

J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences

Personnel Document Department of Music

Personnel Committee

A departmental Personnel Committee will be elected in January of each year to consider successive appointments, promotion and tenure matters, annual review, and other relevant topics. This committee will consist of three tenured full-time faculty members. The committee will serve beginning on July 1 of the year in which it is elected, through June 30 of the following year. Members of the Personnel Committee will be ineligible to serve again for the next two consecutive years.

Initial Appointment

A. PROCEDURES

The procedure for hiring new full-time, tenure-track faculty will consist of a national search conducted in accordance with Affirmative Action policies. Before the initiation of any search for a full-time tenure-track faculty position, the chair shall meet with the department faculty to solicit input on the job duties associated with the position.

Once a position is advertised, the department chair will appoint a search committee to review applications and to select individuals for closer consideration. Whenever possible, candidates will be brought to campus where all faculty and students in the department will be given an opportunity to meet with them. In most cases each candidate will give a public performance, master class, or lecture. Each candidate shall meet with the music search committee, chair, and appropriate administrators. The full music faculty will be invited to meet with the candidate. Upon recommendation of the music faculty, the chair will recommend a candidate or candidates to the Dean.

B. CRITERIA

General standards for Appointment in the Department of Music are as follows:

Instructor - A person appointed to the rank of Instructor should minimally possess a master's degree, or equivalent professional background, and some teaching experience.

Assistant Professor - A person appointed to the rank of Assistant Professor should minimally possess a master's degree, with a doctorate preferred, or equivalent professional background. In Music Theory, Music History, and Music Education the doctorate is required. In exceptional cases, candidates who are ABD with a target completion date within one year will be considered. In either case, the candidate should have teaching experience and demonstrate potential for success in research, performance and/or other creative activities.

Associate Professor - A person appointed to the rank of Associate Professor should minimally possess the same qualifications required for Assistant Professor. The candidate should have achieved success in performance, composition and/or published research and have had substantial successful teaching experience.

Professor - A person appointed to the rank of Professor should minimally possess a doctorate or equivalent professional background. In either case, the candidate should have achieved distinction in performance, composition and/or published research and be a renowned teacher.

University Professor - A person appointed to the position of University Professor should normally possess a doctorate in the field of specialty, or equivalent professional background, and have

sustained excellence in teaching, research and service. Normally, a nominee for University Professor will have achieved such performances while serving as Professor at the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville

Distinguished Professor - A person appointed to the position of Distinguished Professor should minimally possess a doctorate, or equivalent professional background, and have achieved national or international distinction as a performer, composer, theorist, historian or musical pedagogue.

Emeritus Status - This status will be conferred at the rank held at the time of retirement under conditions specified in Board Policy 475.1, and upon recommendation of the music department faculty.

Work Assignments

Standard faculty appointments are made with a weighting scale (for evaluation purposes) of 40/40/20 to teaching, research, and service, respectively. The chair, with the concurrence of the faculty member and the approval of the dean, may adjust these ratings in individual cases, when the adjustment is in the best interest of the department.

Annual Review

The Annual Review will be used to support successive appointments or non-reappointment. On January 15, each faculty member must present to the chair a completed Resume Update and any supporting documents. The Personnel Committee will meet and develop evaluations of the faculty, including the faculty portion of the Chair's duties, but not including each other. (The Chair will evaluate the members of the Personnel Committee.) The personnel committee's composite numerical evaluations must be accompanied by brief supporting statements. The Department Chair will incorporate Personnel Committee recommendations and may add summative statements at the end in formulating his or her own evaluation, with a maximum one point variance from the committee's recommended overall total. If the variance exceeds one point, then separate evaluations should be submitted. The Chair is responsible for assessing collegiality in each of the three areas of teaching, research, and service. The chair will produce a qualitative evaluation employing a rating scale of 0 to 3, with 3 meaning "exceeds expectations," 2—"meets expectations fully," 1—"minimally meets expectations," 0—"does not meet expectations." The Chair will provide the opportunity for a meeting with each faculty member to discuss his or her evaluation, and a written record of the discussion will be made. The evaluation will then be provided to each faculty member prior to its submission to the Dean of Fulbright College of Arts & Sciences.

Before the chair recommends to the Dean non-reappointment of a non-tenure-track, full-time faculty member, the chair will solicit input from the personnel committee.

The Resume Update should include:

1. TEACHING: a description of teaching/advising activities and student evaluation summaries; and may include syllabi, final exams, notice of students' successes, etc.;
2. RESEARCH/PERFORMANCE/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES: a list/description of Research/Creative activities, including information about the availability of programs, reviews, notice of awards, manuscripts, recordings, films, etc.;
3. SERVICE: a record of committee assignments, newspaper clippings, invitations to adjudicate, thank-you notes, and any other appropriate documentation and materials.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING:

For the purposes of this evaluation, teaching duties will be defined as including the following activities: classroom teaching, studio teaching, master classes, teaching clinics (specify on or off campus), ensemble conducting, ensemble coaching, thesis direction and graduate assistant supervision. The rating may be based on the evidence submitted by the faculty member on the resume update, on first-hand observation of classes, recitals, and concerts, and on other appropriate information.

The following criteria may be applied as appropriate:

1. The instructor informs students of course content, clear objectives and grading criteria, jury requirements and performance objectives at the beginning of the course.
2. The instructor presents materials clearly and has the ability to communicate ideas and concepts effectively.
3. The instructor manifests a mastery of the subject matter, instrumental or conducting and rehearsal technique.
4. The instructor makes appropriate assignments, or selects music suitable for student ensembles.
5. The instructor is available to students through the posting and keeping of office hours, and meets private students regularly.
6. The instructor is abreast of current developments in content and delivery of subject, and music literature.
7. The instructor provides the opportunity for students to acquire a working knowledge of and show good attitudes toward the subject at the end of the course.
8. The instructor maintains high standards in course content and grading or assessment.
9. The instructor serves as an active student advisor, demonstrating clear knowledge of University curricula and regulations

Guidelines for numeric evaluation (0-3):

A rating of 3 should be supported by very high student evaluations, student successes in competitions, fine student performances, etc.

A rating of 2 should be supported by good student evaluations, good student performances, conscientious out-of-class assistance to students, etc.

A rating of 1 corresponds to minimally acceptable performance as a teacher, as measured by many of the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraphs.

A rating of 0 indicates unsatisfactory performance. Evidence may consist of poor student ratings, poor student performances (musical or on standard tests), lack of course development, poor student attendance, and small private studio enrollments, if sustained over a period of years.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH:

For organizational purposes, a Music Department is divided into four categories: Performance, Composition, Scholarship (music education, music theory, and music history) and Conducting. Most music faculty members have broad interests that transcend the potentially narrow confines of each category, and those broad interests should be encouraged and recognized. Therefore, any faculty member may do research in any of the areas. All faculty members are expected to support their teaching with an appropriate research agenda.

Among the research activities music faculty engage in are:

1. Solo performance and recordings;
2. Collaborative performances (chamber music);
3. Recordings;
4. Conducting small and large ensembles;
5. Music Composition, arranging, and transcription;
6. Producing books, book chapters, journal articles and scholarly presentations.

Evaluation of a faculty member's research agenda will take into account first and foremost the quality of the research. It is assumed that the quality of *all* research activity is excellent; regardless of other criteria, research/creative activities that fall below excellent quality will result in a rating of "does not meet expectation." The venue of presentation will also be evaluated. Local presentation of research—as an example for students—is important and expected, as is presentation away from campus, to enhance the reputation of the University of Arkansas. Presentations in prestigious or influential venues are particularly valued.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH – PERFORMANCE:

Evaluation of performance—for purposes of annual merit evaluation—shall take into account at least three factors (1) Type of performance/recording (i.e., solo recital, orchestral participant, etc.); (2) Number of performances; (3) Venues.

Underlying this evaluation is the expectation that performances/recordings require initiative, energy, and practice beyond the routine, and that those who teach performance remain active as performers.

(1) Type of performance/recordings: Examples: Solo recital, performance as part of a small or large ensemble, concerto solos, lecture recital, etc. Types of performances will be taken into consideration.

(2) Number of performances: While not an isolated criterion, the expectation is one of multiple performances.

(3) Venues: (Assuming excellent quality) a variety of venues will only enhance the evaluation. Local performance—as an example for students—is important and expected, as is performance away from campus, to enhance the reputation of the University of Arkansas. Performances in prestigious or influential venues are particularly valued.

Guidelines for numeric evaluation (0-3):

A rating of 3 should be supported by the consistently high quality of numerous performances—as evidenced by (positive) published reviews, (positive) peer reviews, repeated invitations—in a variety of venues (especially prestigious and influential ones) and, as appropriate, in a variety of formats/ensembles.

A rating of 2 should be supported by the consistently high quality of performances—supported by generally high regard among colleagues and peers away from the Music Department—in multiple venues with positive audience response.

A rating of 1 should be supported by the consistently high quality of performances, but at fewer performances during the year, or at performances not requiring initiative, or those merely “fulfilling an obligation,” or lack of performances extending beyond local impact.

A rating of 0 should indicate either no record of performances, or performances that are not of high quality.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH – SCHOLARSHIP:

Evaluation of scholarship—for purposes of annual merit evaluation—shall take into account at least two factors: (1) Scope of contribution (i.e., article, chapter, book) and (2) Peer-review, prestige, and influence of contribution. Underlying this evaluation is the expectation that scholars remain active as professionals contributing to progress in their discipline.

(1) Scope of contribution: Scholarly works can range in scope from review chapters to original articles to full-length books. The size, breadth, and originality of the work will be taken into consideration.

(2) Peer-review, prestige, and influence of contribution: The selectivity and influence of the journal, conference, institution, venue, or publisher will be taken into consideration when evaluating scholarship.

Guidelines for numeric evaluation (0-3):

A rating of 3 should be supported by peer-reviewed publications in top journals, books, grants, or presentations in national and international conferences or venues.

A rating of 2 should be supported by presentations at conferences and publications in mid-range journals.

A rating of 1 should be supported by presentations at regional venues, and publications that are not peer-reviewed

A rating of 0 should indicate no record of scholarly output

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH-COMPOSITION:

Evaluation of composition—for purposes of annual merit evaluation—shall take into account at least four factors: (1) Performances; (2) New creative work; (3) Commissions; and (4) Publications. Underlying this evaluation is the expectation that composers remain active as professions contributing high quality works in significant venues.

(1) Performances: Scope, medium and venue of performances/recordings will be taken into consideration.

(2) New creative work: The expectation is one of frequent production of new creative work.

(3) Commissions: Size, scope, and nature of the commission will be taken into consideration.

(4) Publications: This includes the publication of works by music publishing companies.

A rating of 3 should be supported by multiple compositions, some presented or performed at national/international venues, by internationally known musicians, or published by a major publisher. In the case of electronic or film music, exposure or awards at a national or international level would qualify for a rating of 3. A large commission for a work could be the evidence for a rating of 3.

A rating of 2 should be supported by performances or presentations of the composer's work at a regional venue, or by a regionally known soloist or ensemble; or, in the case of electronic or film music, exposure at a regional level; awards of a regional nature; commissions of a regional nature; and publication of the creative work by a mid-range publishing company.

A rating of 1 should be supported by performances or presentations of the composer's work at a local venue, or by a locally known soloist or ensemble; or, in the case of electronic or film music, exposure at a local level; awards of a local nature; commissions of a local nature; and publication of the creative work by a small publishing company.

A rating of 0 should indicate no record of creative output.

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF RESEARCH – CONDUCTING:

Evaluation of conducting—for purposes of annual merit evaluation—shall take into account at least three factors: (1) Venue; (2) Type of conducting performances (i.e., chamber, large ensemble, new music ensemble, etc.); (3) Number of conducting engagements. In order to be considered research, a public performance should result. Clinics at high schools are valued, but should be listed under service. Underlying this evaluation is the expectation that conducting as research/creative activity requires initiative, energy, and knowledge of current literature.

(1) Venues: (Assuming excellent quality) a variety of venues will only enhance the evaluation. Local coaching and conducting experiences aside from assigned ensembles—as an example for students—is important and expected, as are engagements away from campus, to enhance the reputation of the University of Arkansas. Invitations to conduct in prestigious or influential venues are particularly valued.

(2) Type of conducting engagements should be varied and reflect a knowledge of current innovations in college ensembles.

(3) Number of conducting engagements: While not an isolated criterion, the expectation is one of multiple conducting venues and occurrences. There is an expectation that conductor/scholars remain active as professionals contributing to progress in their discipline.

Guidelines for numeric evaluation (0-3):

A rating of 3 should be supported by the consistently high quality of numerous performances—as evidenced by (positive) published reviews, (positive) peer reviews, repeated invitations—in a variety of venues (especially prestigious and influential ones) and, as appropriate, in a variety of formats/ensembles.

A rating of 2 should be supported by the consistently high quality of performances supported by generally high regard among colleagues and peers away from the Music Department—in multiple venues with positive audience response.

A rating of 1 should be supported by the consistently high quality of performances, but at fewer performances during the year, or at performances not requiring initiative, or those merely “fulfilling an obligation,” or lack of performances extending beyond local impact.

A rating of 0 should indicate either no record of performances, or performances that are not of high quality.

Note:

Non-tenure track faculty and part-time faculty may have assigned “Research/Creative” activity. If these faculty are evaluated annually, the above criteria shall apply.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF SERVICE:

Music faculty members are expected to serve in Departmental, College, and University capacities; to function professionally in national, regional, state or local activities, such as ASBOA, ASMTA, MENC, MTNA, NATS, and other professional organizations; and to serve the community broadly in a professional capacity. The amount and difficulty of one's teaching load should be reflected in the rating. For the purposes of evaluation, the following activities are considered under the heading of service:

1. Committee memberships;
2. Service in elective or appointive leadership roles in professional associations at the national, international, regional, state, or local levels;
3. Administrative assignments;
4. Private teaching of non-university students;
5. Recruiting;
6. Informal performances or lectures to civic groups;
7. Area coordinator's activities;
8. Clinics and adjudication of contest and festival events;
9. Attendance at departmental functions such as faculty meetings, faculty and student recitals, and concerts and appearances by departmental performing organizations.

Guidelines for numeric evaluation (0-3):

A rating of 3 should be supported by extensive service activities at the department, college, university, regional, and national levels.

A rating of 2 should be supported by above average service activities at levels ranging from the department to the national.

A rating of 1 should be supported by minimally acceptable performance on ordinary or usual assignments (most departmental committees and committees which perform routine functions, etc.).

A rating of 0 indicates minimum performance (attendance but no active participation/contribution/deliberation or committee work, etc.).

SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

In a separate recommendation, not figured into the rating scale and headed "Special Consideration," Chairs may recommend negative ratings for unsatisfactory performance (not meeting classes or office hours, unfair grading practices, etc.). Chairs will explain in detail the reasons for such ratings. A negative rating could be given for dishonesty in research.

The Music Department relies on collegiality in the performance of academic and musical endeavors. Musical performance in particular requires, by its very nature, collaboration and constructive, creative teamwork. Collegiality will not be a separate criterion of assessment, but is needed and expected to be reflected within the traditional triumvirate of teaching, scholarship, and service.

OTHER CASES

The merit ratings defined and described above would apply to "normal" faculty appointees in the ranks of instructor through professor. Special cases (100 percent research appointees, for example) or special ranks (distinguished professor) and other special cases of merit must be allowed as separate cases with different justification.

Promotion

A. PROCEDURES

In order to be considered for promotion or tenure, faculty members should make their desire known to the chair of the music department prior to the beginning of classes in the spring semester. The chair shall notify the candidate in writing by May 1st that the faculty member will be considered for tenure and/or promotion. The candidate must prepare materials following the Faculty Review Checklist, and compile appropriate supporting materials (programs, reviews, recordings, articles, etc.). There must also be reference letters from three distinguished scholars or artists in the candidate's academic discipline from other approved institutions. Evaluators shall be chosen for their recognized expertise in the candidate's field and their ability to provide objective evaluations of the candidate's work. Evaluators should not be close current or former associates, former advisors, or former students or teachers of the candidate. If a recommended evaluator does not meet these criteria, a thorough description of the past associations of the evaluator and the candidate must be included with the evaluation and the special circumstances involved must be thoroughly justified. The selection of the extramural evaluators is to be made by the candidate and the music department personnel committee. Together they will identify between 3 and 5 potential evaluators. The candidate will be able to eliminate any 2 names from the list within 5 working days. The department personnel committee may consult with the chair, but the final three evaluators will consist of at least one of the candidate's choice and one of the personnel committee's choice; the three names must be selected by May 10. The candidate will not be informed of the names of the selected evaluators. By August 10, the candidate will have a complete dossier to submit for online review for university committees and electronic media for external evaluators.

During the process of application for promotion, the Associate Chair shall convene the tenured members of the Music faculty for the purpose of recommending for or against promotion. During this meeting the Associate Chair will make known the recommendations of the outside evaluators.

Following discussion, those present shall vote and the Associate Chair shall convey the will of the group, along with a summary of the discussion, the recorded vote, and his or her own recommendation, to the Chair, who will forward it (along with the Chair's own recommendation) to the Dean and the College Personnel Committee. Copies of the Faculty Review Checklist with all supporting materials will be available for appropriate personnel through the university on-line review system.

B. CRITERIA

The criteria for the granting of a promotion correspond to those criteria for initial appointment at the rank for which the applicant is applying as stated earlier in this document.

Tenure

A. PROCEDURES

The procedure for the granting of tenure is similar to that for promotion, including the three external referees. On May 1st by the candidate's fifth year at the latest, the chair will inform the faculty member in writing that he or she will be considered for promotion in the sixth year. During the time that a faculty member spends in a non-tenured, tenure-track position, a thorough review of the faculty member's professional career will be conducted in the third year. The purpose of the review will be to assess the candidate's progress toward a positive recommendation for tenure, and to provide him or her with advice and analysis resulting from the review. The results of pre-tenure review will be very important in future deliberations on awarding tenure.

During the tenure application process, the Associate Chair shall convene the tenured members of the Music faculty for the purpose of recommending for or against tenure. During this meeting the Associate Chair will make known the recommendation of the outside evaluators. Following discussion, those present shall vote, if necessary, and the Chair shall convey the will of the tenured faculty, along with a summary of the discussion, and his or her own recommendation, to the Dean and the College Personnel Committee. Copies of the Faculty Review Checklist will be available in advance of the meeting. (See above, and Provost doc.)

B. CRITERIA

Attainment of tenure requires a high standard of performance in both teaching and research/creative/artistic endeavors, consistent with the criteria for granting of an initial appointment at the rank of Associate Professor, as stated earlier in this document. In addition, there must be a clear indication that such a performance level will be maintained over a career as a faculty member at the University of Arkansas.