

School of Music Document on Evaluation, Promotion and Tenure  
(Approved by the Music Faculty 03 Sept. 1999)  
(Revisions to this document and Appendices B and C  
Approved by the Music Faculty 07 April 2000)

Further Revisions by the Dean's Office 12 June 2000

Further Revisions by the Associate Provost, School of Music Director, and  
School of Music FEPT Committee Director  
8 February 2001

Further Revisions by the Associate Provost, School of Music Director,  
and School of Music FEPT Committee Director  
30 April 2001

Further Revisions by the Associate Provost, School of Music Director,  
and School of Music FEPT Committee Director  
July 2012

Further Revisions by the School of Music Faculty, 23 March 2018

Approved by the Provost's Office, 14 August 2018

Further Revisions by the School of Music Faculty, 4 May 2020

Approved by the Provost's Office, 27 August 2020

Main Document

- I. Review Process
- II. Qualifications for Ranks
- III. Promotion and Tenure
- IV. Evaluation file
- IV. Memorandum of Understanding of Professional Responsibilities
- V. Criteria for Evaluation

Appendix A (Procedures for Peer Evaluations of Teaching)

Appendix B (School of Music Performance-Based Salary Increase Pay)

Appendix C (Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Ensemble Direction)

## I. Review Process

Annual written evaluations are required of all faculty members in the School of Music, regardless of rank. Faculty files are reviewed every year by the School of Music Faculty Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure (FEPT) committee and Director. Both of these reviews are forwarded to the Dean. Faculty have the opportunity to respond to these reviews within 5 business days. The Dean may elect to have faculty member's file reviewed either by the College committee and/or may review the files personally. The College committee and Dean must review files of tenure track (non-tenured) faculty and faculty recommended for promotion and/or tenure annually. The School of Music committee will prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member, together with an unequivocal recommendation for or against retention, the award of tenure, and/or promotion. The written evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee, dated, and forwarded to the School of Music Director. The total number of positive and negative votes must be recorded in the evaluation. Committee members may include minority statements in the recommendation. The Director will review the committee's evaluation and recommendation regarding each faculty member and make an assessment, in writing, with unequivocal recommendations for retention, award of tenure, and/or promotion for each faculty member. The faculty member shall be informed in writing by the Director of the evaluations and recommendations of both the School of Music committee and the Director. Copies of all written statements shall be placed in the faculty member's Digital Measures evaluation file (see III below). For tenure-track faculty being considered for tenure and/or promotion, the evaluation process requires external reviews. The evaluation process for teaching-track faculty being considered for promotion does not require external reviews, except for Teaching Associate Professors seeking promotion to Teaching Professor. The purposes of the evaluation are: 1) to aid each faculty member in noting strengths and identifying and addressing weaknesses in the performance of duties; 2) to ensure that those persons who are recommended for tenure and/or promotion are truly worthy, 3) to encourage senior faculty to remain vigorous, active, and productive, and 4) to aid in the equitable distribution of merit salary increases.

The SOM FEPT Committee shall be composed of five members, three of whom must hold tenure. The term of service for tenured members of the committee shall be three years; in the last year of their term, the committee member must serve as chair. The term of service for members not holding tenure shall be two years. Exceptions (e.g. due to sabbatical) must be approved by the Director of the School of Music in accordance with College of Creative Arts and university policy.

The guidelines outlined in this document amplify certain portions of the provisions set forth by the university document, West Virginia University Policies and Procedures for Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure, as they apply to the School of Music. (Further policies and procedures are described in the University and College documents which take precedence in authority over this document.)

### **I. Qualifications for Ranks**

Full-time faculty must be evaluated on the basis of their assigned duties and any terms specified in the letter of appointment. The Memorandum of Understanding of Professional Responsibilities (MUPRO) defines the expectations for teaching, research, and service, and will be used by the committee as the basis for assessing annual productivity and may be used to assess progress toward tenure and/or promotion.

A. Assistant Professor. An Assistant Professor should hold the appropriate degree from an accredited institution or equivalent experience. At this level, the faculty member must present evidence of significant contributions as a teacher, demonstrated potential value to the profession and the University through contributions in research/creative activity; and service to the institution, profession, and society, including the citizens of West Virginia.

B. Associate Professor. An Associate Professor must have all qualifications for the previous rank, and an established record of significant contributions as a teacher, acceptance as a senior member of the faculty through mature work in research, scholarship, or creative activity; service to the institution, profession, and society, including the citizens of West Virginia, and recognition from regional and/or national professional organizations. Except in extraordinary circumstances, one must serve for a minimum period of six years as an Assistant Professor before promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

C. Professor. A Professor must have all qualifications for the previous rank and present evidence of attainment of full professional maturity and leadership as evidenced by significant continuing contributions as a teacher and continuing national recognition in the faculty member's discipline and research/creative area. Such achievement should be demonstrated through professional recognition both within and beyond the University. Account will be taken of contributions in teaching, research/creative activity, and service to the Institution, profession, and society, including the citizens of West Virginia. Ordinarily, the interval between promotions is at least five years.

## **II. Promotion and Tenure**

Rank and tenure should be considered separately; however, promotion to Associate Professor should normally be recommended in conjunction with a recommendation for tenure. Granting of tenure requires not only the potential for future achievement and continuing contribution to the goals of the School of Music, but also a record of past achievement. The tenure decision will be made in a faculty member's critical year, as established in the letter of appointment or subsequent documents with the approval of the Provost. Tenure-track faculty who are seeking tenure usually have their areas of significant contribution in teaching and research/creative activity. Any modification of these two areas must be agreed to by the faculty member, Director, SOM FEPT committee, and Dean of the College, and approved by the Provost.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty members seeking promotion are expected to demonstrate significant contributions in two of the following areas: teaching, research/creative activity, and service. In the third area, a reasonable contribution is expected. Areas of significant contribution are identified in the letter of appointment and subsequently defined in the MUPRO.

Recommendations for promotion and tenure are based on a review of all pertinent information in relation to teaching, research/creative activity, and service. (Also see WVU Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure.)

## **III. Evaluation file**

The faculty member's evaluation file is kept in Digital Measures. The evaluation file is maintained by the Director and faculty member, and contains annual evaluations, productivity reports, load reports, MUPROs, as well as other material from current and past years. The faculty member is notified of all entries into the file by the Dean, Director, or designee and has a right to respond within a specific timeline.

#### **IV. Memorandum of Understanding of Professional Responsibilities (MUPRO)**

The Director will confer with each full-time faculty member to establish a Memorandum of Understanding of Professional Responsibilities (MUPRO). The Memorandum will include both teaching load and responsibilities as well as expectations for the nature and level (i.e. regional/national) of the faculty member's research/creative activity and service activity. Contributions in every area of a faculty member's assignment as defined in the MUPRO will serve as the basis for the evaluation of the faculty member's file. The MUPRO should be reviewed annually and placed in the faculty member's file by the Director. For continuing faculty, the MUPRO for the following calendar year should be made by December 15. If an agreement on the MUPRO cannot be reached between the faculty and the Director, an appeal may be made in writing to the Dean of the College of Creative Arts, whose actions will be final. The MUPRO may not supersede University, College, or School of Music guidelines.

#### **V. Criteria for Evaluation**

Annual evaluations and recommendations for action are to be based on the Annual Productivity Report (CCA Productivity Report) and evidence contained in the faculty member's official evaluation file in Digital Measures (For contents of the file, see WVU Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure). Faculty members have the right to access their evaluation files at any time. For annual evaluations, documents maintained in the faculty member's official evaluation file will be added to the faculty member's Annual Productivity Report by the Director and will include: the letter of appointment, faculty load report, and the Memorandum of Understanding and annual evaluations and related materials from at least the past three years.

Each year all full-time faculty will submit an Annual Productivity Report to the Director. Part-time faculty are required to submit relevant portions of the college form. For tenured faculty not seeking promotion and part-time faculty, the evaluative cycle is from August 16th to the following August 15th, with the productivity report due on September 15th. Non-tenured faculty and faculty seeking promotion will follow the University calendar for evaluative cycles and submission of the productivity report.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to identify the activities they deem most significant within the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service. The demands of the workload assigned a faculty member will be taken into consideration in a fair assessment of their total performance.

Descriptors used in the annual evaluation must be in accord with those defined in the WVU Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluations, Promotion, and Tenure. In keeping with the university guidelines, these descriptors are interpreted as follows:

Excellent: characterizing performance of high merit

Good: characterizing performance of merit

Satisfactory: characterizing performance to justify continuation of one's appointment, if received over a period of time, but not necessarily sufficient to support promotion or tenure, if applied to an area in which significant contributions are required.

Unsatisfactory: characterizing performance that does not support continuation of one's appointment.

## Teaching

1. The prime requisites of any effective teacher are intellectual competence, integrity, independence, a spirit of scholarly inquiry, a dedication to improving methods, respect for differences and diversity, and above all, the ability to stimulate and cultivate the intellectual interests and creative potential of students (WVU Policies and Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluations, Promotion and Tenure).

The following kinds of information are required when the faculty member is being considered for promotion and/or tenure and will be considered in the evaluation process as evidence of teaching effectiveness.

- a. Written peer reviews based on observation of classroom and/or studio teaching are mandatory in each of the first three years of tenure track employment, as well as in an action year before any change of status. In accordance to the CCA Document on Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure: "In the first year of tenure-track employment, observations by two tenured colleagues is required; in each the second and third years, one observation by a tenured colleague is required. In the critical year, observations by two tenured colleagues are required." Multiple peer observations of teaching should not occur within the same class period for the faculty member under observation. Peer reviews of teaching are done by a tenured colleague, normally a member of the SOM FEPT committee. (See Appendix A: "Procedures for Peer Review of Teaching")
- b. For tenure track faculty and faculty who are being considered for promotion, annual student evaluations of teaching are required. Tenured faculty are encouraged to regularly submit evaluations of teaching as evidence of teaching effectiveness; however, only faculty who submit student evaluations will be eligible for merit pay increases of any kind. (See Appendix B: "Merit Pay Policy"). Evaluation instruments should be completed anonymously by students, normally administered and collected by a member of the class, and submitted directly to the School of Music administrative assistant. If placed in one's Annual Productivity Report, forms for the entire class--not a select sampling--and a tally sheet must be submitted.
- c. Evidence of student progress and accomplishments as demonstrated in the quality of student achievements in teaching, research and/or public performances in recitals and university ensembles (not including juries).

2. The following kinds of information can provide further important evidence of teaching effectiveness:

- a. Solicited or unsolicited letters from peers in the field or from present or former students
- b. Success of former students (include all former students in a critical year; include only most recent former students for annual evaluations)
- c. Evidence of the development of new courses, teaching materials, and innovative techniques
- d. Evidence of initiatives in curriculum and program development
- e. Publication of textbooks, videotapes, or pedagogical scholarship (unless consider research; see also B.1.a.)
- f. Summer teaching of university students (on or off campus)
- g. Invitations to teach special courses off campus (summer or otherwise)
- h. Membership on or Director of graduate committees
- i. Supervision of graduate projects/papers/theses/dissertations
- j. Academic advising

- k. Videotapes of teaching
- l. Evidence of recruiting and retention of students
- m. Demands of the teaching workload

3. Guidelines for evaluating teaching effectiveness:

Excellent: Evidence of highly meritorious teaching that is documented in more than one way (peer evaluations, student evaluations, course development, student accomplishments, etc.).

Good: Evidence of meritorious teaching that is documented in more than one way (peer evaluations, student evaluations, course development, student accomplishments, etc.).

Satisfactory: Evidence of adequate teaching.

Unsatisfactory: Characterizing performance that does not support continuation of one's appointment.

### **Research/Creative Activity**

Full-time faculty members in the School of Music are expected to engage in a continuing program of research and creative activity (for scholars—a continuing program of publications in peer-reviewed venues). Quality is considered more important than mere quantity. Significant evidence of scholarly and artistic merit may be either a single work of considerable importance or a program of worthwhile research or creative activity. (WVU Guidelines) For tenure track, full-time faculty for whom research/creative activity is a significant area of contribution, a continuing record of activity in regional venues with some activity in national venues is expected, especially for promotion and/or tenure. For tenured faculty for whom research/creative activity is a significant area of contribution, a continuing record of activity in national venues of high quality is expected, especially for promotion. The faculty member is encouraged to thoroughly document the significance of the forum to assist the committee in making an accurate assessment of the contribution.

1. The significance of the work will be determined by taking into consideration:

- a. The prestige and visibility of the publication, recording, presentation, or performance
- b. The forum (local, regional, national, international) of the publication, recording, presentation, or performance. Regional or national significance is not strictly defined by proximity to Morgantown, but rather by the prominence of the activity within the area of expertise and the geographic range of participants.
- c. The selection process for the publication, recording, presentation, or performance (peer review or invitation).
- d. Evidence of ongoing peer recognition as a performer or scholar (such as repeated invitations to perform or present, evidence of publication, or distribution of compositions/arrangements).

2. Documentation of Activity

Documentation of a publication such as a book, monograph, composition, arrangement, or the release of a CD will only be considered a finished work when, it is accompanied by a letter or contract from the publisher that confirms "unequivocal acceptance" with no further revisions to be made. Such publications should be by recognized publishers, distributors or producers, not a vanity press.

Documentation of major performances should include programs and recordings when available.

The following kinds of documentation can provide evidence of contributions in research/creative activity:

- a. Authored, co-authored or edited book, composition, arrangement, or recording
- b. Authored, co-authored article, monograph, or chapter
- c. Performance by non-WVU personnel of a composition or arrangement (include location, program, and, if available, review)
- d. Commissioned composition or performance
- e. Performance of a solo or chamber recital
- f. Performance with a professional ensemble
- g. Visible presence as a performer on campus. (Depending upon their content and intended audience, on-campus performances may be considered as either research/creative activities or service. Such activity does not replace off campus activity in peer-oriented venues.)
- h. Presentation of a lecture-recital
- i. Participation in a professional conference as a speaker, presenter, performer, or panelist
- j. Edited articles containing original contributions to the discipline. (Normally this activity is considered service unless original scholarship can be adequately documented)
- k. Translation of scholarly works
- l. Funded grant, research award, or fellowship
- m. Performance by a student ensemble in significant off campus venues (for ensemble directors only who wish to document student performances as research/creative activity and not as evidence of teaching effectiveness)
- n. Interdisciplinary and/or collaborative research (as identified in the MUPRO)
- o. Appearance as a guest conductor or clinician
- p. Electronic publication (include venue and review, if available)
- q. Peer-reviewed evaluation (by a tenured music faculty member) of an ensemble's on-campus performance (for ensemble conductors/directors only who wish to document student performances as research/creative activity and not as evidence of teaching effectiveness).

### 3. Work-in-Progress

The progress of research/creative activity that is either in preparation, in review, or pending publication may be included as some evidence of ongoing study and professional development. Research in progress will be considered to a lesser extent than completed work and will not be a factor in support of recommendations for promotion or tenure. Thorough documentation of the activity, including representative work (outlines, drafts, excerpts, descriptions) as well as a projected timeline for the work will provide important evidence of progress toward completion.

Work-in-progress may include, but is not limited to:

- a. manuscripts, compositions, arrangements, or recordings
- b. scholarly presentations and artistic performances
- c. proposals for grants and fellowships

### 4. Guidelines for Research Contributions of National Significance

For tenured and tenure-track full-time faculty for whom research/creative activity is a significant area of contribution, a record of activity in national forums is expected. Documented activity within a forum of national significance includes, but is not limited to:

- a. A successful performance or presentation at a national professional meeting

- b. A successful performance with a professional ensemble in a major cultural center
- c. A successful performance or presentation at a high-quality institution
- d. A nationally distributed recording (such publications should be by recognized publishers, distributors, or producers, not a vanity press. WVU CAC recordings do not count).
- e. Publication in a juried journal (including electronic journals)
- f. Publication of a manuscript by a university or commercial press
- g. A competitively selected or invited paper presented, or composition performed at a national conference
- h. Placement in a national competition or receipt of a national award
- i. Successful performance by student group(s) in a major cultural center or in a national conference (for ensemble directors only)

5. Guidelines for evaluating research/creative activity:

Excellent: evidence of highly meritorious research/creative activities in multiple forums of national or international significance. Most often research/creative activity of regional significance will also be included. Excellent research may differ from good research not only in quantity, but also in quality. A single contribution of major significance may be deemed the equivalent of multiple contributions.

Good: evidence of ongoing meritorious research/creative activity culminating in performances, presentations, or publications of regional, national, or international significance.

Satisfactory: evidence of adequate continuation of a program of research and/or creative activity including performances, presentations, or publications of local or regional significance.

Unsatisfactory: characterizing performance that does not support continuation of one's appointment.

**C. Service**

1. Service activities are typically non-credit and educational in nature, are within a person's professional expertise as a faculty member and are performed as a WVU faculty member. Service should involve the application of the benefits and products of teaching and research to address the needs of society and the profession and especially to the citizens of West Virginia. Faculty members are normally expected to make reasonable service-related contributions within three broad areas: the institution, the public, and the profession. The evaluation of service shall include an assessment of the degree to which the service yields important benefits to any or all of the above recipients.

2. The following kinds of activity provide evidence of a faculty member's service-related contributions:

Service to the Institution (School of Music, College, University)

- a. Service on committees
- b. Service as a representative of the university
- c. Faculty adviser on campus to professional associations, honorary organizations, and other student organizations
- d. Contributions to other programs and courses in the university
- e. Providing administrative services



- f. Development of special materials such as brochures, handbooks, fliers, bibliographies, and catalogs
- g. Committee involvement in program and curriculum development
- h. Recruiting activities, unless defined as teaching in the letter of appointment or MUPRO  
Visible presence as a performer on campus (Depending upon their content and intended audience, on-campus performances may be considered as either research/creative activities or service)

#### Service to the Public (Community, State, Citizens of West Virginia and the region)

- a. Professional activities in a public organization
- b. Participation in University off-campus, non-credit programs, and Community Music
- c. Consulting to public and private agencies
- d. Development and direction of special educational programs for the public
- e. Membership on committees and commissions at the international, national, state, and local levels in a professional capacity
- f. Professional presentations to community groups
- g. Performances not included under research

#### Service to the Profession

- a. Leadership or committee membership in professional organizations within the discipline
- b. Service as a clinician, guest conductor, consultant, or adjudicator (unless considered teaching or research/creative activity in the MUPRO)
- c. Editing/reviewing
- d. Hosting/planning for conferences and conventions

### 3. Guidelines for Evaluating Service Activity

Excellent: outstanding participation in service-related activities to the institution, the public, and the profession. These activities involve a significant time commitment and reflect the faculty member's leadership role. Excellent service may differ from good service not only in time commitment, but also in the significance of the activity to the institution, state, or profession.

Good: admirable participation in service-related activities to the institution, the public, and/or the profession. These activities involve a significant time commitment and reflect the faculty member's leadership role.

Satisfactory: adequate participation in service-related activities to the institution, the public, and/or the profession.

Unsatisfactory: characterizing performance that does not support continuation.

## **Appendix A**

### **Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

Written peer evaluations are mandatory in each of the first three years of employment in tenure track status and in a critical year before any change of status. Faculty not in the above categories may include peer evaluations of teaching to document teaching effectiveness at any time. For faculty for whom peer evaluations are required, the following procedures will be followed:

1. The FEPT Committee shall designate the evaluator. This evaluator must be a tenured faculty member and normally will be a member of the FEPT Committee. In rare instances, two evaluators may be assigned to a teacher who is teaching in two disparate fields.
2. The teacher under review and the evaluator shall meet before the scheduled observation time(s) to discuss the procedures to be followed and to apprise the evaluator of background information concerning the course as a whole, as well as the specific session to be observed.
3. Whereas the teacher shall be advised of the general evaluation procedures to be followed, the specific devising of these procedures is the sole province of the evaluator.
4. Either the evaluator or the teacher may decide to require more than one observation. In the case of a teacher who teaches in different subject areas, or at widely different levels, separate reviews of these areas and/or levels are normally required.
5. The observation time(s) shall be agreed upon mutually between the evaluator and the teacher.
6. After the observations have been completed, the evaluator shall submit within five working days a written evaluation to the School of Music Director, who will then distribute copies to the FEPT Committee and to the teacher. If the teacher finds this evaluation to be unsatisfactory, they may request a second review by a different evaluator. This request should be made within three working days of receipt of the written evaluation. The second evaluator shall be appointed by the FEPT Committee, and the review process shall be in accordance with the guidelines stated above. The evaluation from the first review shall remain in the teacher's file.
7. Following the scheduled observations, a conference to discuss the observations shall be held at the request of either party.
8. The faculty member is responsible for uploading their observation reports to Digital Measures.

### **Suggested Guidelines for the Written Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

The evaluator's commentary may include, but need not necessarily be limited to, the following points:

#### **I. For Classroom Teaching**

- A. Organization of the course, including course objectives, syllabus, handouts (if any), and evaluation procedures.
- B. Evidence of relevant teacher expertise.
- C. Clarity and relevance of goals for the class period observed; student achievement of those goals within the class period.
- D. Organization of instruction and efficient use of time for the class period observed.
- E. Interaction between students and teacher; effectiveness of teacher's communications; evidence of appropriate response to relevant student input offered during the class.

## II. Conductors

- A. Evidence of the organization and the scope of the ensemble for that semester, including syllabus, handouts (if any), and evaluation procedures.
- B. Evidence of relevant conductor expertise.
- C. Clarity and relevance of goals for the rehearsal observed; student achievement of those goals and/or the amount of positive change that occurred during the rehearsal.
- D. Organization of instruction and efficient use of time for the rehearsal observed.
- E. Interaction between students and conductor; effectiveness of conductor's communications; evidence of appropriate response to relevant student input offered during the rehearsal.

## III. Studio Teachers

- A. Organization of the course, including course objectives, syllabus, handouts (if any), and evaluation procedures.
- B. Evidence of relevant teacher expertise.
- C. Clarity and relevance of goals for the class period observed; student achievement of those goals within the class period.
- D. Organization of instruction and efficient use of time for the class period observed.
- E. Interaction between students and teacher; effectiveness of teacher's communications; evidence of appropriate response to relevant student input offered during the lesson.

## **Appendix B**

### School of Music Performance-Based Salary Increase Policy

In addition to the Procedure for Recommendation of Performance-Based Salary Increases set forth in the College of Creative Arts Performance-Based Salary Increase Policy (10/21/02), to be considered for performance-based pay a tenure-track or tenured Music faculty member must:

- Meet annually with the Director of the School of Music to complete the yearly MUPRO document (Memorandum of Understanding of Professional Responsibilities).
- Submit student evaluations of at least one course/studio per cycle using approved forms developed by the University or School of Music. If the university or School of Music forms seem inappropriate to the faculty member, evaluation instruments appropriate to the type of teaching (classroom, studio, ensembles) may be designed by the School of Music or faculty member. In any case the submission of student evaluations must include the form from each student respondent as well as any summary or compilation document.

## **Appendix C**

### Procedures for Peer Evaluation of Ensemble Direction

1. The ensemble director may either approach the prospective evaluator of a performance or may ask the School's FEPT committee to provide an evaluator. An evaluator must be a tenured faculty member. The number of peer reviews per performance is at the discretion of the ensemble director.
2. At the discretion of either the ensemble director under review or the evaluator, a pre-performance meeting may be held either to discuss the procedures to be followed by the evaluator or to allow the ensemble director the opportunity to apprise the evaluator of background information concerning the specific performance to be observed, or both.
3. The ultimate decision of specific evaluation procedures is the sole province of the evaluator.

4. Following the performance, a conference to discuss the observation may be held at the request of either party.