer equivalent terminal degrees by different names. The RTP committee will evaluate the equivalence of degrees from foreign institutions.
- The quality of teaching must be maintained at the level of effectiveness and rigor required for awarding of tenure.
- The quality of scholarship must be maintained at the level of effectiveness and rigor required for awarding of tenure.
- Senior faculty are often sought for administrative assignments and major service assignments—such as service as Department Chair, Dean, or other significant administrative appointment, and membership on school and university committees. The quality and length of such service will be given substantial consideration in evaluations for advancement to the rank of Professor.

Advancement in Non-Tenure Positions

Senior Lecturer

- Seven years of university full-time equivalent teaching are required.
- Ongoing excellence in teaching as documented by a minimum of one annual peer evaluation, and an annual in-class evaluation by the Department Chair.
- Although scholarly activity and university service are not required for advancement, such activities may be considered as positive evidence to support advancement.

Senior Appointment in Residence

- Seven years of university-level experience are required.
- A substantial professional record including major (international or national) peer reviewed works as appropriate to the discipline are required.
- Ongoing excellence in teaching as documented by a minimum of one annual peer evaluation, and an annual in-class evaluation by the Department Chair.

- Although university service may not be required for advancement, service activities may be considered as positive evidence to support advancement.
- This position may be awarded at time of hire based on central administration determination that the candidate's credentials meet standards as set forth in UVU Policy 632.

Senior Visiting Faculty/Scholar

- Seven years of university-level experience are required.
- Terminal degree or equivalent, as defined above.
- A substantial professional record including major (international or national) peer reviewed works as appropriate to the discipline are required.
- This position may be awarded at time of hire based on central administration determination that the candidate's credentials meet standards as set forth in UVU Policy 632.

Advancement to Professor and in Non-Tenure Positions Updated April 5, 2012*

*updated criteria submitted 9-11-2022, currently under review