

Western Carolina University
School of Music
Department Collegial Review Document
Effective Fall Semester, 2012

Policies, Procedures, and Criteria for Faculty Evaluation:
Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post-Tenure Review

- I. Overview** – The criteria, guidelines and procedures contained herein are supplementary to Volume II, Section 4 of the current *Faculty Handbook* and the WCU Tenure Policies and Regulations as approved by the Board of Governors, the provisions of which shall prevail on any matter not covered herein by further allowable specification or on any point wherein this document is inconsistent with those provisions.

This document shall be provided in writing and discussed with each new faculty member before initial appointment and at the beginning of the first term of employment. It shall also be provided in writing and discussed at the beginning of each academic year with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment, promotion or tenure, and each non-tenured or continuing part-time faculty member. A record of these discussions shall be kept in the individual's personnel file.

II. Domains of Evaluation

A. Teaching (Faculty Handbook Section 4.04 & 4.05)

1. According to the Faculty Handbook (4.05.B.1), teaching effectiveness is to be evaluated in the following three areas:
 - a) **Pedagogical Content Knowledge**—Effective teachers remain current in their fields, know how students learn, and recognize what prior information, including misconceptions, students bring to their courses. Most importantly, effective teachers know how to employ these three kinds of knowledge to help students learn. This combination is called “pedagogical content knowledge” to distinguish it from disciplinary expertise on the one hand and pedagogical expertise on the other. Using this pedagogical content knowledge, scholars restructure their expertise in forms that are understandable and useable by their students.
 - b) **Professional Aspects of Teaching**—Effective teaching relies upon the ability to perform well the required administrative and professional functions associated with instruction. In addition to disciplinary expertise and pedagogical content knowledge, good teaching also requires the instructor to make effective use of class time, to make materials available, to provide clear instructions, to respond appropriately to students, and to give timely feedback to students regarding particular assignments and their overall progress in the course.

c) **Student Response to Instruction**—Students have a unique and important perspective on certain components of teaching effectiveness. They value intellectual engagement, enthusiasm, and passion for course content. Course organization and clarity, two aspects that relate to student success, are validly rated by students. Effective teachers are available to students, and the extent to which students feel respected and share a sense of rapport with the instructor has been shown to correlate with student perceptions of teaching effectiveness. The School of Music recognizes that Student Assessments of Instruction (SAI) are not the only evidence of student response to instruction. Evidence of student accomplishment in juried performances, research symposia, and other forums are also valuable in assessing student response.

2. Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence

- a) **A concise self-evaluative statement addressing pedagogical content knowledge, particularly with regard to efforts to remain current in the discipline (4.05B2C). A discussion of changes made in one's teaching to help students understand the central concepts, skills, and recent developments in the discipline may be particularly helpful to the review committee.**
- b) **Peer review of teaching materials --including syllabi, examinations, study guides, handouts, assignments, etc. (4.05B)**
- c) **Direct observation of instruction using the departmental protocol. (4.05B2)**
- d) **Student assessment of instruction, using a form of the university-wide SAI instrument--required of all sections of all courses taught by untenured faculty. (4.05A)** The School of Music requires course evaluations of all sections of all courses taught by all faculty.

3. General comments –

a) **Professional Development** - Professional development activities with regard to teaching are highly valued by the School of Music when directly related to the candidate's current assignment, or to support an initiative in an area that will enhance the School's services to students and its image in the community. It is up to the candidate to make the case that a particular professional development activity should be highly valued by the School of Music.

B. Scholarship and Creative Works (4.05C)

1. **WCU recognizes as legitimate forms of scholarly activity the four types described by Boyer. Specific departmental perspectives on these categories, relative valuations of various forms of scholarly activity, and department-specific examples of each, are described below.**

The College of Fine and Performing Arts recognizes a difference between scholarly activity and scholarship/creative activity. Scholarly activity is required and may encompass the many facets of activities covered under the umbrella of

the Boyer model. For scholarly activity to be accepted as scholarship in the deliberations for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit it must meet the standards of peer review as set forth in this document. Scholarly activity may sometimes fall under service and it is up to the individual to document and reference this activity. An activity sometimes falls between service and scholarly activity and it is up to the individual to decide the scope and intent. Faculty members are advised to check with the unit CRC and/or Director or Department Head if there is a questions about the scope of the activity.

a) Scholarship of discovery – Original research that advances knowledge. Also includes creative activities such as artistic products, performances, musical or literary works.

(1) Examples of *scholarship* in this area include but are not limited to:

- publication of original monographs and articles in peer-reviewed journals
- presentation of original peer-reviewed research in regional or national conferences
- any other presentation of original research in a peer-reviewed context

(2) Examples of *creative activity* in this area include but are not limited to:

- Composition, publication, and performance of original musical works
- Conducting or performance of a musical work not previously in one's repertoire
- Learning and performing a new leading role in works of musical theatre (operas, musicals, oratorios, etc.)
- Solo performance in a regional or national venue where the performance is by invitation or selected by a panel of peers in the profession, such as a professional conference, appearance as a guest artist at another university, etc.
- Solo and chamber music performances on campus

b) Scholarship of integration – Synthesis of information across disciplines, across topics, or across time.

(1) Examples of *scholarship* in this area include but are not limited to:

- publication of original monographs (such as a textbook), chapters, or articles in peer-reviewed journals that present a new integration or interpretation of knowledge rather than original research
- any other presentation of such material in a peer-reviewed context, such as a regional or national conference, or on a scholarly website

(2) Examples of *creative activity* in this area include but are not limited to:

- Organization and performance of a recital or concert that presents a particular interpretation or analysis of music in addition to its performance, such as a lecture recital that explicates relationships between the musical works being performed or between the music

and other humanistic endeavors, or that is interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary in content and purpose

- Invited performance in such programs without an organizational role

c) Scholarship of application – Application of disciplinary expertise with results that can be shared with and/or evaluated by peers.

(1) Examples of *scholarship* in this area include but are not limited to:

- Publication or presentation of analytical studies of music in a peer-reviewed context
- Publication or presentation of bibliographical studies in a peer-reviewed context
- Invited presentation of critical interpretations or discussions of music for a popular audience, such as program notes, radio programs, etc.
- Authorship of program review and accreditation documents

(2) Examples of *creative activity* in this area include but are not limited to:

- Conducting or performance of works already in one's repertoire, including additional performances of music prepared and presented in fulfillment of one of the prior categories (that is, a first performance of a work is equivalent to "discovery," while additional performances of the same work are equivalent to "application")
- Performances in which the individual is not the primary interpreter of the music, such as performance in ensembles of various types (chamber music, orchestra, band, chorus, etc.) and supportive roles in operatic and music theatre
- Professional (rather than merely archival) recordings of musical performances, when such activity involves the creative collaboration of the musicians themselves in producing the final product

d) Scholarship of teaching and learning – Systematic study of teaching and learning processes.

(1) Examples of *scholarship* in this area include but are not limited to:

- publication of original monographs and articles in peer-reviewed journals
- presentation of original peer-reviewed research in regional or national conferences
- any other presentation of research or teaching materials in a peer-reviewed context, including regional journals devoted to the promotion of teaching, such as the *North Carolina Music Educators Journal* or *Teaching Music*, WCU's *Mountain Rise*, or similar publications, including those published on-line

(2) Examples of *creative activity* in this area include but are not limited to:

- creation and publication of original aids to teaching, whether in traditional print media or on the web, including method books, collections of exercises, study guides, etc., for an audience larger than that of a specific class being taught
- masterclasses that reach an off-campus audience

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence—including acceptable processes for peer review**

a) *Methods of evaluation:* The School of Music recognizes the primacy of sober, dispassionate, professional judgment over any artificially numerical assessment of value regarding the complex nature of scholarship and creative activity in music. Therefore, it does not quantify values for the various activities outlined above, nor does it presume the listing above to be comprehensive or exclusive. However, the School values such activities as have a regional or national significance in the profession more highly than those that have only a local effect. A primarily local record of performance, however, may be regarded as sufficient for reappointment (but not for tenure), provided its impact clearly advances the quality of the Music program, its reputation and ability to attract and retain students, or its engagement with other organizations in the community. It is therefore, up to the individual faculty member, in consultation with the Director and faculty peers, to present his or her own case for having met the requirements for tenure and promotion with regard to scholarship and creative activity. It is likewise up to the Collegial Review Committee to provide clear and direct feedback to the candidate for reappointment as to how the committee sees the developing record as meeting the ultimate goal of tenure. Expectations for faculty scholarship and creative activity are outlined in Section IV of this document as well as in the College of Fine and Performing Arts document “Protocols: Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Multiple Year Contract Renewal” (Appendix A).

b) *Sources of evidence:* The candidate is responsible for providing evidence of scholarship/creative activity appropriate to the personnel action for which application is being made. Such evidence may include copies of publications, letters of acceptance for publication, copies of recital programs, audio or video recordings of representative performances, etc. It is not necessary to document every listed performance given during the evaluation period, but every concert which the candidate argues should be highly valued or should be considered to have regional or national significance should be documented. Faculty who receive load credit for scholarship and creative activity must clearly differentiate those activities for which the load credit is received from their other creative activity. Expectations for scholarship and creative activity are greater when load credit is received.

c) *Peer review*: In a traditional academic discipline, the scholarly record that must meet appropriate levels of peer review typically involves a relatively small number of activities (several major articles, a book, a major research grant, etc.) over the period of review. The creative activity of a music faculty member who is also a professional musician, however, typically comprises dozens of performances each year. While some of these performances may best be characterized as service (such as performing for a commencement ceremony), the overall record must be regarded as creative activity on a par with traditional scholarship, as provided by the Boyer Model. Therefore, expectations for peer review and dissemination of scholarly work must be flexible enough to allow for review of a candidate's performance career as a whole, in addition to those particular activities for which there exists a direct parallel to traditional peer review.

Peer review is inherent in juried publications and concerts, invited performances, and many similar activities related to scholarship and creative activity. Many creative activities and performances that are appropriate for the School of Music to value highly in faculty evaluation processes, however, are not ordinarily subject to traditional peer review or to traditional means of dissemination of scholarly work. For example, recitals and concerts presented to an audience of peer musicians or the general public have an inherent aspect of peer review, even if a formal critique or review is not published. For such activities, taken individually or as a whole, appropriate peer review may be established by letters of support from peers external to the university who have personal knowledge of specific demonstrations of a candidate's expertise and who document this knowledge in their letters (i.e., the letter must be more specific than a general letter of recommendation and must clearly state the nature of the demonstration of expertise to which the writer was witness, along with the date and venue of the presentation). Public performance is a primary means by which a musician's creative work is disseminated to peers and the general public. While a larger public may be reached through recordings of performances, live performance must be regarded, at all levels of the university collegial review process, as significant dissemination of the creative work of musicians.

External peer review may also be established by inviting, at the discretion of the Candidate, Director, Dean, or the Collegial Review Committee, a colleague from a peer institution who is familiar with the collegial review process, to review the overall record of scholarship/creative activity of a candidate and to advise the Collegial Review Committee with regard to how that candidate's record would compare to candidates for a similar personnel action at the peer institution. Such a process would be cumbersome for annual faculty evaluation and reappointment, but would

be entirely appropriate for considerations of tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. If an external reviewer is invited, the Candidate may submit the names of up to three peer institutions and up to three individuals whom he or she considers to be peers, from which the Collegial Review Committee in consultation with the Director and Dean shall select the external reviewer. The external reviewer may, at the discretion of the Director, Dean and the Collegial Review Committee, participate in the actual deliberations of the Committee, but without a vote.

The School of Music accepts the list of examples of peer review in the College of Fine and Performing Arts peer review document (Appendix A) as representative but not exclusive. It is up to the candidate to make the case that his or her scholarship and creative activity has been appropriately disseminated and reviewed by peers external to the University.

3. **General comments** –The School of Music makes no formal distinction between the different types of scholarship as described by Boyer in terms of inherent value, recognizing that each type contributes in its own way to the advancement of learning. More significantly, our accrediting agency, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), requires that “creative activity and achievement must be regarded as being equivalent to scholarly efforts and publication in matters of appointment and advancement when the institution has goals and objectives for the preparation of professional composers and performers” (Standard II.E.3.a.(1), *NASM Handbook 2007-08*, pg. 52). NASM further recommends that “the creative production and professional work of performers, composers, and other applied faculty should be accepted as equivalent to scholarly publication or research as a criterion for appointment and advancement in all institutions” (*ibid.*). Music faculty whose primary role is to train performers through studio teaching and composing (“applied faculty”) must be regarded as performers and creative artists rather than as scholars in the traditional sense. Music faculty whose teaching duties combine teaching in both academic and performance courses may present a combination of creative activities and traditional scholarship in making their cases for reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review and in the AFE. Faculty whose entire teaching load is devoted to academic coursework must present evidence of traditional scholarship and may supplement this with creative activity.
 - a) **Grant proposals and awards** – Successful applications for grants, especially grants external to the university, are valued in each of the faculty evaluation processes, but this value only strengthens an already acceptable record in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service; it cannot make up for an inadequate record in any of these areas, least of all in scholarship/creative activity. Grant-writing, even

if not successful, is still a valued activity when it is part of a long-term strategy and not merely occasional.

- b) Professional development** – Professional development activities with regard to scholarship/creative activity are highly valued by the School of Music when directly related to the candidate’s current assignment, or to support an initiative in an area that will enhance the School’s services to students and its image in the community. It is up to the candidate to make the case that a particular professional development activity should be highly valued by the School of Music.

C. Service (4.04C3 & 4.05D)

1. Types of service

a) Institutional service –

- (1) Teaching activities within the university but outside the instructor’s regularly assigned courses, such as guest lectures and other special instructional presentations given to students, faculty, and staff.
- (2) Non-teaching activities at the school, college, and university levels
 - (a) Committee memberships
 - (b) Committee chairmanships
 - (c) Assigned responsibilities, such as technical support
 - (d) Administrative responsibilities
 - (e) Other professional service activities, including performances not for pay, such as performing for commencement ceremonies, banquets, etc., where the music is not the focus of the activity
- (3) Formal or informal mentorship of individual students
- (4) Supervision of student employee or volunteer work experiences

b) Community engagement –

- (1) Presentations, workshops, guest lectures, etc., in the faculty member’s area of expertise for groups outside the University
- (2) Judging of competitions, festivals, etc.
- (3) Consultation and support in the faculty member’s area of expertise
- (4) Benefit performances and other services provided free of charge
- (5) Non-concert performances, such as weddings, dinners, etc., for which the music is not the focus of the activity
- (6) Participation in professional organizations, including positions of leadership, attendance at professional meetings, contributions and recognition of achievement

c) Special expertise, unusual time commitments, or exceptional leadership -

d) Advising –

- (1) Academic advising
- (2) Career/professional advising
- (3) Serving as faculty advisor or consultant to student organizations

e) Recruitment of students

2. **Methods of evaluation and sources of evidence** – Unless exempted by nature of the appointment (e.g., a Lecturer position), the faculty candidate shall provide a complete listing, in reverse chronological order beginning with the most recent, of all service activities for the period under review. The headings listed above may be used, or any other set of headings that helps to clarify and elucidate the candidate’s record in this area. Further documentation is not required except for those activities that the candidate believes should be especially highly valued or should be considered to have regional or national significance. Evidence for such activities may be in the form of a letter of thanks or of support for the significance of the activity.
 - a) *Candidates for Reappointment.* As a general rule, candidates for reappointment may reasonably be expected to focus on teaching and scholarship/creative activity in their early years, but should be developing a tenurable record in service by the third year of employment.
 - b) *Recruitment.* Efforts to recruit and maintain a studio of sufficient size and quality to support the performance agenda of the School of Music must be documented in a succinct narrative outlining strategies, audition results, and enrollment outcomes for the period under review.
 - c) *Advising.* Evaluation of advising is required by the College of Fine and Performing Arts, using a standard evaluation form. Results of the advising summative review must be included in annual faculty evaluation, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review documents.
3. **General comments** – The lists of service activities above are suggestive, not restrictive; it is up to the faculty candidate to make the case for the appropriateness and significance of his or her reported service activities.
 - a) **Professional development** - Professional development activities with regard to service are highly valued by the School of Music when directly related to the candidate’s current assignment, or to support an initiative in an area that will enhance the School’s services to students and its image in the community. It is up to the candidate to make the case that a particular professional development activity should be highly valued by the School of Music.

III. Specific Procedures for Review Events

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. **Overview** –Application of the procedures which follow depends upon a number of ideas which can be called a philosophy of faculty evaluation. As we understand the process, faculty evaluation enables individual faculty members to improve their performance by making each individual aware of strengths and weaknesses, it assists the administrator and

advisory committee in making decisions relating to faculty status, it promotes the continuing professional development of faculty members, and it helps faculty members know how their work is being evaluated.

We believe that in the matter of faculty evaluation no such thing as truly objective data can be obtained, if one understands that term to mean facts which can be compared without considerable interpretation. For example, one cannot, for purposes of faculty evaluation, compare class enrollment figures without regard for the time of day a particular section is taught, whether the course is required, and a realistic assessment of the alternatives available to students enrolled, to mention only a few of the variables. One cannot compare publications without regard for the field of specialty they treat, the quality of the journal in which they appear, their length and their value as new knowledge. Furthermore, we believe that the number of variables affecting all the criteria suggested below is so great that one cannot assign a realistic set of numbers to them. To devise a set of numbers that would attempt to include all the variables would produce an unmanageable set, and to use a set of numbers that does not account for all the variables lowers the quality of the decision based on them. In other words, we believe that the best decision in matters of faculty status will be made by an intelligent, sensitive, and fair-minded Director assisted by a Collegial Review Committee operating on the basis of the criteria suggested below without any attempt to mathematically weight, sum, or average the value of the various contributions made by each member of the School of Music. We suggest that the subtle mental weighting and averaging which we intend to indicate by the term "professional judgment" as used below is much more accurate, acceptable, and equitable than any manageable system of mathematical weighting could be.

We believe it is essential to recognize the diverse abilities of the faculty since these contribute to the overall mission of the School of Music. While it is essential for each faculty member to perform effectively as a teacher, it is unrealistic to expect every member of the School of Music to be equally active in the three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The Director, in consultation with the faculty, should decide what emphasis each individual needs to place in the three areas relative to the effort of the School as a whole. Rationale for any significant changes in teaching assignments must be included in the AFE and be reviewed by the Collegial Review Committee as a whole.

2. **Composition of review committee** – Members of the School of Music Collegial Review Committee (see composition in section III.B.2., below) shall conduct the Annual Peer Evaluation, which summarizes and evaluates the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. The review should specify any

areas that the reviewers find to be either superior or unsatisfactory. At least two members of the committee shall review each candidate's AFE document. The same two members of the committee may not conduct the review of a particular candidate two years in a row. The reviewers shall submit a written peer evaluation which, along with the Director's Summary, becomes a permanent part of the faculty member's AFE file, and the evaluation itself will be made available to the candidate and the Dean.

3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation**

a. All full-time faculty members must prepare an AFE document that includes:

1) **Teaching**

- a) **a self-evaluation of teaching, as outlined in Section II.A. above.**
- b) **copies of peer evaluations of teaching materials.**
- c) **direct observation of classroom teaching (if required)**
- d) **Student Assessment of Instruction**

2) **Scholarship and Creative Activity –**

3) **Service –**

b. Specific guidelines for preparation of the AFE document -The *Self Evaluation* must be submitted to the Director by the announced deadline and will become part of the faculty member's AFE file. Supporting documents may be submitted but will not become part of the faculty member's permanent record.

1) Teaching. Because teaching assignments in the School of Music may include classroom, studio, and ensemble courses, the candidate may choose to base the self-evaluation on one area of teaching assignment each year, but all areas of assignment must be covered in a regular rotation. For Lecturers, only the teaching portion of the Self-Evaluation must be completed, since Lecturers are not assigned School of Music service duties, nor are they expected to produce scholarship and creative activities.

a) The *self-evaluation of teaching* should be a concise and objective summary (5-7 pages, not including supporting materials), followed directly by a simple listing of the faculty teaching load for the semesters under review (including the number of students enrolled in each course). The objective summary must include a narrative regarding pedagogical content knowledge, as defined in section II A above.

b) The *peer evaluation of teaching materials* is conducted by at least two faculty members, one of whom must be a member of the CRC, using the departmentally approved form. These forms will

be placed in the individual's School of Music employment file, and copies shall be given to the candidate for inclusion in that year's AFE. Peer evaluation of teaching materials is required of all full-time faculty, and must be completed prior 1 March in order to facilitate the candidate's preparation of the AFE.

c) *Direct Observation of Teaching* is conducted by a member of the School of Music CRC or a designee recommended by the instructor and approved by the CRC who will visit a class, lesson, or ensemble rehearsal and record his or her evaluation on the departmentally approved document. This form will be placed in the individual's School of Music employment file. A copy shall be given to the instructor for inclusion in that year's AFE. Direct observation of teaching is required for all non-tenured full-time and newly employed part-time faculty members. Direct observations of teaching should be completed during the fall semester.

d) *Student Assessment of Instruction (SAI)* is conducted on-line for every section of every course every semester, according to the University's published schedule. Student completion of the course evaluation must be entirely independent of any grading procedure for the course. All student evaluations for the current academic year must be submitted along with the AFE. Faculty are encouraged to provide a chart or summary of SAI results, and may also include a concise discussion of the results, to assist review committees in interpreting this evidence.

If the instructor feels that the SAI has been compromised during a particular semester due to technological or other causes, the instructor may make a case for the SAIs for that semester not to be used as summative data. In such cases, the instructor must submit an alternative type of course evaluation; the administration of this alternative evaluation must preserve the confidentiality of student responses and must not allow the faculty member to see student responses until after final grades have been submitted. The rationale for using an alternative form must be presented along with the results of the alternative form as part of the supplemental materials submitted with the AFE.

2) Scholarship and Creative Activity – List all activities for the year under review in reverse chronological order, beginning with the most recent. Activities may be grouped or summarized in order to enhance clarity.

3) Service – List all activities for the year under review in reverse chronological order, beginning with the most recent. Activities may be grouped or summarized in order to enhance clarity. A summative review of the College of Fine and Performing Arts advising form must be included.

4) Annual Peer Evaluation. The report of the Annual Peer Evaluation conducted by members of the Collegial Review Committee as outlined above shall be submitted to the Director and be forwarded to the Dean along with the AFE and the Director's Summary. The Director shall provide a copy of the report to the candidate prior to the consultation.

5) Director's Summary. The Director is responsible for developing a separate written evaluation of each faculty member. For all full-time faculty, this evaluation must include an evaluation of teaching, specifically noting any ratings that differ from those assigned by the CRC. In addition, the summary must evaluate the candidate in terms of scholarship/creative activity; and service. The Director shall provide a copy of the summary to the faculty member prior to the consultation.

5) Consultation. At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the Director will consult with each member of the faculty to review the results of the evaluation and discuss ways to improve performance. The faculty member must sign the Director's summary to indicate receipt of it, but has the right to respond in writing to indicate acceptance of the summary or to provide a rebuttal. The faculty member's written response is to be attached to the Director's summary.

6) Materials submitted to the Dean. The faculty member's self-evaluation, peer review of teaching materials, the Director's summary, and any rebuttal shall be submitted to the Dean of the College of Fine and Performing Arts.

c. Evaluation of part-time/non tenure-track instructors (4.05 F) – Part-time faculty, graduate teaching assistants with full responsibility for a course, and faculty on phased retirement are not required to complete a self-evaluation document, but must submit course syllabi and student evaluations. Part-time faculty who teach in only one semester per year are evaluated immediately following the semester of teaching. Direct observation of teaching and peer review of materials must be completed for every new part-time faculty and graduate teaching assistant. Continuing part-time and faculty on phased retirement are reviewed by the Director, who provides each faculty member with a written evaluation based on student evaluations, direct observation of teaching (at the

discretion of the Director), and course syllabi (and other materials at the discretion of the faculty member).

d. Special Considerations Unique to the School of Music: Because Student Assessment of Instruction is an important part of the Annual Faculty Evaluation process and because student evaluations are not available until the end of each semester, the School of Music shall initiate its review of AFE documents after the end of the Spring semester, beginning in the Spring 2009 semester. Documents will be due on 15 May, and the Director's responses are due to the Dean on 1 June. Faculty must be available for consultation on the AFE in the last two weeks of May or waive their right to such consultation. Consultation may be by phone or in person; the faculty member's signature on the Director's summary shall affirm either face-to-face or phone consultation. A faculty member may request to have the consultation prior to May 15. In such cases, the faculty member must submit the AFE document by 15 April.

B. Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (4.06 & 4.07)

1. **Overview** –The School of Music, in its interpretation and application of the criteria, guidelines, and procedures for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, acknowledges its obligation to retain the best possible faculty to serve the students, university, and region. On initial appointment we will be selective, and when recommending tenure we will be more selective. We should appoint only those whom we expect eventually to deserve tenure. For tenured faculty and those advancing toward tenure, it is our duty to review carefully and thoughtfully their work and accomplishments, give suggestions for improvement, and recommend tenure or promotion in rank as appropriate. Recommendations with regard to reappointment, tenure, and promotion are made by the Director only after consultation with the School of Music Collegial Review Committee.
2. **Composition of review committee (4.07D1)** – The School of Music's Collegial Review Committee shall be composed of six tenured faculty from the School of Music, two of whom are elected each year to three-year terms. Should a position become vacant, the Director shall appoint an interim member who shall serve until ratified or replaced by faculty vote at the next faculty meeting. The committee is convened and chaired by the Director, but the Director has no vote in the decisions of the committee.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** – **The candidate list for each college is prepared by the Office of the Provost and distributed to the deans for review. The list is finalized by the Office of the Provost in conjunction with the Dean's office. Detailed instructions**

for preparing the dossier are issued annually from the Office of the Provost including the TPR schedule for when documents are due and decisions are made at the various review levels.

- 4. Candidate's Proposal of an Agenda for Scholarship/Creative Activity.**
The Boyer model offers to tenure-track Music faculty a great variety of types of scholarship/creative activity that may be presented to establish the candidate's individual case. Therefore, the School of Music shall expect each candidate to propose an agenda for the scholarship/creative activity to be presented in establishing the candidate's individual case for tenure/promotion.

For the first formal reappointment application for which a dossier is prepared (typically during the second year of tenure-track employment), the candidate shall develop a specific proposal for the types of scholarship/creative activity to be pursued in the upcoming years of tenure-track employment. This proposal should also include the means by which the proposed activities will be disseminated and peer-reviewed. A positive recommendation for reappointment shall constitute acceptance of the candidate's proposal as satisfactory or with modifications suggested by the reviewer(s). Subsequent review of the candidate's scholarship/creative activity shall be based on this proposal.

For the second formal reappointment application for which a dossier is prepared (typically during the fourth year of tenure-track service), progress toward the scholarship goals shall be presented by the candidate, and modifications proposed as necessary to accommodate changes in direction, unforeseen opportunities, etc. A positive recommendation for reappointment shall constitute acceptance of the candidate's modified proposal as satisfactory or with modifications suggested by the reviewer(s). Subsequent review of the candidate's scholarship/creative activity shall be based on this proposal.

The application for tenure/promotion (typically during the sixth year of tenure-track service) shall include an evaluation of the candidate's performance based on the proposed scholarship agenda and taking into account any additional opportunities that may have arisen since the last review. It must also include a specific proposal for the types of scholarship/creative activity to be pursued in the upcoming years of tenured employment. This proposal should also include the means by which the proposed activities will be disseminated and peer-reviewed. Documentation must be provided in the appendices for everything that the candidate presents as significant scholarly activity. Other activities and performances of lesser significance or that are primarily service-related should be listed in the application document, but need not be documented in the appendices. That is, materials included in the appendices to

document scholarship may be limited to those activities that are to be considered as highly significant.

Candidates and the Collegial Review Committee alike must recognize that it is the responsibility of the CRC to evaluate the *quality and significance* of the scholarly/creative activity submitted as meeting the standard for tenure, not merely to check items off a list. In other words, the standard is not met simply by having completed the activities previously approved in the proposed agenda for scholarly/creative activity, but by having done them at an appropriate level as supported by the evidence of peer review.

C. **Post-Tenure Review (4.08)**

1. **Overview** - Post-tenure review is a comprehensive, formal, periodic evaluation of cumulative faculty performance, the prime purpose of which is to ensure faculty development and to promote faculty vitality. The criteria for post-tenure review are based on a record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service that, in the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee, continues to meet the standards for the current rank.
2. **Composition of review committee** - Three members of the departmental Collegial Review Committee, selected by the Director, shall conduct the post-tenure review. Candidates may not choose any member of the post-tenure review committee.
3. **Procedures and preparation of documentation** - Post-tenure review occurs no later than five years after the most recent personnel action was granted (tenure, promotion, or a previous post-tenure review). Post-tenure review may not be undertaken in the same year as an application for promotion. A faculty member who intends to apply for early promotion may request an early post-tenure review.

The following documents are to be submitted for review:

- The current AFE self-evaluation, without the Director's summary
- The last four AFE self-evaluations, complete with Director's summary
- A current curriculum vitae
- Summary of student assessment of instruction (SAI) for the years following the most recent personnel action
- Teaching materials or other supporting evidence at the candidate's discretion
- Summative advising evaluation for the years following the most recent personnel action

- A specific proposal for the types of scholarship/creative activity to be pursued in the upcoming years of employment as a tenured faculty member. This proposal should also include the means by which the proposed activities will be disseminated and peer-reviewed. A positive recommendation for reappointment shall constitute acceptance of the candidate's proposal as satisfactory or with modifications suggested by the reviewer(s). Subsequent review of the candidate's scholarship/creative activity shall be based on this proposal.

The CRC's evaluation of the post-tenure review candidate's file shall be communicated to the candidate and the Director in writing. This evaluation must report either an *Exemplary*, a *Satisfactory*, or an *Unsatisfactory* rating, including supporting rationale based on the evidence provided, with regard to each of the following categories: teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.

If the evaluation is *Satisfactory*, the committee may also determine that the candidate's performance is *Exemplary* in one or more categories. An overall rating of *Exemplary* must be supported with evidence of exemplary performance in each of the categories. Results of a *Satisfactory* or *Exemplary* review are documented for university award and merit pay decisions. In addition, suggestions to enhance performance may be provided.

If the evaluation is *Unsatisfactory* in any of the areas, the committee must support this with a specific descriptions of shortcomings as they relate to the faculty member's assigned duties, and a recommendation of specific improvements for consideration by the candidate and the Director. A candidate who receives a negative review in any area may submit a written response that shall be forwarded to the Dean along with the candidate's file.

The Director makes an independent review of each post-tenure review candidate, and shall communicate the results of his or her review in writing to the candidate and the Dean.

In the case of an *Unsatisfactory* review, the Director, in consultation with the candidate, CRC, and dean of the college, will create a three-year development plan within one month of the review. The plan shall include (1) specific improvements to be accomplished within three years, (2) resources to be committed to the improvement efforts, and (3) other support provided by the administration. The plan shall also include a clear statement of consequences should adequate progress not occur by the end of the third year. The consequences may range from suspension of pay raise to, in the most extreme cases, reduction in rank, temporary suspension of employment, or termination of employment. The Director

and the CRC will monitor the candidate's progress relative to the development plan and provide verbal and written feedback to the faculty member each semester.

Criteria for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Reappointment, Tenure, Promotion, and Post Tenure Review

IV. The criteria for meeting expectations in the School of Music

Overview: The School of Music relates each of its performance evaluations to the criteria for the awarding of tenure. Therefore, candidates for reappointment are evaluated on their progress toward this goal, while candidates for post-tenure review are evaluated upon their continued record of success in all three areas (teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service) and candidates for promotion are evaluated on the degree to which they exceed the expectations for tenure. With the additional considerations noted below, the School of Music accepts the College of Fine and Performing Arts definitions with regard to the "high" level of performance for recommendation for tenure, promotion to Associate Professor, and the "superior" level of performance for promotion to Professor (Appendix B).

Earned Academic Degrees. School of Music requirements are the same as those stated in the *Faculty Handbook* (Section 4.02.02 Section IV). Requirements for academic rank may be waived in exceptional cases where clear equivalency is established in terms of (a) distinctive or specialized training or experience, (b) recognized contributions in the area of a teaching field through research and professional service, or (c) private professional work in the teaching area assigned.

Criteria for Initial Appointment: Appointment at the rank of *Instructor* requires a Master's degree that includes a minimum of 18 semester hours appropriate to the teaching field. Appointment at the rank of *Assistant Professor* requires an earned doctorate appropriate to the teaching field and evidence of effective teaching, or a Master's degree appropriate to the teaching field and three years of effective teaching at the college level or six years of other appropriate teaching and professional experience. Significant alternative qualifications are required if a candidate with a Master's degree is to teach graduate courses.

Years of College-level Teaching Experience. Except in cases where individuals have demonstrated unusually high competence and have made highly significant contributions to the university, the years of experience and times in rank indicated below are the minimum for appointment or promotion (Vol. 2, Section IV. B *Faculty Handbook*).

All full-time faculty in the School of Music are expected to perform at an acceptable level in each of the areas (Teaching, Scholarship/Creative Activity, Service) as appropriate to their individual teaching or administrative assignments. Part-time faculty and Lecturers are not expected to contribute to Service or Scholarship and Creative Activity, but special contributions

in these areas may be considered in the annual reappointment process and in determination of merit pay.

A. Annual Faculty Evaluation (4.05)

1. **Teaching** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
2. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
3. **Service** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
4. **General comments** – The criteria for annual faculty evaluation are based on a record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the past year that, in the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee, meets the standards outlined below as appropriate to the candidate's assignment and current rank. Special cases are noted in the procedures for the AFE described in section III.A.3.c. and d. of this document.

B. Reappointment (4.06)

1. **Teaching** - Significant progress toward a tenurable record in teaching. In consideration of the complex nature of teaching, especially for a new faculty member, specific thresholds for evaluation shall not be defined. However, the candidate shall provide evidence of thoughtful consideration of teaching evaluations (including student, peer, and administrative evaluations) and of concrete and effective steps taken to address any areas of weakness.
2. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** – Significant progress toward a tenurable record in performance. An annual faculty recital or a rigorous level of chamber music performance is typical of candidates for reappointment. Significant contribution to the musical community beyond the university campus is expected.
3. **Service** - Significant progress toward a tenurable record in service. While in the early years of tenure-track service, it is understandable that a candidate's service record be largely within the School, as the tenure year approaches, the scope of service activities should reflect a broadening range of activities and commitments that include service to the College, University, Community, and Profession.
4. **General comments** - The criteria for reappointment are based on a continuous record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service as appropriate to the candidate's assigned responsibilities that, in the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee, shows significant progress toward the awarding of tenure. In the first years of service, one or more areas—such as service—may be significantly less developed than the others. Beginning with the third full year of service, the record is expected to show significant progress toward tenure in all three areas.
5. **Academic Qualifications:** An earned doctorate in the primary teaching field, a masters degree in the primary teaching field plus documentation of significant work toward the doctorate, or a masters degree and significant professional experience if the primary teaching field is one in which the

masters degree is generally considered to be the terminal degree. If the masters degree is not specifically recognized as the terminal degree by the School of Music at the time of hiring, the doctorate shall be considered to be the terminal degree.

C. Tenure (4.07)

1. **Teaching** - Effective teaching in all areas of teaching assignment, as determined by direct observation of teaching, review of teaching materials, student evaluations, peer review, etc. No one measure shall be considered to trump the others in consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness. For example, very high or very low student evaluations may not be used exclusively to support or deny a requested personnel action in the absence of similar evidence in the other measures. Evidence highly valued by the School of Music includes:
 - Versatility and demonstrated ability and willingness to teach in a variety of areas
 - Ability and willingness to support colleagues in collaborative teaching
 - Development of new courses or significant redesign of existing course content or delivery
 - Special recognition for teaching excellence, such as a teaching award
 - Special recognition earned by students as a result of work with this teacher
2. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** – Faculty who teach performance skills are expected to maintain a performance schedule (including both on-campus and external performances) that support the performance agenda of the School. For candidates whose assignments are not related to musical performance, significant contribution to the profession in the area of research or composition is expected. Research may include any of the four levels of Scholarship as defined in University’s interpretation of the Boyer Model. To be considered as scholarship for tenure, scholarly and creative activities must be peer-reviewed. The scope and content of the peer review should be regional or multi-state. The College of Fine and Performing Arts document “Protocols: Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure, and Multiple Year Contract Renewal” (Appendix A) provides indicators of scope and content for peer review. Evidence highly valued by the School of Music includes:
 - Invited performance with an off-campus ensemble, such as a concerto performance or significant role in an opera
 - Invited performance as a guest artist at a regional or national conference
 - Invited performance as a guest artist at another institution of higher education
 - Solo faculty recital, especially when performed both on and off-campus
 - Collaborative work with a regularly performing faculty chamber music ensemble, especially when the group performs off-campus
 - Peer-reviewed publication or performance of an original composition
 - Publication of a music textbook or monograph
 - Publication of an article in a nationally recognized peer-reviewed journal

Other evidence that is valued by the School of Music includes:

- An overall record of on-campus performances sufficient to establish credibility as a professional musician amongst students, colleagues, and the community
- Featured performance as a guest artist with a WCU student ensemble
- Membership in a regional orchestra or regular performances with two or more regional ensembles

3. Service – The School of Music defines service as effective support of colleagues in the School, University, and Profession through the recruitment of students, advising, work as a committee member, consultant, or administrator. Unpaid work off-campus as a board member, consultant, guest artist or lecturer, etc., is also recognized as service so long as it is relevant to the goals and mission of the School of Music. Except in unusual circumstances, contributions in a field unrelated to music are not regarded as evidence of effective service for a music faculty member. Faculty who have release-time from teaching for administrative or technical assignments must distinguish between their specific release-time activities and their general service when reporting on this category. Evidence highly valued by the School of Music includes:

- Development or maintenance of a studio of sufficient size and quality to support the large performance ensembles of the School
- Effective academic advisement of students, including maintenance of accurate and complete advisement records. Advising is evaluated each semester utilizing a form and process developed by the College of Fine and Performing Arts.
- Effective and willing participation in committee work at the departmental, college, or university level, especially that which promotes the goals and mission of the School of Music
- Work with students and colleagues that engages the community in musical activities beyond simply attending a concert
- Effective efforts to publicize the performance agenda of the School of Music
- Effectiveness as a fund-raiser for the School of Music
- Effective administration of non-teaching assignments such as Director, Program Director, Coordinator, etc.
- Leadership in professional music-related organizations

4. General comments – The criteria for tenure are based on a continuous record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service as appropriate to the candidate's assigned responsibilities that, in the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee, meets the standards outlined above. The significance of the candidate's contributions must reach beyond the university campus and local community in scholarship/creative activity and at least one other area. It is up to the candidate to make the case for having developed such a record and to the School of Music CRC to carefully consider the candidate's case based on the record as presented.

5. **Academic Qualifications:** An earned doctorate in the primary teaching field, or a masters degree and significant professional experience if this degree was specifically recognized as the terminal degree in the original hiring process.
6. **Length of Service:** A minimum of five years of effective teaching at the college level as Assistant Professor. For candidates for whom a masters degree was specifically recognized as the terminal degree in the original hiring process, nine years of effective teaching at the college level, including six years at the rank of Assistant Professor, are required. A candidate may petition for consideration of prior service (either before coming to Western or while on term contract at Western). The maximum number of years of continuous full-time probationary service shall be seven years except as provided by Section 4.02.02 Section V, pp II-21 and 22 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

D. Promotion to Associate Professor (4.07)

1. **Teaching** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
2. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
3. **Service** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
4. **General comments** – The School of Music accepts the College of Fine and Performing Arts definitions of “high” performance (Appendix B) required for promotion to Associate Professor as general guidelines that may be modified in individual circumstances. It is up to the candidate to make the case that he or she has achieved the high level of performance required for promotion to Associate Professor.

In general, the School of Music considers promotion to associate professor to be on a par with the achievement of tenure. Therefore, if a candidate has developed a sustained record of the high level of achievement that is worthy of tenure, the candidate should generally also receive promotion to the rank of associate professor.

In rare instances, should the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee find that the candidate’s record is worthy of tenure due to recent significant accomplishment or improvement, but that the overall record has not demonstrated a sustained level of accomplishment, the committee may recommend that the candidate withdraw an application for promotion, or the committee may deliver a positive vote on tenure and a negative vote on promotion.

If a candidate is not awarded promotion to associate professor, the School of Music recommends that re-application for promotion be made in the second calendar year following the year in which the unsuccessful application was made, in order to give time to establish the sustained accomplishment that is

expected for promotion (that is, an unsuccessful application in the Fall of 2010 may be followed by a re-application in the fall of 2012).

E. Promotion to Full Professor (4.07)

1. **Teaching** - (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
2. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** - (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
3. **Service** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
4. **General comments** – The School of Music accepts the College of Fine and Performing Arts definitions of “superior” performance (Appendix B) required for promotion to Professor as general guidelines that may be modified in individual circumstances. It is up to the candidate to make the case that he or she has achieved the superior level of performance required for promotion to Professor.

Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained record of superior achievement in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service as appropriate to the candidate’s teaching or administrative assignment. However, the significance of the candidate’s contributions must reach beyond the region to the national or international level in at least two of the three areas of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. It is up to the candidate to make the case for having developed such a record and to the School of Music CRC to carefully consider the candidate’s case based on the record as presented.

If a candidate is not awarded promotion to professor, re-application for promotion may be made in the second calendar year following the year in which the unsuccessful application was made, in order to give time to establish the sustained accomplishment that is expected for promotion (that is, an unsuccessful application in the Fall of 2010 may be followed by a re-application in the fall of 2012).

5. Academic Qualifications: An earned doctorate in the primary teaching field, or a masters degree and significant professional experience if this degree was specifically recognized as the terminal degree in the original hiring process.

6. Length of Service: Ten years of effective teaching at the college level, including five years at the rank of Associate Professor. For candidates for whom a master's degree was specifically recognized as the terminal degree in the original hiring process, fourteen years of effective teaching at the college level, including five years at the rank of Associate Professor, are required.

F. Post-Tenure Review (4.08)

1. **Teaching** - (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
2. **Scholarship/Creative Activity** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
3. **Service** – (refer to criteria for tenure, and see general comments, below)
4. **General comments** - The criteria for post-tenure review are based on a sustained record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service that, in the dispassionate professional judgment of the collegial review committee, continues to meet the standards for the awarding of tenure. The candidate's record must document conscientious execution of duties, including efforts to improve performance. Such a record shall be recognized by the departmental CRC with a rating of "Satisfactory" for the post-tenure review. To be recognized as "Exemplary" in any area, the candidate's record should meet the standards for sustained excellence in teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service that are required for promotion to professor. The CRC may evaluate a candidate's overall performance as "Exemplary" only if it is "Exemplary" in each of the three areas: teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service.

Approved by:

Director

Date

Dean

Date

Provost

Date

Appendix A

College of Fine and Performing Arts: Dean's Office Reference Document

Protocols: Appointment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion, Multiple Year Contract Renewal

The following statements are verification standards related to a review by peers and scholarship/creative activity benchmarks. The Boyer model has four differentia categories. It is up to the applicant to reasonably document a choice of Boyer category which a particular activity represents for scholarship and creative activity credit. In all cases outside peer review is required. Terminology examples may be found at the end of this document. The examples are not intended to be a complete list and are intended to be a guide. A faculty member is not expected to show evidence in each Boyer category, but only identify into which category a particular activity falls.

Scholarship and creative activities for which faculty teaching load is received are considered of lesser value and/or greater expectations assumed for personnel actions and must be clearly identified as such. In all cases 'peer review' is interpreted to mean outside the WCU community acknowledgement of the specificity and quality of the scholarship. In specific cases 'outside peer review' may be associated with a campus event as the College is an arts centered academy with professional works often times in exhibition or in review in a time based media. The validity of such reviews must be confirmed by the Dean. Outside reviews of on-campus creative activity may carry weight in reappointment, but may not be used as the chief peer review for tenure, promotion and renewal of multiyear contracts.

Peer Review

Level I: Appointment / 1-3 years Reappointment

- ❖ Validation by: Context should be related to primary teaching assignment
 - Articles in journals submitted to be reviewed by editor only
 - Performances self scheduled in a community and surrounding area
 - Adjudication in community and surrounding area for pay
 - Clinics, workshops, master classes for state wide meetings / regional arts organizations / regional professional societies
 - Exhibitions in regional venues by invitation
 - Performances in regional professional ensembles for pay
 - For hire work and commissions related to teaching assignment in region
 - Creative works performed, staged, etc. for regional venues
 - Regional acknowledgement of scholarship of application
 - Application of SOTL research in one's own courses – evidence of outcome
 - Application of Scholarship of Integration in workshop and/or one's own teaching – evidence of outcome
 - Evidence of Institutional and local grant success with application in one's own teaching or creative activity
 - Grant writing > \$5,000
 -

Level II: Reappointment 4-6 years, multiple year contract renewal

- ❖ Validation criteria focused on multiple peer reviews
 - Articles in journals submitted for review to multiple member review panels
 - Works in discipline recognized scholarly publications
 - Adjudication in regionally recognized venues (i.e. southeast)
 - Clinics, workshops, master class for regional (multi-state) venues
 - Exhibitions in recognized venues and facilities outside of local and immediate region
 - Performances in ensembles with a multi-state reputation and/or national call for member auditions
 - For hire work and commissions with demonstrated competition from a multi state context
 - Creative works performed, staged, etc. for documented venues of regional (multi-state) venues
 - Honors and awards and acknowledgement of scholarship of engagement with related publication
 - Peer reviewed scholarship of application by juried publication, workshop presentations, guest artist engagements

- Application of SOTL research in one's own teaching and peer reviewed through juried publication and/or invitational venues
- Application of scholarship of integration in one's own teaching, evidence of outcome peer reviewed through juried publication and/or invitational venues
- Successful grant writing with application in one's own teaching or creative activity > \$5,000.

Level III. Tenure - PTR

- ❖ Validation same as 4-6 years with continuous record

Level IV. Associate Professor

- ❖ Validation based on 4-6 year recommendation with emphasis on continuous record in one's area of faculty teaching assignment and the following
 - Systemic evidence of continuous record of achievement in identified field of expertise with application explicitly identified in one's teaching assignment
 - Clear evidence of professional reputation in a field of study (leadership in professional societies and organizations, and/or multi-state to national reputation in field of study, continuous for hire work with multi-state implications, commissions and exhibitions exhibiting regional competition)
 - Specific record in one or more of the four Boyer models of scholarship
 - Collegial verification of one's promise for sustained work in scholarship

Level V. Full Professor

- ❖ Acknowledged as a mentor for scholarship and or creative activity, teaching, and service in the academy and college
 - Includes expectations of all prior levels
 - **Continuous** record of achievement with national and/or international reputation in field of study
 - Office holder in defined national professional organization related to one's teaching field, elected by membership
 - Recognized as professional expert in field of study by participating as a peer reviewer
 - Exhibitions in a national recognized gallery for a particular field of inquiry or artistic endeavor
 - Performances, workshops, clinics, master-classes, adjudication, exhibitions, at annual or semi-annual professional meeting, organization sponsorship, and or web recognized competition
 - For hire work that brings national attention to the area of one's specialty
 - Collegial leadership in verification of work in scholarship and indicator for to this effect in the professional and teaching academy
 - National recognition in application of SOTL research to one's own teaching and leadership within the unit for this type of scholarship
 - National recognition for scholarship of integration as it applies to one or more of the following: teaching, community venues, economic development, and new art (must reflect synthesis across disciplines either in the arts or others)
 - National recognition for scholarship of application as it applies to one of more of the following: undergraduate research and creative activity, community venues, economic development

Glossary / Working Definitions

National/International Recognition

- ❖ Indicated by national organization, meetings, workshops, etc. in one's field of study or discipline
- ❖ Competitive as it applies to exhibition venues, performance organizations and/or sites
- ❖ Competitive as it applies to competitions
- ❖ Competitive as it applies to for hire work
- ❖ Competitive referenced calls and announcements for participation and submission at the national and international level

Regional

- ❖ Western most counties in NC for Level I
- ❖ Multi-state for levels II-V
- ❖ Publications, exhibitions, juried work, panel peer reviewed, in a recognized region of the US

For Hire

- ❖ Pay for services
- ❖ Level of competition depends on local, state, national, international calls for work
- ❖ Level of competition includes exhibition at reputation of facility or web placement as indicated from past participants and level of reputation (the applicant must verify this through collegial acknowledgment)

Faculty Load Scholarship/Creative Activity

- ❖ Individuals receiving faculty load for an activity that is creative in nature and listed in this area must acknowledge this condition
 - Director of Museum, Conductors, Exhibition Coordinators, Designers, etc.
- ❖ It carries lesser value in consideration for promotion to associate and full professor than similar work engaged in without load reduction

Peer Review

- ❖ Recognized only if outside the University
- ❖ Implies region acknowledgement to professional society panel review
- ❖ Implies of stature of for hire work – calls for applications, auditions, portfolios, etc
- ❖ Implies noted field of experts within one's professional field of inquiry

Continuous

- ❖ Acknowledged in annual AFE Summary Reviews
- ❖ Indicators of involvement over three years and promise for continued efforts in a specific field of inquiry or particular Boyer model
- ❖ Understood that fruition may be outside an academic year, but evidence of ongoing and progress clearly peer reviewed

Collegial Verification

- ❖ Acknowledge within the University Community
- ❖ Acknowledge within a society or professional organization

Examples

The following are indicators of specific types of inquiry within the Boyer model. Many inquiries include aspects of more than one Boyer category. One's intent in classification is primary for consideration and acceptance as valid scholarship and/or creative activity submitted for support of action.

Discovery

- ❖ New creative venues, commissions, research
 - Lesser value on reworking or use of already prepared or completed art in new venues
 - Displays, commissions for hire performances etc.
- ❖ Emphasis on new works

Integration

- ❖ Cross discipline in the arts or greater fields of study
- ❖ Clear indicators of the interrelationship of the disciplines and the application associated
- ❖ May include new works such as publications, exhibitions, etc.
- ❖ May include aspects of Discovery but emphasis must be clearly indicated by intent of activity

Application

- ❖ Use of one's expertise (field of scholarship in teaching specialty area) in application
- ❖ Must include intent or indication as to relationship of one's expertise to event, work, and/or subject of inquiry
- ❖ Benchmarking results a clear indicator of intent
- ❖ Peer review may included results, promise for further study, or acknowledgement in the profession, community, region, nation, world
- ❖ Longitudinal context, differentiated from isolated service events

SOTL

- ❖ Specific application of research into one's own teaching required and clearly stated as primary intent
- ❖ Thesis or statement of intent must be clearly indicated at the onset of study
- ❖ Expectations are that this may be a two to three year cycle and progress reports must include peer review
- ❖ Indicators must include participation in SOTL activities and may be leveled by region, state, multi-state, national and international

Appendix B.

College of Fine and Performing Arts: Dean's Office Reference Document Collegial Review: Expectations for High and Superior Performance

Category	High Level	Superior Level
<p data-bbox="183 417 557 617">Teaching</p> <p data-bbox="183 470 557 617">For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to teaching and learning is REQUIRED.</p> <p data-bbox="183 653 557 737">Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations.</p> <p data-bbox="183 772 557 919">Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one's teaching and learning through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.</p>	<p data-bbox="581 417 946 470">Five (> 40%) of the following should be met for this designation</p> <ol data-bbox="581 470 946 1656" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Taught a new course in the past three years 2. Received an average of 3 on the 4 point scale for all courses taught in the past three years 3. Developed a new on-line course in the past three years 4. Peer review of teaching meets or exceeds expectations in the past three years 5. Served as faculty mentor for the past three years 6. Sponsored three students at the national undergraduate research conference in the past six years 7. Student advisee accepted into a masters or doctorate at a recognized arts program 8. School, Department, College or University award for teaching 9. Cited for a service learning course by an outside agency 10. Teacher for three students who submitted creative work to competitions, in the past three years, whose work garnered high honors or recognition 11. Cited as high level in peer review committees and/or Directors or Department Heads Summary Statement for each of the last three years 12. Sponsored three guest artists working with assigned classes in the past three years 	<p data-bbox="971 417 1323 470">Eight (> 50%) of the following should be met for this designation</p> <p data-bbox="971 501 1323 596">Designators same as high level with the inclusion of the following.</p> <ol data-bbox="971 627 1323 953" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Served on University wide CRC within the past three years – if used may not use for service qualifier 2. Coulter Faculty Center Fellow in activity directly related to improving teaching 3. Received an average of 3.5 on the 4 point scale for all SAI for all courses taught in the past three years

Category	High Value	Superior
<p data-bbox="183 264 548 468">Scholarly and/or creative activity</p> <p data-bbox="183 527 529 590">For both high and superior level designations a continuous record of meritorious work and commitment to teaching and learning is REQUIRED.</p> <p data-bbox="183 611 529 674">Meritorious is defined as above the average, above meeting expectations.</p> <p data-bbox="183 695 529 758">Commitment is defined as a record of examination of one's teaching and learning through a normative examination in the annual AFE process.</p>	<p data-bbox="581 264 946 527">Four (> 40%) of the following should be met for this designation – a continuous record of achievement is mandatory but may be attained in one or combination of the following list– must identify Boyer model(s) applicable – must be peer review outside of WCU</p> <ol data-bbox="581 558 946 1764" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continuous record of activity off campus for the past three years 2. Regional (multi-state) reputation in field of inquiry or art in primary teaching area or as designated and approved by the School or Department through exhibitions, digital artifacts or web based media 3. Continuous record of activity on-campus for the past three years 4. Juried publications in regional and/or national journals related to one's teaching field 5. Publish book or teaching method in ones teaching area 6. Grant writing in excess of \$5,000 from outside University consideration 7. Presentation of workshops, master classes, exhibitions, etc. at state wide or regional meetings related to one's teaching area 8. Continuous record of significant for hire work in one's area of teaching assignment (commitment contributing to the regional, multi-state and national reputation of the home unit, college and University 9. Adjudication or critic in a regional (multi-state) arena 10. Commissions for art artifacts which bring significant image enhancement to one's program assignment 	<p data-bbox="971 264 1323 495">Six (> 60%) of the high value designators should be attained - a continuous record of achievement is mandatory but may be attained in one or combination of the following list– must identify Boyer model(s) applicable – must be peer review outside of WCU</p> <p data-bbox="971 527 1323 642">National reputation in one's primary teaching area required and defined by one or more of the following</p> <ol data-bbox="971 674 1323 1472" style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presentations, exhibitions, performances at recognized national meetings, workshops, festivals 2. For hire work in venues associated with a national regional context (Northeast – Mid-west, etc.) 3. Clients in for-hire work associated with six figure (\$) projects related to one's teaching area 4. Publication in national and/or international journals and/or national level visual arts critics and/or programs 5. Books, screenplays, plays, or manuscripts syndicated at national level or produced for national mediums, i.e.: Movies, TV, Internet, and etc. 6. Works of art reviewed by national peers, documented in regional and national publications

Service	High Level	Superior Level
<p>Service is defined as University service, service to the community, and service to the profession. Service must be distinctive from (while the activity may be related to one's scholarly work – service is intended as a not for profit and not for scholarly review activity – justification is predetermined) scholarly and/or creative activity as a qualifier for requested personnel actions.</p> <p>University service is more than committee work and often times in the arts is reflected through recruiting activities, arts applications in support of other university events or initiatives, and arts applications for communities outside of WCU.</p>	<p>A continuous record of service activities is expected with the expectations that initial appointments will be involved more in home unit activities and committees.</p> <p>Three (>40%) of the following should be documented to warrant high level of service to support personnel actions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued record of university or college wide committee and/or taskforce or other planning group for the immediate past three years 2. Record of two university wide service committee commitments that reflect monthly commitments in the past three years 3. Positive qualifiers by Director or Department Head and student survey reviewed advising for 10 or more students annually for the past three years 4. Annual performances or artistic support for other University events, excluding commencements annually 5. Recruiting off campus three or more times annually in each of the past three years 6. Holding professional office in state and/or region or national professional organization related to discipline 7. Use of arts expertise in communities outside of WCU – continuous annual activities 	<p>A continuous record of service is expected with emphasis on regional service (multi-state) in one's professional area required.</p> <p>Five (>70%) of the following should be documented to warrant superior level of service to support personnel actions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued record of university or college wide committee and/or taskforce or other planning group for the immediate past three years 2. Record of serving on two University wide committees that reflect monthly commitments in the past three years 3. Positive qualifiers by Director or Department Head and student survey reviewed advising for 10 or more students annually for the past three years 4. Annual performances or artistic support for other University events, excluding commencements annually 5. Recruiting off campus three or more times annually in each of the past three years 6. Holding professional office in state and/or region or national professional organization related to discipline 7. Use of arts expertise in communities outside of WCU – continuous annual record