INTRODUCTION

Statement of Performance Expectations

1. **Unit expectations:** It is the policy of the School that the faculty shall consist of the most highly qualified persons available. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed so as to prevent the School from acting within Regents and University guidelines and policies in pursuit of this objective. School of Music faculty members are expected to teach loads as assigned by the Dean, in accordance with the faculty load policy. Some faculty members will teach a combination of studio and academic classes as assigned by the Dean, and in accordance with the faculty load policy. Faculty members are expected to advise students as needed. Studio faculty will usually mentor students that they teach, and formally advise graduate students. Academic faculty members might be involved in advising undergraduate and graduate students in their own area. Faculty members are also expected to maintain a distinctive program of research and/or creative activity that brings them national, and perhaps international, recognition in one or more areas of endeavor. Service is also an important component for School of Music faculty members, who are expected to contribute in appropriate capacities to their divisions, the School, the University of Kansas, and in their professional fields.

These criteria and procedures are to be used in conjunction with the University Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff (https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyandUnclassifiedStaffHandbook.pdf) and the Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations governing faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure. These sources should be consulted for additional pertinent information concerning the topics discussed in this document.

The future distinction of the School of Music depends in large part upon the quality of the judgment exercised in making tenure decisions. For this reason, and because the awarding of tenure represents a commitment of substantial resources on the part of the University, each recommendation will be made with the greatest possible care and will be the result of thorough and rigorous scrutiny of all relevant information.

The extended commitment inherent in the granting of tenure requires an established record of past achievement and the potential for future achievement. It is expected that each person awarded tenure will have demonstrated a meritorious level of achievement in the areas of teaching, research/performance/creative activity (hereafter referred to as “research”), and service. It is further expected that each candidate will show clear evidence of the potential to achieve the rank of full professor.
2. **Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty**: In the School of Music, tenured faculty must maintain an acceptable standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching and research interests and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the University. An evaluation rating of at least "good" (on the University's scale of excellent, very good, good, marginal, poor) must be achieved to indicate an acceptable level of performance. If a faculty member fails to achieve a rating of "good" or higher in teaching, research, or service, the faculty member and the Dean will develop a plan to address the areas of concern. Continued failure to achieve an acceptable level of performance will result in a review by the Committee on Promotion and Tenure and the forwarding of a recommendation to the Dean of the School of Music. This expectation is in accordance with the School's statement concerning the criteria for evaluation and promotion and tenure found in this document, and the Faculty Code of Conduct, Article IV. Faculty Responsibilities, found in the Handbook for Faculty and other Unclassified Staff (see https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyandUnclassifiedStaffHandbook.pdf).

3. **Differential Allocation of Effort**: Each full-time member of the School of Music faculty is expected to engage in teaching, research, and service. The expectation is that under normal circumstances that each faculty member will adhere to the 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service allocation of effort that is the University norm. Exceptions to these percentages of effort will be determined by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member. The evaluation of all faculty members is simplified with as many as possible using the 40/40/20 allocation of effort, and by maintaining these percentages the School of Music recognizes the importance of all three components in our joint work.

**ANNUAL EVALUATION SYSTEM**

**Overview**: Annual Faculty Evaluation is the regular review process for assessing the work and professional accomplishments of faculty members. Results of Annual Faculty Evaluations are used to inform decisions regarding merit-based salary increases. Each faculty member will submit a portfolio of prescribed materials to the Dean of the School on the first day of classes in January. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will conduct the review.

**Faculty Evaluation Committee**: The Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of the following tenured members elected by the named divisions of the School of Music: three from Performance divisions (including one large ensemble director), one from MENT, and one from MUSC/THO. The Committee will evaluate all faculty members annually (except associate or assistant deans with administrative appointments of 0.5 FTE or higher).
Annual Faculty Report: All faculty members will prepare an Annual Faculty Report as prescribed by the School of Music using the on-line PRO system. All relevant achievements should be duly documented in this report as it is the single most important document for Annual Faculty Evaluation. Faculty members are encouraged to include a narrative of up to 250 words for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) describing their most important accomplishments during the time period being evaluated.

Peer Teaching Observation Assessments: For faculty members in tenure-acquiring positions (except in the academic year they are considered for tenure) peer observation of teaching will be included in the assessment of Teaching. Peer Teaching Observation Assessments will consist of written reports by two tenured colleagues appointed by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member’s division director.

Assessment reports should address overall effectiveness and organization of the observed instruction. Although there is no prescribed format, reports should include critical and constructive comments, and also clearly identify any concerns of the reviewer. The Dean will inform all parties of observation assignments well in advance of deadlines so that reviewers can arrange a mutually agreeable observation time. After the assessment report is submitted to the Dean, the observed faculty member will be given the option (within one week) to submit a statement addressing anything in the report s/he feels is inaccurate or needs clarification.

Annual Evaluation Portfolio: It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit materials (including student evaluations) in the Annual Evaluation Portfolio that accurately and effectively document the member’s activities in teaching, research/performance/creative activity, and service for the calendar year under consideration. Because research and other creative achievements are documented in the Annual Faculty Report, copies of articles, books, musical scores, audio or video recordings, or other like materials should not be submitted for Annual Reviews.

The Annual Evaluation Portfolio will include the following:
- Annual Faculty Report (prepared using the on-line PRO system)
- Current CV produced by the PRO system
- Student Course Evaluations
- Course Syllabi
- Peer Teaching Assessments (tenure-acquiring faculty only)
- Other Supporting Materials (optional)

Each item of the Annual Evaluation Portfolio should be submitted as a single document attached to an email, per the instructions given by the Office of the Dean. Files should be labeled with the faculty member’s name and what the document is (i.e. – Annual Faculty Report, CV, etc.). Although not required, faculty members may submit electronic copies of miscellaneous documents they feel are important in a single file labeled “Other Supporting Materials.” Materials documenting Research productivity (i.e. – articles, books, musical scores, audio/video recordings, etc.) should not be included in this file.

Evaluation Report: The Evaluation Report (ratings, written comments) will be prepared by the
Faculty Evaluation Committee and delivered to each faculty member by the Dean. The Committee will base the evaluation of each faculty member on criteria defined in this document in the section *Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Progress Toward Tenure Review, and Promotion and Tenure*. The School of Music will retain a copy of all Evaluation Reports. The evaluation process will be completed as soon as possible, well before merit salary deliberations.

The Evaluation Report will include a single assessment rating for each category (Teaching, Research, and Service) according to the following scale:

5 – Excellent, substantially exceeds expectations
4 – Very Good, exceeds expectations
3 – Good, meets expectations
2 – Marginal, below expectations
1 – Poor, significantly below expectations

Evaluation of each category will consider, on balance, both the quantity and quality of work. An overall evaluation rating will be calculated by using the rating for each category and the percentage weightings for each faculty member’s appointment (usually 40-40-20). *Example: for a faculty member achieving ratings of 4, 3, and 5 in Teaching, Research, and Service respectively, the calculation would be [(4 x 40) + (3 x 40) + (5 x 20)] = 380 (maximum possible score = 500).*

There will also be a brief narrative included in the Evaluation Report for each category, justifying the assigned rating. The Faculty Evaluation Committee may also choose to include a summary paragraph with suggestions/commendations.

The Evaluation Report will also assess the following for each faculty member in comparison to other faculty members with similar specializations in Music: a) heaviness of teaching load, b) overall quantity of research productivity, and c) overall quantity of service obligations. This assessment will identify one of three comparative levels for each category: 1) significantly higher/more than the median for all faculty, 2) at or about the median for all faculty, or 3) noticeably lower than the median for all faculty. Although not used in determining evaluation ratings, this information may be used in considering merit-based salary increases.

**Outcomes:** All ratings of “3 – Good” or above (according to the 1 – 5 defined above) require no special action or sanction. A rating of “2 – Marginal” or “1 – Poor” in any category is considered to be failing to meet academic responsibilities and requires further corrective steps described below.

A faculty member will either 1) accept the Evaluation Report, or 2) appeal the results of their individual evaluation. Appeals must be made in writing and submitted to the Office of the Dean within one week of receiving the Evaluation Report. Appeals must clearly explain the rationale for challenging the determination of the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Appeals follow a 2-step process.

Step 1: Without knowledge of the Evaluation Report completed by the Faculty Evaluation Committee or the written appeal by the faculty member, the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs will conduct an independent assessment of the Annual Evaluation
Portfolio. Findings will be documented in a separate report, similar in construction to the one produced by the Faculty Evaluation Committee, but without quantitative comparisons with other faculty with similar specializations. The report from the Associate Dean will be due within one week.

Step 2: Consistent with the School of Music Grievance Policy, a 3-person judicial committee appointed by the dean will consider the appeal. The committee members shall be tenured, disinterested music faculty members who have not had previous involvement in the Annual Review process that year. This judicial committee will use the written appeal of the faculty member, as well as the Evaluation Report and assessment by the Associate Dean, to determine the final numeric rating for the appealing faculty member. After the appeal is complete, the judicial committee will present its findings, including the final rating(s) and any comments it determines to be appropriate, to the dean. The dean will deliver the findings of the judicial committee to the appealing faculty member. Any further disputes will be subject to processes defined in the School of Music Grievance Policy.

Each faculty member has the option to meet annually with the Dean to discuss his/her productivity, evaluation, and expectations for the future. Such meetings are required for all tenure-acquiring faculty members.

Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities

The following is taken from the official KU policy for faculty evaluation, retrieved October 6, 2010 from https://documents.ku.edu/policies/provost/FacultyEvaluation.htm

If a unit administrator ascertains that a faculty member's performance seems to be failing to meet academic responsibilities, the administrator and the faculty member shall develop a written plan of methods to improve the faculty member's performance. The plan may include appropriate provisions for faculty development, such as campus opportunities for faculty continued renewal and development, reassignment of duties, or a change in teaching assignments. The unit administrator may call upon the University administration for assistance in constructing such a plan, including provision for additional resources, where needed. A faculty member may reject any plan recommended to aid performance levels, but the faculty member must understand that a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities based on articulated performance criteria is a basis for dismissal.

If a faculty member has been informed that his or her overall performance fails to meet academic responsibilities, the faculty member may request a review by a faculty committee designated to hear such matters in the school. The review committee will issue a non-binding recommendation on the appropriateness of this conclusion to the unit administrator. The administrator may change the evaluation after receiving the committee's decision, or may choose not to do so. In any event, the report of the committee will become a permanent part of the faculty member's personnel file within the academic unit and shall be available to the faculty member.

Department chairs shall consult annually with the dean, and deans shall consult annually with the Provost, on the progress of any faculty member who fails within the category of
overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities. Based upon the judgment that there has been a sustained overall failure to meet academic responsibilities, a dean may recommend to the Provost that a tenured faculty member be dismissed. In making this determination, the dean shall consider the nature of the failure to meet academic responsibilities, the reason or reasons for this failure, the number of years that the faculty member has failed to meet academic responsibilities, 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 any plan developed to improve the faculty member's performance. The Provost will review the case and, if the Provost agrees with the dean's recommendation, the Provost will recommend to the Chancellor that the faculty member be dismissed. If the Chancellor agrees and recommends dismissal, this recommendation will go to the faculty committee on Faculty Rights Board (FRB) for a hearing as specified in Part III.G.3 of the Handbook for Faculty and Other Unclassified Staff.

Should any recommendation to dismiss be brought against a tenured faculty member based exclusively or in part on grounds of sustained failure to meet academic responsibilities, both the report(s) of the review committee(s), the annual written evaluation(s) of the unit administrator concerning the faculty member, any outside evaluations, and any germane written response by the faculty member to the charges shall be made available to the Faculty Rights Board in the dismissal proceedings.

The finding of sustained failure must not abuse academic freedom or be used as a cover for discriminatory, unfair, arbitrary or capricious dismissal. If on the basis of the faculty member's presentation of the evidence FRB concludes that such factors were considered in formulating the recommendation to dismiss, FRB shall recommend to the Chancellor that the proceeding to dismiss be terminated.

**CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE**

Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation, progress toward tenure review, and promotion and tenure shall be based on the record of the faculty member in teaching, research/creative activity (hereafter referred to as research), and service.

**Teaching**

It is expected that each member of the faculty will excel in teaching. All faculty must demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible.

**Research**

Research may include any of a wide variety of activities depending upon the field of specialization and the interests of the faculty member. It is expected that each faculty member will pursue research or professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization and will achieve national recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity.
Service

Service refers to activities that utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member. Each member of the faculty is expected to render appropriate service to one or more of the following:

(1) the School of Music, (2) the University, (3) the profession, or (4) the public at large. Under normal circumstances, service cannot substitute for appropriate success in teaching or productivity in research or other creative activity. Exceptions will be determined by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member.

THE CRITERIA

It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under any of the following categories. Neither is it expected that a faculty member will be equally active in each of the three categories. The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity. Prestige and/or scope of the publication or presentation venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity.

Teaching

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of teaching shall include, but not be limited to, student evaluations and peer evaluations. Student evaluations, using University and School forms, will be administered every term by each faculty member. Annual peer evaluations of teaching will be required. These teaching evaluations will include written assessments by at least two colleagues each year selected by the Dean, in consultation with the faculty member’s Division Director or, in divisions with fewer than three tenured/tenure-track faculty members, by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Responsibility for conducting peer evaluations will be distributed as equally as possible among members of the tenured faculty. Generally speaking, faculty in academic divisions (MUSC, MTHC, and MEMT) will evaluate other academic faculty. Likewise, faculty in the performance divisions will evaluate other performance faculty. Peer evaluations will consist of a class visit (full time period) and a written report in the prescribed format (included in the appendix at the end of this document). The Associate Dean will place the peer evaluations in the faculty evaluation portfolio.

Evidence must include:

1. level of achievement and success of current students; and/or
2. level of achievement and success of former students.

Other evidence may include:

1. written statements by colleagues;
2. written statements by former students;
3. development of new courses, instructional programs, teaching materials, or teaching techniques.

Research

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research activity will be examined according to quantity and especially quality of productivity. Such evidence may include:

1. For studio faculty:
   a) Significant public performance. The significance of public performance, like that of the kinds of public exposure described in other areas, will be evaluated on the basis of location, nature of the audience, quality, quantity, and critical review, if any. Such public performance might include recital appearances as a soloist or as a member of a chamber ensemble, guest solo appearances off campus, or participation in professional performing ensembles.
   b) Presentations at workshops, seminars, conferences, and contributions to professional journals.
   c) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.

2. For conducting faculty:
   a) performances with university student groups that exhibit exceptional activity;
   b) guest conducting appearances;
   c) preparation of performances or papers for professional societies;
   d) scholarly publications such as articles, editions, and arrangements.
   e) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.

3. For composers:
   a) commissions, performances, or publication of musical compositions or arrangements;
   b) publication of books, articles, reviews, chapters in books, monographs, or substantial electronic media;
   c) presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional societies.

4. For musicologists, music theorists, and music education and music therapy faculty:
   a) publication as the author, co-author, editor, or translator of books, chapters in books, articles, reviews, monographs, scholarly editions, or substantial electronic media;
   b) presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional associations;
   c) appearances as a guest lecturer or seminar leader on other campuses.
It is understood that a faculty member in any particular area is not limited only to the research activities listed in that area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, write, edit, compose, publish, consult, record, and participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, each faculty member’s primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her appointment.

Service

Service is an essential aspect of faculty evaluation. Because of the visibility the School of Music seeks to maintain in the state, region, and nation, the service component is significant.

1. A satisfactory and nurturing environment for teachers and students within the School of Music requires the development and maintenance of studios, ensembles and classrooms with sufficient quality and quantity to support the School’s performance and academic programs. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attract and retain qualified music majors. Evidence of developing and/or supporting recruitment and retention programs may include:
   a. active and ongoing communication with prospective students by letter, telephone or e-mail,
   b. developing opportunities to work with prospective undergraduate and graduate students,
   c. active contact with public school and private instructors,
   d. active involvement in the recruiting activities of the School of Music (KMEA, providing information for databases, festivals, Midwestern Music Institutes, etc.),
   e. participating in the regularly scheduled audition days,
   f. mentoring student groups.

2. Other evidence to be considered in the evaluation of service may include:
   a. active participation, elective or appointive leadership roles in professional associations, or attendance at professional meetings;
   b. student advising;
   c. serving on committees of the School and University;
   d. administrative duties, including division director and workshop or institute organizer;
   e. utilization of the professional abilities and expertise of the faculty members on behalf of continuing education in music or in the service of government agencies, citizens' groups, educational or religious institutions, or charitable organizations at any level;
   f. editorial boards;
g. conference workshops.

Criteria for Classifying Music Research as Major or Minor

In assessing research during the annual faculty evaluation process, progress toward tenure review, and when a faculty member applies for promotion and tenure, it is necessary to classify research accomplishments as major or minor. The following criteria are to assist the faculty number in making that determination.

Music Composition

One must consider many variable and subjective factors when evaluating the artistic merits of a musical composition, but the following objective criteria should usually be considered when ranking works as having greater or lesser significance.

Major research by a composer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:

1. a work or arrangement of major proportion, including performance length and artistic merit, in any medium that requires substantial creative time and effort by the composer;
2. a commission for a major work in any medium by a highly respected and widely known performance ensemble, conductor, or individual performer;
3. publication and/or recording of a major work;
4. a successfully completed research grant for composition from a national or international foundation or agency;
5. a successful entry in a national or international, impartially refereed composition contest;
6. a performance of the composer's work(s) at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional society.

Minor research by a composer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:

1. a work or arrangement of smaller proportion or of lesser difficulty, requiring less time and creative effort to complete;
2. composing original incidental music of smaller proportion or writing an arrangement for a local university event;
3. publication and/or recording of a minor work, arrangement* or transcription**.

* Especially in the field of jazz or commercial music, arranging is, at its most professional level, a reconstruction and, oftentimes, a total transformation of an existing melody and/or harmonic progression. As much creativity can be involved in this process as in the majority of original composition.

** Transcribing is a process whereby one transliterates as closely as possible existing music by another composer, or, more rarely, one’s own composition, from one performing medium to another. This process requires careful craftsmanship, knowledgeable taste, and considerable skills as an orchestrator, but it does not normally require the proportional amount of creativity involved in arranging.
Music Performance

In the field of music performance, public performance is equated with publication. When classifying music performance as major or minor, the factors of difficulty of repertory, performance venue, and the performer's role in a given performance should be considered.

The factor of quality pervades all music performance and does not change the classifications of major and minor presented here. A major performance can be unsuccessful; a minor performance can be flawless, but still be considered a minor performance.

Major performances typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. solo performance with a large ensemble or leading role in a vocal production;
2. solo recital or collaborative performance as part of a concert series;
3. recital as a member of an established professional small ensemble in a university setting or as part of a professional ensemble;
4. concert in a major city as a member of a professional ensemble;
5. performance at a professional music symposium, conference, or institute;
6. a solo recording or a recording as a member of an ensemble with some possibility of peer review, such as a review published in a major professional journal, website, or equivalent.

Minor performances typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. performance as a member of an ad hoc ensemble;
2. minor role in a vocal production;
3. performance as assisting artist in a recital;
4. solo performance or collaborative performance in an informal setting;
5. performance as a member of a community or semi-professional ensemble;

Scholarly Research

Scholarly research in music usually results in publication or the presentation of a paper, lecture, or work in electronic media. The classification of the results of research as major or minor is based on several factors: the topic being considered and its relative scope and importance; the length, form and style of the final product; and the audience for whom it is intended.

Major publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. book, monograph, textbook, book chapter or work in electronic media of substantial significance and scope;
2. a substantial scholarly edition of extant music;
3. a scholarly article published in a refereed journal;
4. a lengthy, scholarly article based on original research written for a major music dictionary or encyclopedia.
Minor publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. a relatively brief monograph, textbook, or work in electronic media;
2. a scholarly or performing edition of a relatively brief composition;
3. an article on a less substantial topic, published in a magazine or regional journal; a brief article based on widely available materials, written for a general dictionary or encyclopedia;

Major papers or lectures typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. a substantial, scholarly paper or lecture selected by committee, presented at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional society;
2. a substantial, invited paper or lecture presented at a meeting of a professional society or at another university.

Minor papers or lectures typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. a paper or lecture of lesser significance, presented at a state or regional meeting;
2. a paper or lecture presented at a university function or an invited guest lecture in another department of the university.

Funded grants that may be considered major research are typically large, externally funded grants made available to the faculty member by a state, national or international agency.

Funded grants that may be considered minor research are normally smaller, internally funded grants from within the university.

Conducting

A conductor's performance should be assessed on the musicality and artistic quality of performances.

Major conducting performances typically fit into at least one of the following criteria:

1. Conducting regular university ensembles that exhibit exceptional activity:
   a. premieres, professional recordings or interdisciplinary projects;
   b. performances with soloists that demand a high degree of interaction between soloist and ensemble;
   c. off-campus performances, such as invited appearances at meetings of professional societies and at other important venues, and important performances during tours of an ensemble.

2. Guest conducting. Invitations for guest appearances are a measure of a conductor's professional recognition. Relative importance may be measured by
the stature and visibility of the inviting organization. Major guest appearances include:

a. invited appearances with professional ensembles;
b. invited appearances with ensembles at other universities;
c. invited appearances at all-state festivals or professional music societies.

Minor conducting performances are typically somewhat less demanding musically and technically; they are often performances in a pedagogical environment or performances that serve as an adjunct to some other activity. Performances of this type typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. performances as guest conductor with public school groups and regional music festivals;
2. brief performances with university ensembles at local and regional off-campus events;
3. serving as guest conductor on a recital with other faculty members, such as conducting a large chamber work.