

Roles, Scope, Criteria, Standards and Procedures

of the

School of Music

(Name of Department/School/College)

Effective Date: August 15, 2019

APPROVALS

SIGNATURE

DATE

Kristin Harney
Department Faculty

Kristin Harney
Chair, Primary Review Committee

9/5/19

Keith Kothman
Primary Administrative Reviewer

[Signature]
Department Head/Director

9/5/19

Intermediate Review Committee

Chair, Intermediate Review Committee

[Signature]
Intermediate Administrative Reviewer

Royce W. Smith
College Dean

9-6-19

Regina Gee
College Review Committee

[Signature]
Chair, College Review Committee

9/5/19

David T. Singer
University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

[Signature]
Chair, University Retention, Tenure and Promotion

8-15-19

Robert L. Mohan
Provost

[Signature]

8-15-19

Role and Scope Document for the School of Music

Article I. Role and Scope of Unit

The School of Music at Montana State University is committed to:

- developing and delivering programs which prepare students for careers in music.
- providing opportunities for all University students to actively continue their musical endeavors and to gain new musical insights and experiences.
- creating a stimulating cultural environment through the sponsorship of musical events for the enrichment and enjoyment of all students, faculty, and the public.
- supporting faculty excellence in teaching, scholarship, outreach and engagement, and integration.

The School offers academic programs in:

Bachelor of Music Education, School Music (K-12 Broadfield)
Bachelor of Arts in Music Technology
Bachelor of Arts in Music
Music Minor (non-teaching)

Faculty in the SoM are involved in areas of scholarship appropriate to their disciplines, which can include:

- performance
- conducting
- the authoring of articles, book chapters, monographs, books, and other similar products
- authoring of textbooks or other educational materials
- composition
- arranging
- marching band drill design
- software design
- sound engineering
- other activities that develop through new technologies, genres, and the expanding nature of the arts.

The doctoral degree is generally considered the terminal degree needed for a tenured or tenure-track positions in music. The doctoral degree in music can take a variety of forms, including but not limited to the Ph.D., the D.M.A., the D.M., and the D.A. Recognition of the appropriate terminal degree should be made in the letter of hire. Candidates that are very close to completion of the terminal degree can be hired with the stipulation that they finish their terminal degree. The letter of hire should stipulate the deadline for completion—either by the retention review or tenure review. The completion, or progress towards the completion, of the dissertation or final creative project required for graduation will not be considered a scholarly achievement for retention and tenure purposes. Peer-reviewed scholarly activities that derive from and follow the completion of the dissertation or final creative project can be considered for retention, tenure, and/or promotion where appropriate.

Faculty in the areas of music performance, conducting, and composition may be hired with only a master's degree if they possess a significant amount of professional experience that is deemed equivalent to the accomplishments of a faculty candidate with a doctoral degree. The letter of hire should stipulate that such equivalent experience has been achieved before the time of hire.

The master's degree is the terminal degree for music technology faculty whose primary area of scholarship is recording. We know of no doctoral programs that exist in sound recording or recording engineering.

Peer review of scholarship is an essential part of the retention, tenure, and promotion process. Many activities of music scholarship will conform to normal understandings of peer review—scholarship submitted to one or more people in the discipline who decide the scholarship's suitability for publication or presentation. In music, however, peer review of scholarship, particularly in the area of creative activity, can take different forms. An instance of scholarship is considered to be peer reviewed any time that someone else besides the performer controls access to the presentation of the scholarship.

Mission Statement

The School of Music at Montana State University offers dynamic programs in music, music technology, and music education, preparing our students for various professions in music, music education and life-long musical enhancement.

Inspired by the belief that music is central to human ways of life, the SoM affirms the University's mission to serve the people and communities of Montana by providing a musically enriched environment.

The SoM is committed to contributing to the musical world through performance, scholarship, composition, and leadership, and nurturing the musical expression, understanding, discovery, and creativity of its students and faculty.

Article II. Appointment and Advancement of Research Faculty

Not applicable

Article III. Annual Review Process

The Annual Review process is governed by the Faculty Handbook, available on the MSU Policies and Procedures website, <http://www.montana.edu/policy>.

Tenure-track and tenured faculty must enter their teaching, scholarship, and service activities into Activity Insight. Faculty must supply student evaluations of teaching as part of the review, which can be uploaded to Activity Insight. Faculty must also supply a personal narrative (uploaded to Activity Insight) outlining their achievements for the year, and they must enter goals in teaching, scholarship and service directly into Activity Insight.

Faculty are evaluated by the Director of the School of Music, who completes the appropriate form with numerical and explanatory feedback. Faculty members are provided with a copy of the review and ratings.

Article IV. Primary Review Committee and Administrator

Section 4.01 Primary Review Committee-Composition and Appointment

- A. Membership. The Primary Review Committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members from the School of Music. Two of the faculty members will serve two-year terms, and the other faculty member will serve a one-year term. The School of Music is committed to diversity and inclusion with respect to committee representation.

At least two of the Primary Review Committee's membership will be comprised of faculty at the rank of professor. If this requirement cannot be met, the Primary Review Committee and Primary Review Administrator will consult with the chair of the University Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee to allow substitutions deemed appropriate.

No faculty member may serve on the committee if they are undergoing review. Any current committee member undergoing review must vacate committee membership during the consideration of their review, or the review of someone with whom they have a conflict of interest. A replacement from the eligible music faculty will be chosen according to normal election procedures.

- B. Election. The members of the committee are elected by a majority vote of the tenure-track and tenured faculty in the School of Music. Elections for the committee will be held each January, with committee member terms coinciding with the academic year. One of the two-year members will be elected in even years, the other in odd years.
- C. Chair. The Chair of the Primary Review Committee will be the member serving the second year of a two-year term.

Section 4.02 Primary Review Administrator

The Director of the School of Music is the Primary Review Administrator

Section 4.03 Identification of responsible entities

- (a) The Review Administrator establishes the Primary Review Committee by facilitating the election of the members as described.
- (b) The Review Administrator, working in consultation with the Review Committee, selects external reviewers and solicits review letters.
- (c) The Review Committee selects and solicits Internal Reviews.
- (d) Assuring the following materials are included in the Dossier:
- (i) The Review Administrator is responsible for including internal and external reviewer letters of solicitation, letters from the reviewers and, in the case of external reviewers, a short bio-sketch or CV of the reviewer should be included in the Dossier.

- (ii) The Review Administrator ensures that the applicable Role and Scope Document is included in the Dossier.
 - (iii) The Review Administrator ensures that the letter of hire, any Percentages of Effort changes, all annual reviews, and all Evaluation Letters from prior retention, tenure, and promotion reviews at MSU are included in the Dossier.
 - (iv) The Business Operations Manager (staff administrator) ensures that the candidate's teaching evaluations from the review period are included. If the evaluations are not in electronic format, the unit will provide evaluation summaries. Upon request by review committees and review administrators, the unit will provide access to the original evaluations to review committees and administrators during the review.
- (e) The Business Operations Manager maintains all copies of all review committee Evaluation Letters and internal, (if applicable), and external review letters after the review.

Section 4.04 Next Review Level

The College of Arts and Architecture Promotion and Tenure Committee

Article V. Intermediate Review Committee and Administrator

Section 5.01 Intermediate Review Committee – Composition and Appointment

The College of Arts and Architecture Promotion and Tenure Committee is the Intermediate Review Committee. It's composition and appointment is determined by policies and procedures in the CAA's Role and Scope document.

Section 5.02 Intermediate Review Administrator

The Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture

Section 5.03 Level of Review following Intermediate Review Administrator

The University Retention Promotion and Tenure Committee follows the review by the Dean of the CAA.

Article VI. Review Materials

Section 6.01 Materials submitted by Candidate

Candidates shall submit to the School of Music Director a dossier that lists all relevant teaching, scholarship, and service activities and includes the articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence that, in their judgment, represents their best efforts to meet the applicable standards for the current review.

The dossier is maintained by the university, with materials uploaded by the Business Operations Manager of the School of Music. The faculty member will organize their materials according to the

structure provided by the university and notated in the following list. The Business Operations Manager in the School of Music will provide certain materials as indicated.

The candidate will provide:

1. The university-approved *Cover Sheet* obtained from the Provost's office website.
2. [CurriculumVitae] A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae that provides a detailed listing of teaching, scholarship, and service activities.
3. [PersonalStatement] A Personal Statement organized according to School of Music standards for retention, tenure, or promotion as appropriate, described in Articles XIII – XI, appropriate to the level of review. The Personal Statement should include a self-evaluation of how those standards are met.
4. [Teaching] A self-evaluation of teaching in the form of a teaching narrative, and all materials needed to conduct an in-depth assessment of teaching. Required materials are listed in *Appendix B: Materials to Include in Dossier Related to the In-Depth Assessment of Teaching*.
5. [Scholarship] A list and self-evaluation of scholarship in the form of a scholarship narrative, along with documentation in support of achievements in scholarship.
6. [Integration] A list and self-evaluation of integration in the form of an integration narrative, along with documentation in support of achievements in integration.
7. [Service] A list and self-evaluation of service in the form of a service narrative, along with any documentation that the candidate feels is necessary or explanatory.
8. [ProfessionalDevelopment] [Optional] A narrative and/or listing of professional development activities.
9. [Appendix] Any additional materials the candidate feels are important to include, but do not fall under specific folders as outlined above. The appendix can also include a document that provides links to documentation in support of teaching, scholarship, service, and integration.

Candidates for either tenure or promotion to full professor are required to submit materials for external peer review. These materials must include:

1. A comprehensive Curriculum Vitae with teaching, scholarship, and service activities of the candidate.
2. A personal narrative that describes the candidate's area(s) of scholarship and provides context to the external reviewers regarding work examples submitted.
3. Selected articles, publications, creative endeavors, or other evidence from the review period that, in the candidate's judgment, best represent their Scholarship.

Section 6.02 Documentation of Collaborative Scholarly Contributions

The School of Music recognizes that collaboration occurs regularly in scholarly activities, including collaborative performances, collaborative composition, the writing of articles, and in all manner of interdisciplinary works. In general, MSU expects candidates to establish independent lines of scholarship. For that reason, faculty under review should take special care to document and delineate their contributions to collaborative scholarly activities. The School of Music recognizes that a candidate's regular participation in a group (such as a chamber music ensemble, a collaborative creative entity, or co-author) can still be considered independent scholarship.

Performers should consider their relative role within a group (leader, equal partner, subordinate), and can take into account the amount of preparation time needed as one indicator of the importance of their work.

Composers who collaborate should clearly indicate what level of responsibility they had for the overall work.

Authors should indicate what proportion or specific aspects of research that they undertook.

Section 6.03 Peer Review Solicitation Procedure

External peer review appropriate to the specific discipline(s) of the candidate is required for candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. External review letters must include a review of the candidate's scholarship. External reviewers will also provide a short CV and/or bio-sketch that will be provided to all review committees and review administrators, along with their actual review.

A total of four (4) external review letters are required. The candidate may supply names of potential external evaluators, but at least half of the review letters must be from persons other than those suggested by the candidate. The candidate submits names of potential external evaluators to the Director of the School of Music, who will, in consultation with the chair of the SoM Promotion and Tenure Committee, solicit letters from reviewers who are respected authorities in their field, with comparable fields of scholarship activity to the candidate, and who are at comparable institutions. The candidate shall not personally solicit letters of support from external evaluators. These materials shall become part of the faculty member's personnel file and uploaded to the online dossier.

For reviews of scholarship, the Director of the School of Music shall furnish external reviewers with information relevant to the review:

1. Background material about the candidate: Curriculum Vitae and a copy of candidate's principle duties and responsibilities.
2. Background material about the department: a copy of departmental Role and Scope, Standards and Criteria, and a general overview of the School of Music (majors offered, number of majors, and other information relevant to the review).
3. Evaluation material: A copy of the Scholarship section of the candidate's materials, including relevant attachments

Internal peer reviews of the candidate's teaching shall take place during the review period. The School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee will assign tenured faculty appropriate to the discipline of the candidate, and not serving on the SoM P&T Committee during the academic year of review, to conduct the reviews.

Article VII. Applicable Role and Scope Documents

Section 7.01 Retention Review – Candidates for retention are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position.

Section 7.02 Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Review – Candidates for tenure are reviewed under the standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect on the first day of employment in a tenurable position. Candidates may select a more recent, approved Role and Scope Document by notifying the primary review committee.

Section 7.03 Promotion to Professor Review – The faculty member will be reviewed using standards and indicators in the Role and Scope Documents in effect two (2) years prior to the deadline for notification of intent to apply for promotion.

Article VIII. Retention Reviews

Section 8.01 Timing of Retention Review.

Faculty are reviewed for retention in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 8.02 University Standard.

The standards for the retention of probationary faculty members are:

- (a) effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) satisfactory progress towards meeting the standards for tenure by the candidate's tenure review year.

Section 8.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

TEACHING

The SoM uses the following performance indicators for teaching effectiveness, weighted from most important to least important. These indicators are:

- A. the relevance, breadth, and quality of course content, including curricular development and innovation;
- B. peer assessment of teaching performance;
- C. if applicable, advising quality, including communication of accurate information, assistance with student goal setting, appropriate and timely referral of students, and availability to students;
- D. if applicable, quality of supervision of student teaching, including site visitation, coordination with on-site supervisor, and record-keeping;
- E. student assessment of teaching performance.

SCHOLARSHIP

A. Performance

For performance activities to be considered as scholarship, the activity must be peer reviewed (as defined by SoM standards in Article I) by peers in the academic and/or artistic communities.

Indicator weighting is inter-related; less significance in any one indicator can be offset by greater significance in other indicators.

1. awards, grants, competitions, prizes
2. type of performance (solo, chamber music, orchestral principal, orchestral section, recording)
3. role and level of responsibility of the performer
4. repertoire programmed (importance, level of difficulty, etc.)
5. significance of the performance occasion (international, national, regional, as determined by relation to MSU, its audience, and its participants)
6. amount of new preparation involved
7. other evidence of quality explicitly presented by the faculty member and reviewed by the committee

B. Conducting

For conducting activities to be considered as scholarship, the activity must be peer reviewed (as defined by SoM standards in Article I), or available for review by peers in the academic and/or artistic communities.

Indicator weighting is inter-related; less significance in any one indicator can be offset by greater significance in other indicators.

The SoM recognizes that conductors have more limited national and international opportunities than other faculty in the School. The SoM lacks a performance major or Bachelor of Music degree, and it relies heavily on non-music majors for ensemble participation. These realities limit a conductor's ability to successfully secure individual engagements at the national and international levels. Further, the large expense associated with ensemble touring limits a conductor's ability to pursue activities from the regional level upward with their respective groups. For these reasons, the scope of activities is balanced with an assessment of the quality of performance relative to the resources at hand.

In addition, the following indicators are used to assess conducting activity.

1. awards, grants, competitions, prizes
2. role and responsibility of conductor
3. performance level of ensemble
4. repertoire programmed (importance, level of difficulty, etc.)
5. significance of the performance occasion (international, national, regional, as determined by relation to MSU, its audience, and its participants)
6. amount of new preparation involved

7. other evidence of quality explicitly presented by the faculty member and reviewed by the committee

C. Research

For research activities to be considered as scholarship, the activity must be peer reviewed (as defined by SoM standards in Article I).

Indicator weighting is inter-related; less significance in any one indicator can be offset by greater significance in other indicators.

1. awards, grants, competitions, prizes
2. format (book, chapter, article, presentation, etc.)
3. level of responsibility of authorship
4. significance of publication, audience, or occasion
5. other evidence of quality explicitly presented by the faculty member and reviewed by the committee

D. Composition (including arranging and marching band drill design)

For composition activities to be considered as scholarship, the activity must be peer reviewed (as defined by SoM standards in Article I) by peers in the academic and/or artistic communities.

Indicator weighting is inter-related; less significance in any one indicator can be offset by greater significance in other indicators.

1. awards, commissions, grants, jury selections, competitions
2. significance and number of performances
3. publication (lack of publication of musical scores is not to be considered negatively, given the understanding that composers are encouraged to self-publish printed scores by music rights organizations, that many commercial publishers do not market new music well, and that publishers often do not distribute digital materials efficiently)
4. other evidence of quality explicitly presented by the faculty member and reviewed by the committee

E. Music Technology (software design and sound engineering)

For music technology activities to be considered as scholarship, the activity must be peer reviewed (as defined by SoM standards in Article I) by peers in the academic and/or artistic communities.

Indicator weighting is inter-related; less significance in any one indicator can be offset by greater significance in other indicators.

1. awards, grants, competitions, prizes
2. release of recordings, software, and/or hardware
3. awards, commissions, grants, jury selection, competitions, invitations
4. significance of the occasion and level of responsibility

5. other evidence of quality explicitly presented by the faculty member and reviewed by the committee

SERVICE/OUTREACH

The SoM uses the following indicators to evaluate service to the profession, the university, and the public.

- A. [Profession] The role of the faculty member in the organization or activity (officer, board member, editor, manager, adjudicator, etc).
- B. [Profession] The scope of the organization (international, national, regional, local).
- C. [University] The role of the faculty member in service to the university (committee chair, committee member, student organization mentor, university activity, student recruitment).
- D. [University] The scope of the service performed (university, college, school).
- E. [Public] The role of the faculty member in activities designed to serve the public good, such as public performances, workshops, presentations, and other activities that provide visibility for the School of Music, MSU, and the profession.

INTEGRATION

The SoM recognizes a wide range of activities that combine two or all of the areas of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service. The most common aspect of integration for the School involves our regular public performances on the MSU campus, in Bozeman, and in the surrounding region. The following list is intended to provide examples, but it is not to be considered exhaustive or exclusive considering the wide range of activities that take place in the School.

- A. presenting any concert for the public on campus, in Bozeman, and in the surrounding region (Scholarship/Service)
- B. presenting (specifically) ensemble concerts anywhere (Teaching/Scholarship), or on campus/locally/regionally (Teaching/Scholarship/Service)
- C. teaching repertoire to students that you have yourself performed (Teaching/Scholarship)
- D. teaching computer music and/or music technology techniques and procedures that you use in your own creative activity/scholarship (Teaching/Scholarship)
- E. incorporating findings from your own research into classroom teaching (Teaching/Scholarship)
- F. teaching research methods and techniques in classes that result in publicly presented research by students (Teaching/Scholarship/Service)
- G. teaching composition and related methods and techniques in classes that result in publicly performed works by students (Teaching/Scholarship/Service)
- H. presenting talks about your creative work or research work to community audiences (Scholarship/Service)

Section 8.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

TEACHING

Qualitative standards for teaching effectiveness vary by mode/type of teaching.

1. Classroom teaching will be judged effective if:
 - a. course content reflects current research, literature, and understanding; is relevant to the SoM role and scope; and, when applicable, fulfills state accreditation requirements; and
 - b. instruction encourages students' development of performance, critical thinking, problem solving, and communication skills as well as a professional knowledge base; and
 - c. a variety of instructional strategies are used to foster inquiry and positive interaction in the classroom; and
 - d. there are consistently supportive peer and student course evaluations.

2. Studio teaching will be judged effective if:
 - a. there is evidence of recruitment and retention to ensure a sufficient number of students in the studio to serve ensemble and other SoM needs; and
 - b. there is student progress in the studio as evidenced by juries, recitals, performance seminar, ensemble performance, and peer review; and
 - c. the performance quality of the studio is sufficient to serve SoM and ensemble needs; and
 - d. there are consistently supportive course evaluations.

3. Ensemble teaching will be judged effective if:
 - a. the performance quality of the ensemble is strong relative to the type of group (auditioned, university, or studio); and
 - b. instruction encourages individual student progress as evidenced by ensemble performance; and
 - c. the selection of repertoire provides sufficient musical variety, encourages the development of performance skills, and has musical merit; and
 - d. there is evidence of recruitment and retention to maintain a viable ensemble; and
 - e. there are consistently supportive course evaluations.

4. Advising will be judged effective if:
 - a. Academic advising will be assigned to option heads and their assistants. Tenure-track faculty should engage in professional advising of students in their studio or independent instruction. Faculty will provide a description of advising duties as evidence of effectiveness in this area and may be addressed in the faculty members' annual reviews.

Quantitative standards for teaching effectiveness will be established through peer and student assessments of teaching.

1. Peer assessments of teaching should be positive, and with quantitative scores at 70% or above using MSU/SoM approved review forms.
2. Since research shows the existence of bias in student evaluations of teaching (by gender of professor, time of day of class meeting, etc.), no specific quantitative number is appropriate for student evaluations. Student evaluations will be looked at in conjunction with peer evaluations, possible signs of bias, and will be part of the qualitative assessment of teaching success.

SCHOLARSHIP

Individual faculty are expected, by university standards, to be effective in at least one area of

scholarship for retention. This sub-section outlines the expectations for individual areas of scholarship detailed in Section 8.03. The SoM recognizes that music faculty may pursue combined areas of scholarship relative to their appointment and professional interests. For those faculty pursuing multiple areas of scholarship, the responsibility falls on them to provide a narrative that explains how their combined areas of scholarship meet the standards of effectiveness for retention.

Performance

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of performances, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the performance situation. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the performance situation, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other performers/conductors that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. Other performers/conductors and/or groups that you share the performance event with
 - c. Size of audience
 - d. Geographic reach of audience
2. A record of new preparations of and performances of artistically important and varied repertoire.
3. A variety of performance occasions, including the expectation that activities will take place both locally as part of the SoM activities and activities at the regional (and above) levels.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I. The minimum quantity is one instance, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a positive evaluation.

Conducting

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of conducting, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the performance situation. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the performance situation, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other performers/conductors that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. Other performers/conductors and/or groups that you share the performance event with
 - c. Size of audience
 - d. Geographic reach of audience

2. A record of new preparations of and performances of artistically important and varied repertoire.
3. A variety of performance occasions, including the expectation that activities will take place both locally as part of the SoM activities and activities at the regional (and above) levels.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I. The minimum quantity is one instance, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a positive evaluation.

Research

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of the work, based on acceptances, significance of the invitations, and grants received. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the publication or the presenting event, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other researchers whose work appears in the publication or event during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. The acceptance rate and impact of the journal, if available
 - c. Size of audience
 - d. Geographic reach of audience
2. The consistency of completed work and submission for publication or presentation.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have publications and/or presentations that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I. The minimum quantity is one instance, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a positive evaluation.

Composition

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of composition, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the public performances, publication (print or recording), commissions, and significant attributes of the occasion for performances. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the performance situation, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:

- a. Other composers that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. Other performers/conductors that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - c. Other composers that you share the performance event with
 - d. Size of audience
 - e. Geographic reach of audience
2. The consistency of completed work and submission for publication or presentation/performance.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances, exhibitions, and/or publications that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I. The minimum quantity is one instance, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a positive evaluation.

Music Technology

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of the product, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the release or events. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the product, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Collaborators (performers, composers, engineers, technologists)
 - b. Other performers, etc., appearing at the same venue in the current year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - c. Other performers, etc., appearing on the same label in the current year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - d. Importance of the company releasing the product through documentation of other important releases
 - e. Size and/or geographic reach of audience
2. The consistency of completed work and submission for publication, release, and/or performance.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances, exhibitions, and/or publications that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I. The minimum quantity is one instance, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a positive evaluation.

SERVICE/OUTREACH

Qualitative Standards

1. The degree to which the service advances the school, university, profession, and/or community. Under this standard, service goes beyond the support of common or regular activities of the institution/organization/public and provides *new* opportunities and advancements for the institution/organization/public.
2. The degree to which the service supports the school, university, and/or the profession. The level of support can be derived from the importance of the service activity and the scope of the activity.

Quantitative Standards

1. Providing at least one institutional service activity during the review period, *if available*. The SoM realizes that it does not have a large committee structure, and that pre-tenure faculty are limited in what committees they can serve on. Not all pre-tenure faculty will have institutional service available to them, but all should be available to serve if asked.
2. For candidates where performance and/or conducting are the primary scholarship activities, providing at least one outreach service to the public through performance during the review period.
3. For candidates where performance and/or conducting is not the primary area of scholarship, providing at least one outreach service to the public through any means.

INTEGRATION

Qualitative Standards

1. The degree to which the integration activity advances any of the individual areas (teaching, scholarship, service) involved, taking into consideration the scope of the activity (audience reached) and the success of the activity as measured by peer review, student success, faculty advancement, and other measures as appropriate.

Quantitative Standards

1. The university requires the integration of no less than two areas during the review period. The SoM requires documentation of at least one example of such integration.

Section 8.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

TEACHING

Evidence of performance indicators for teaching is thoroughly outlined in Section 6.01, Materials to be Submitted by Candidate. It is reprinted here:

1. A list of all assigned courses for each semester under review, including course numbers, course titles, number of contact hours, number of credit hours, and enrollments. Faculty with applied music (studio) assignments shall also indicate the number of music majors enrolled.
2. A detailed list of all other teaching activities and contributions to the instructional program.
3. Course evaluation forms, including copies of evaluation summaries and evaluation forms. The Knapp form or online forms shall be used unless another instrument is required by another department for courses taught under that department's rubric.

4. A selection of student work from courses taught. The selection of student work is not expected to represent every class taught during the review period.
5. [Optional] Documentation of student achievement.
6. The Director's written assessments of any observed teaching and subsequent responses for the current review period, assembled in accordance with the Annual Review process.
7. For faculty that provide academic advising to students, specify the duties or advising activities, indicating the average number of advisees per semester.
8. [Optional] A description of professional development related to instructional activities, which give evidence of maintaining currency in the field, developing new skills, or supporting the development of the faculty member as a professional.
9. [If applicable] Additional information relevant to instruction (e.g., unique course development, experimental course design, innovative course materials and methodology, media).
10. Unsolicited letters regarding teaching activities.

SCHOLARSHIP

Performance

1. List of all performances, including dates, repertoire, and significance of the performance occasions. Organize this list by the scope of impact (International, national, regional, local).
2. Compile a set of performances that is representative of the best efforts of the candidate to advance the discipline or profession. For each performance in this set, indicate the type of performance, role and level of responsibility of performer, repertoire programmed, significance of the performance occasion, whether new preparation was involved, and other evidence of the quality of performance.
3. For this set of performances, include copies of programs, letters of invitation, recording of representative material, and other documentary evidence.

Conducting

1. For the review period, list all performances, including ensembles, dates, and repertoire, and significance of the performance occasions. Organize this list by the scope of impact (international, national, regional, local).
2. Compile a set of performances from the review period that is representative of the best efforts of the candidate to advance the discipline or profession. For each performance in this set, indicate the ensemble, repertoire, role and level of responsibility of the conductor, significance of the performance occasion, whether new preparation was involved, and other evidence of the quality of conducting.
3. For this set of performances, include copies of programs, letters of invitation, recording of representative material, and other documentary evidence.

Research

1. For the review period, list all books, papers, publications, and presentations completed. Organize this list by the scope of impact (international, national, regional, local).
2. Compile a set of material from the review period that is representative of the best efforts of the candidate to advance the discipline or profession. For each item in this set,

- indicate the format (book, chapter, article, presentation), type of research (discovery, synthesis, application), significance of publication, audience, or occasion, and other evidence of the quality of scholarship.
3. For this set of material, include copies of publications, invitations, and other documentary evidence.

Composition

1. For the review period, list all compositions/arrangements completed, performances, recordings, and publications. Organize this list by the scope of impact (international, national, regional, local).
2. Compile a set of compositions/arrangements from the review period that is representative of the best efforts of the candidate to advance the discipline or profession. For each item in this set, indicate the format (publication, recording, performance), significance of the performances, and other evidence of the quality of composition.
3. For this set of material, include copies of publications, recordings, programs, invitations, and other documentary evidence.

Music Technology

1. For the review period, list all projects completed. Organize this list by the scope of impact (international, national, regional, local).
2. Compile a set of materials from the review period that represents the best efforts of the candidate to advance the discipline or profession. For each item in this set, indicate the format (publication, recording, performance), significance of the activity, and other evidence of the quality of sound engineering.
3. For this set of material, include copies of recordings, software, hardware descriptions, details of responsibility with respect to media and multimedia events, programs, invitations, and other documentary evidence.

SERVICE/OUTREACH

For the review period, list all service activity. Organize this list by the scope of impact (international, national, regional, local).

INTEGRATION

For the review period, list all integration activity, noting the areas of integration for each activity. It is understood that this list will most likely include the re-listing of activities documented in other areas of the dossier.

Section 8.06 Status of Scholarly Products

According to the Faculty Handbook, scholarly activities that have been accepted for publication, performance, or presentation must be listed in the faculty candidate's CV. These activities should be clearly listed as accepted but in progress towards publication/performance/presentation.

Given that there is a short time from arrival on campus to the retention review, and that the purpose of the retention review is to assess progress towards achieving the standards for tenure

and promotion, the School of Music will give consideration to scholarly activities that are *in progress* as long as the activities have successfully passed the peer-review process.

The candidate must provide documentation showing the activity has successfully passed peer review (letter of acceptance for performance/publication/etc.) as defined in Article I and providing an expected date for the activity to be completed.

As stated in Article I, faculty who are hired with the stipulation that they must finish their terminal degree cannot use the completion, or progress towards completion, of the dissertation, thesis, or final creative project as a scholarly achievement for retention, tenure, and promotion purposes.

Article IX. Tenure Review

Section 9.01 Timing of Tenure Review

Faculty are normally reviewed for tenure in the academic year specified in their Letter of Hire, unless extended under the Extending Tenure Review Period policy.

Section 9.02 University Standard

The University standards for the award of tenure are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- (b) integration of no less than two of the following during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) accomplishment in scholarship.

Section 9.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

TEACHING

In addition to the Performance Indicators and weighting used for retention, Section 8.03, TEACHING (p. 8), the SoM requires a continued pattern of success in those indicators.

SCHOLARSHIP

Performance Indicators and weighting for accomplishment in scholarship are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03.

SERVICE/OUTREACH

In addition to the Performance Indicators and weighting used for retention, Section 8.03, SERVICE/OUTREACH, the SoM requires a continued pattern of success in those indicators.

INTEGRATION

Performance Indicators and weighting for integration are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, INTEGRATION.

Section 9.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

TEACHING

Qualitative standards for sustained teaching effectiveness vary by mode/type of teaching.

A. Classroom teaching will be judged to have achieved sustained effectiveness if:

1. all of the criteria for Effectiveness in classroom teaching are met; and
2. faculty demonstrate a continued pattern of success in the criteria for Effectiveness in classroom teaching, which can be expressed as the continual meeting or exceeding these expressed expectations, or a progression of success that culminates in a repeated meeting or exceeding of these expectations.

B. Studio teaching will be judged to have achieved sustained effectiveness if:

1. all of the criteria for Effectiveness in studio teaching are met; and
2. faculty demonstrate a continued pattern of success in the criteria for Effectiveness in classroom teaching, which can be expressed as the continual meeting or exceeding these expressed expectations, or a progression of success that culminates in a repeated meeting or exceeding of these expectations.

C. Ensemble teaching will be judged to have achieved sustained if:

1. all of the criteria for Effectiveness in ensemble teaching are met; and
2. faculty demonstrate a continued pattern of success in the criteria for Effectiveness in ensemble teaching, which can be expressed as the continual meeting or exceeding these expressed expectations, or a progression of success that culminates in a repeated meeting or exceeding of these expectations.

Quantitative standards for teaching effectiveness will be established through peer and student assessments of teaching.

1. Peer assessments of teaching should be consistently positive, and with quantitative scores at 3.5 or above using approved SoM review forms. These forms will be developed and approved by SoM faculty (tenured and tenure-track). Approved forms will be posted in the faculty resources section of the SoM website.
2. Since research shows the existence of bias in student evaluations of teaching (by gender of professor, time of day of class meeting, etc.), no specific quantitative number is appropriate for student evaluations. Student evaluations will be looked at in conjunction with peer evaluations, possible signs of bias, and will be part of the qualitative assessment of teaching success.

SCHOLARSHIP

Individual faculty are expected, by university standards, to be accomplished in at least one area of scholarship for tenure. This sub-section outlines the expectations for individual areas of scholarship detailed in Section 8.03. The SoM recognizes that music faculty may pursue combined areas of scholarship relative to their appointment and professional interests. For those faculty pursuing multiple areas of scholarship, the responsibility falls on them to provide a narrative that explains how their combined areas of scholarship meet the standards of accomplishment in scholarship for tenure.

Performance

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of performances, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the performance situation. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the performance situation, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other performers/conductors that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. Other performers/conductors and/or groups that you share the performance event with
 - c. Size of audience
 - d. Geographic reach of audience
- D. A record of new preparations of and performances of artistically important and varied repertoire.
- E. A variety of performance occasions, including the expectation that activities will take place both locally as part of the SoM activities and activities at the national (or above) level.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I, preferably at the national level (or above). The minimum quantity is two instances since the start of tenure-track service at MSU, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a successful evaluation of accomplishment.

Conducting

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of conducting, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the performance situation. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the performance situation, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other performers/conductors that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. Other performers/conductors and/or groups that you share the performance event with
 - c. Size of audience
 - d. Geographic reach of audience
2. A record of new preparations of and performances of artistically important and varied repertoire.
3. A variety of performance occasions, including the expectation that activities will take place both locally as part of the SoM activities and activities at the national (or above) level.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I, preferably at the national level (or above). The minimum quantity is two instances since the start of tenure-track service at MSU, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a successful evaluation of accomplishment.

Research

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of the work, based on acceptances, format of the work, significance of the invitations, and grants received. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the publication or the presenting event, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other researchers whose work appears in the publication or event during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. The acceptance rate and impact of the journal, if available
 - c. Size of audience
 - d. Geographic reach of audience
2. The consistency of completed work and submission for publication or presentation.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have publications/presentations that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I, preferably at the national level (or above). The minimum quantity is two instances since the start of tenure-track service at MSU, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a successful evaluation of accomplishment.

Composition

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of composition, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the public performances, publication (print or recording), commissions, and significant attributes of the occasion for performances. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the performance situation, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Other composers that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - b. Other performers/conductors that appear at the venue/concert series during the same year, recent years, or upcoming years

- c. Other composers that you share the performance event with
 - d. Size of audience
 - e. Geographic reach of audience
2. The consistency of completed work and submission for publication or presentation/performance.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances/publications that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I, preferably at the national level (or above). The minimum quantity is two instances since the start of tenure-track service at MSU, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a successful evaluation of accomplishment.

Music Technology

Qualitative Standards

1. Recognition for the quality of the product, through peer review and through the evaluation of the significance of the release or events. It is up to the faculty member to explain the significance of the product, which will be reviewed by the School committee and director. The following factors, although not an exclusive list, can help to show significance:
 - a. Collaborators (performers, composers, engineers, technologists)
 - b. Other performers, etc., appearing at the same venue in the current year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - c. Other performers, etc., appearing on the same label in the current year, recent years, or upcoming years
 - d. Importance of the company releasing the product through documentation of other important releases
 - e. Size and/or geographic reach of audience
2. The consistency of completed work and submission for publication, release, and/or performance.

Quantitative Standards

1. The faculty member must have performances, exhibitions, and/or publications that take place through a peer-reviewed process, as defined in Article I, preferably at the national level (or above). The minimum quantity is two instances since the start of tenure-track service at MSU, but any quantitative number will be judged according to the qualitative standards listed above. Meeting this minimum number does not guarantee a successful evaluation of accomplishment.

SERVICE/OUTREACH

Qualitative Standards

1. all of the criteria for Effectiveness in service are met; and
2. faculty demonstrate a continued pattern of success in the criteria for service, which can

be expressed as the continual meeting or exceeding these expressed expectations, or a progression of success that culminates in a repeated meeting or exceeding of these expectations.

Quantitative Standards

1. Providing at least two institutional service activities during the review period, *if available*. The SoM realizes that it does not have a large committee structure, and that pre-tenure faculty are limited in what committees they can serve on. Not all pre-tenure faculty will have institutional service available to them, but all should be available to serve if asked.
2. For candidates where performance and/or conducting are the primary scholarship activities, providing at least two outreach service activities to the public through performance during the review period.
3. For candidates where performance and/or conducting is not the primary area of scholarship, providing at least two outreach services to the public through any means.

INTEGRATION

Qualitative Standards

The degree to which the integration activity advances any of the individual areas (teaching, scholarship, service) involved, taking into consideration the scope of the activity (audience reached) and the success of the activity as measured by peer review, student success, faculty advancement, and other measures as appropriate.

Quantitative Standards

The university requires the integration of no less than two areas during the review period. The SoM requires that happen at least two times.

Section 9.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

Evidence of performance indicators in all areas (teaching, scholarship, service, integration) are the same as listed in Section 8.05.

Article X. Promotion to Rank of Associate Professor

Section 10.01 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are the standards for the award of tenure. Appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor does not demonstrate, in and of itself, that standards for tenure have been met.

Article XI. Promotion to Rank of Professor

Section 11.01 Timing of Review

Normally, faculty are reviewed for promotion after the completion of five (5) years of service in the current rank, however, faculty may seek promotion earlier if they can establish that they “meet

the same standards of effectiveness and accomplishment or excellence used in evaluating candidates after five (5) years in rank.”

Section 11.02 University Standards

The University standards for promotion to the rank of Professor are:

- (a) sustained effectiveness in teaching and service during the review period, and
- (b) sustained integration of no less than two of the following areas during the review period: teaching, scholarship, and service, and
- (c) excellence in scholarship.

Section 11.03 Performance Indicators and Weighting

TEACHING

In addition to the Performance Indicators and weighting used for retention, Section 8.03, TEACHING (p. 8), the SoM requires a continued pattern of success in those indicators. *This is the same set of performance indicators and weighting used for tenure.*

SCHOLARSHIP

Performance

Performance Indicators and weighting for accomplishment in performance are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, Performance (p. 9).

Conducting

Performance Indicators and weighting for accomplishment in conducting are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, Conducting (p. 9).

Research

Performance Indicators and weighting for accomplishment in research are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, Research (p. 10).

Composition

Performance Indicators and weighting for accomplishment in composition are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, Composition (p. 10).

Music Technology

Performance Indicators and weighting for accomplishment in music technology are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, Music Technology (p. 10).

SERVICE/OUTREACH

In addition to the Performance Indicators and weighting used for retention, Section 8.03,

TEACHING (pp. 10-11), the SoM requires a continued pattern of success in those indicators. *This is the same set of performance indicators and weighting used for tenure.*

INTEGRATION

Performance Indicators and weighting for integration are the same as used for retention found in Section 8.03, INTEGRATION (p. 11). *This is the same set of performance indicators and weighting used for tenure.*

Section 11.04 Quantitative and Qualitative Expectations

TEACHING

The qualitative and quantitative standards for sustained teaching effectiveness required for promotion to full professor are the same as those for achieving tenure. (Section 9.04)

SCHOLARSHIP

Performance

Qualitative and Quantitative Standards

To meet the university standard of excellence in scholarship, the faculty candidate should significantly exceed the criteria for tenure/promotion to associate professor. Using the qualitative and quantitative standards established for tenure, it is up to the candidate to explain why their scholarship meets the required level. The scope of the candidate's scholarship should normally extend beyond national recognition to international recognition as an expert in the field. The School is aware that international opportunities vary by instrument, and that a determination of the quality and quantity of works at the national level can satisfy the criteria for extending one's scope of activity past the national level. The primary review committee will evaluate the candidate's narrative, indicators, and the evaluations of external peer reviewers in making the determination that the standard of excellence has been met.

Conducting

Qualitative and Quantitative Standards

To meet the university standard of excellence in scholarship, the faculty candidate should significantly exceed the criteria for tenure/promotion to associate professor. Using the qualitative and quantitative standards established for tenure, it is up to the candidate to explain why their scholarship meets the required level. The School acknowledges that given our geographic location and the limitations of our students' performing abilities (based on the majors and levels of study we offer), extending the scope of activities to international recognition can be extremely difficult. The School can use the examination of quality and quantity of works to satisfy criteria for significantly exceeding the criteria for

tenure. The primary review committee will evaluate the candidate's narrative, indicators, and the evaluations of external peer reviewers in making the determination that the standard of excellence has been met.

Research

Qualitative and Quantitative Standards

To meet the university standard of excellence in scholarship, the faculty candidate should significantly exceed the criteria for tenure/promotion to associate professor. Using the qualitative and quantitative standards established for tenure, it is up to the candidate to explain why their scholarship meets the required level. The scope of the candidate's scholarship should normally extend beyond national recognition to international recognition as an expert in the field. The primary review committee will evaluate the candidate's narrative, indicators, and the evaluations of external peer reviewers in making the determination that the standard of excellence has been met.

Composition (including arranging)

Qualitative and Quantitative Standards

To meet the university standard of excellence in scholarship, the faculty candidate should significantly exceed the criteria for tenure/promotion to associate professor. Using the qualitative and quantitative standards established for tenure, it is up to the candidate to explain why their scholarship meets the required level. The scope of the candidate's scholarship should normally extend beyond national recognition to international recognition as an expert in the field. The primary review committee will evaluate the candidate's narrative, indicators, and the evaluations of external peer reviewers in making the determination that the standard of excellence has been met.

Music Technology

Qualitative and Quantitative Standards

To meet the university standard of excellence in scholarship, the faculty candidate should significantly exceed the criteria for tenure/promotion to associate professor. Using the qualitative and quantitative standards established for tenure, it is up to the candidate to explain why their scholarship meets the required level. The scope of the candidate's scholarship should normally extend beyond national recognition to international recognition as an expert in the field. The primary review committee will evaluate the candidate's narrative, indicators, and the evaluations of external peer reviewers in making the determination that the standard of excellence has been met.

SERVICE/OUTREACH

The qualitative and quantitative standards for Service/Outreach are the same as they are for tenure. (Section 9.04)

INTEGRATION

The qualitative and quantitative standards for Integration are the same as they are for tenure. (Section 9.04)

Section 11.05 Evidence of Performance Indicators

The evidence of performance indicators in all areas (teaching, scholarship, service, integration) are the same as those for retention and tenure reviews. The full, detailed listing of these indicators is in Section 8.05 of this document.

Article XII. Procedures for Update and Revision of the Unit Role and Scope Document

Any tenured or tenure-track faculty member (including the Director of the School) may propose changes to the School of Music Role and Scope Document. Review committee members and/or administrators outside the School may also identify a need for improvement, clarification, or other revision to the School of Music Role and Scope Document. Faculty within the School of Music may propose changes directly to the chair of the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee or to the Director of the School of Music. Review committee members and administrators from the College of Arts and Architecture should make suggestions for changes to the Dean of the College of Arts and Architecture, who will forward such requests to the Director of the School. Other people outside the CAA submit requests for changes to the Chair of URTPC, who will forward the recommendations to the unit.

The School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee should address requests for changes during the spring semester. Any changes will be submitted for approval according to the process outlined in Article XIII.

As required by the university, the School of Music will undertake a full review of their document no less than every three years. An approval page should be included in the index of the document, with a note as to whether the changes or minor or major in order to track this requirement.

Article XIII. Approval Process

Section 13.01 Primary Academic and Unit Role and Scope Document

- (a) tenurable faculty and administrator of the primary academic unit;
- (b) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);
- (c) University Promotion and Tenure Committee (URTPC);
- (d) provost.

Section 13.02 Intermediate Academic Unit Role and Scope Document

(a) promotion and tenure review committee and administrator of all associated intermediate units (usually colleges);

(b) University Promotion and Tenure Committee (URTPC);

(c) provost.

Section 13.03 University Role and Scope Document

(a) University Promotion and Tenure Committee (URTPC);

(b) Faculty Senate;

(c) Deans' Council; and

(d) provost.

Appendix A: Document Approval

- School of Music Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty, September 5, 2019
- School of Music Director, September 5, 2019

Appendix B: Materials to Include in Dossier Related to the In-Depth Assessment of Teaching

- A list of all assigned courses for each semester under review, including course numbers, course titles, number of contact hours, number of credit hours, and enrollments. Faculty with applied music (studio) assignments shall also indicate the number of music majors enrolled.
- A detailed list of all other teaching activities and contributions to the instructional program.
- Course evaluation forms, including copies of evaluation summaries and evaluation forms. University-approved forms and methods shall be used unless another instrument is required by another department.
- A selection of student work from courses taught. The selection of student work is not expected to represent every course taught during the review period.
- [Optional] Documentation of student achievement.
- Any written assessments of observed teaching and subsequent responses for the current review period, done in accordance with the Annual Review process.
- For faculty that provide academic advising to students, specify the duties or advising activities, indicating the average number of advisees per semester.
- [If applicable] Additional information relevant to instruction (e.g., unique course development, experimental course design, innovative course materials and methodology, media).

