



*School of Music*  
A SOUND TRADITION

**Organizational Structure**  
**POLICIES and PROCEDURES**

**Adopted April 07, 2005**  
Revised February 14, 2016

goals in the Annual Performance Review process for junior faculty, but they will not be considered in the summative evaluation process of faculty.

- e. Length of Commitment: It is expected that the Mentor/ Protégé relationship will be sustained through the Promotion and Tenure process. The Director will maintain the right to end the Mentor/ Protégé relationship at his/her discretion. Both the Mentor and Protégé will have the opportunity to provide input to the Director as to the status of the relationship at any time.

## **ARTICLE XIII**

### **PROVISIONAL School of Music Tenure and Promotion Policies**

---

*Revised for faculty review, February 15, 2016  
Full faculty vote to approve scheduled for March 24, 2016*

#### **Section I: Criteria for Appointment to Faculty Rank**

**A. Faculty holding the rank of Full Professor** are expected:

- To hold a terminal degree in the field or equivalent professional experiences/credentials in the discipline.
- To be effective in teaching as demonstrated by student success and achievement and/or ability to attract students to our institution. At the rank of Full Professor, it is expected that the faculty member continues to deepen and broaden their teaching skills, and that they are engaged in continual and critical self-evaluation as educators.
- To have sustained effort and activity in focused creative and/or scholarly research agenda that indicates a distinguished career and a substantial reputation in the profession and among peers for outstanding quality and quantity of sustained and substantive endeavors in the field. It is expected at the rank of Full Professor that the faculty member demonstrate a significant depth and/or scope of their creative and/or scholarly research and that they can demonstrate the significant impact they have made on the field.
- To be engaged in shared governance and to have a record of service to the school of music, college, university, profession and the broader community.

**B. Faculty holding the rank of Associate Professors** are expected:

- To hold a terminal degree in the field or equivalent professional experiences/credentials in the discipline.

- To be effective in teaching as demonstrated by student success and achievement and/or ability to attract students to our institution.
- To have a sustained effort and activity in focused creative and/or scholarly research agenda that indicates the beginning of a distinguished career paired with a developing reputation in the profession and among peers for outstanding quality and quantity of sustained endeavors in the particular field of competence.
- To be engaged in shared governance and to have a developing record of service to the school of music, college, university, profession and the broader community.

**C. Faculty holding the rank of Assistant Professors** are expected:

- To hold a terminal degree in the field or equivalent professional experiences/credentials in the discipline.
- To show promise in being effective in teaching as demonstrated by student success and achievement and/or ability to attract students to our institution.
- To show promise of a focused creative and/or scholarly research agenda and to show promise of a distinguished career.
- To show promise of engagement in shared governance and of an ability to develop a record of service to the school of music, college, university, profession and the broader community.

**D. Instructors/Visiting Guest Artists** are expected:

- To hold at least a master's degree in the field or equivalent professional experiences/credentials in the discipline.
- To be effective in teaching as demonstrated by student success and achievement.

**Section II: Requirements for Promotion**

**A: University Standards for Promotion**

The *Faculty Handbook* section 9.4.2 outlines IHL policy, specifying that a candidate for promotion in academic rank must display evidence of:

- Professional training and experience
- Effectiveness in teaching or librarianship
- Effectiveness in interpersonal relationships, including professional ethics, cooperativeness, resourcefulness, and responsibility
- Professional growth, such as research, publications, and creative activities;
- Service, such as economic development and non-teaching activities that further university goals or reflect favorably on the university

The *Faculty Handbook* also states that “promotion in academic rank requires demonstrable merit,

on a continuing basis, in the categories of evaluation” (9.4.2).

The *Faculty Handbook* defines eligibility for Promotion in section (9.4.3): “In cases involving promotions from assistant professor to associate professor and from associate professor to Full professor, candidates must serve a minimum of five (5) years in the lower rank, thereby making a recommendation for promotion permissible during the fifth year of service in the lower rank and an approved promotion effective at the beginning of the following academic year.”

In addition, in accordance with the *Faculty Handbook* Section XI – 12.5 three external referees will be used in the evaluation process of promotion to Professor. At least one of these referees must have the opportunity to view a candidate’s work in live performance.

#### B: Departmental Standards for Promotion

Promotion means assignment to a higher professional rank. Such advancement signifies recognition of accumulated past achievement. It implies an increasing measure of professional status. Promotions constitute one of the principal elements of rewards and commendation in the University.

Promotion in rank is based on performance, rather than on a specified number of years in service. However since performance that merits promotion must be exhibited on a continuing basis, a reasonable period of time must elapse to enable the individual faculty member to demonstrate competency and have it confirmed by periodic evaluations. (See *Faculty Handbook* Section 9.4.3).

#### 1. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Satisfies all requirements for appointment to Assistant Professor (See section on Criteria for Appointment to Rank)

Record of effectiveness in teaching as demonstrated by student success and achievement and/or ability to attract students to our institution. A pursuit of excellence and effectiveness in teaching will be demonstrated by engagement in components of teaching as defined by the School of Music, including teaching and curriculum development, refining and augmenting professional skills and knowledge, graduate committee work, and/or recruitment. (Refer to SoM Annual Evaluation document).

Record of sustained effort and activity in a focused creative and/or scholarly research agenda that indicates the beginning of a distinguished career paired with a developing reputation in the profession and among peers for outstanding quality and quantity of sustained endeavors in the area of competence.

Record of engagement in shared governance and a developing record of service to the school of music, college, university, profession and the broader community.

#### 2. Promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor

Satisfies all requirements for appointment to Associate Professor (See section on Criteria for Appointment to Rank)

Record of effectiveness in teaching as demonstrated by student success and achievement and/or ability to attract students to our institution. A pursuit of excellence and effectiveness in teaching will be demonstrated by engagement in the components of teaching as defined by the School of Music, including teaching and curriculum development, refining and augmenting professional skills and knowledge, graduate committee work, and/or recruitment. (Refer to SoM Annual Evaluation document). At the rank of Full Professor, it is expected that the faculty member is both deepening and broadening their teaching skills, and that they are engaged in continual and critical self-evaluation as educators.

Record of sustained effort and activity in a focused creative and/or scholarly research agenda that indicates a distinguished career and a substantial reputation in the profession and among peers for outstanding quality and quantity of sustained and substantive endeavors in the field. It is expected at the rank of Full Professor that the faculty member demonstrate a significant scope of their creative and/or scholarly research and that they can demonstrate the significant impact they have made on the field.

Record of engagement in shared governance and a record of service to the school of music, college, university, profession and the broader community.

### C: External Evaluations for Promotion to Full Professor

University guidelines for promotion to full professor are detailed in the *Faculty Handbook* in Chapter 9. At this level of promotion, in addition to the documented evidence specified in the individual college/school document, each candidate for promotion from Associate to Full Professor must undergo an external evaluation consisting of at least three confidential letters from qualified referees from outside the University who can provide an objective evaluation. The candidate shall select such referees jointly with the recommending body within the candidate's promotion unit, and the letters shall be solicited by and directed to the chair of said recommending body.

At all levels of review, faculty in the School of Music often include letters of support from colleagues, both internal and external to the institution. A document of best practices for doing this is attached at the end of this document in Appendix A. This document explains why one might solicit and include such letters as well as how to do so.

### Section III: School of Music Teaching Criteria.

The following criteria are considered for evaluation of teaching for School of Music faculty. These criteria are abbreviated from the School of Music Annual Evaluation document, but are included here for ease of reference. It is expected that for promotion a faculty member engages in the activities below over a sustained period of time in a manner that yields student success.

The following criteria are considered for evaluation of teaching for School of Music faculty. These criteria are abbreviated from the School of Music Annual Evaluation document, but are included here for ease of reference. It is expected that for promotion a faculty member engages in the activities below over a sustained period of time in a manner that yields student success.

6. Teaching courses. Instructing assigned courses that reflect a full teaching load as defined by the SoM Workload Guidelines.
7. Curriculum development. Faculty engagement in curricular development in their areas of expertise. This includes the development of new courses or the redesign of existing courses, including updating instructional strategies/pedagogical practices, content, assessment processes and/or instruments, technology integration, and/or service learning. New courses and course redesigns should be undertaken in relationship to larger curricular aims, should directly meet the needs of undergraduate and graduate students, and should be premised on enhancing student learning.
8. Refining and augmenting professional skills and knowledge. Faculty engagement in augmenting and sharing/disseminating their professional and/or artistic expertise through a variety of teaching experiences and opportunities that are beyond the scope of their assigned faculty teaching loads and the regular academic year. Such opportunities are based on the artistic/professional reputation of the faculty member, are considered teaching in the SoM, and are recognized as a component of being a faculty member in the SoM. Such opportunities are sometimes invited and at other times determined by the initiative of the faculty member. Such teaching opportunities occur on and off campus and include the following: pre and in-service workshops for teachers and teacher candidates; summer workshops, camps, and applied lessons; clinics and master classes; workshops/presentations; compensated accompaniment and conducting, etc.
9. Graduate committee work. Faculty engagement in graduate and undergraduate committee work. Faculty members can serve as a Chair or a member of committee, depending on the student and circumstance. This activity is considered teaching. Committee memberships are these:
  - a. MM, MME Level (area member, theory or history member, plus Chair)
  - b. DMA Level (area member #1, area member #2, theory member, history member, plus Chair)
  - c. PhD Level (area member #1, area member #2, cognate member, 4th member, plus Chair)

All graduate (MM, MME, DMA, PhD) committee members take part in the following:

- e. Shaping and grading the comprehensive exam(s)
- f. grading the dissertation and/or required documents
- g. grading the defense
- h. grading degree recital

All MM and MME committee Chairs take part in the following:

- b. Advise on thesis or recital preparation. The expectation is that the Chair fully reviews the document in advance of committee participation.

All DMA and PhD committee Chairs take part in the following:

- c. Advise on dissertation. The expectation is that the Chair fully reviews the document in advance of committee participation, although members are often consulted at an early stage in areas of their expertise.
- d. Grade degree recitals (DMA, three)

Faculty engagement in undergraduate committee work can take the form of advising Honor's Theses, McNair Scholars, etc.

10. Recruitment. In the SoM the teaching area includes recruitment. Recruitment takes many forms in the SoM, including performances, clinics, master classes, touring, and attending formal recruiting events. Further, recruiting varies across the different areas of the school. Refer to the School of Music Annual Evaluation document, Section 2b, for full description of recruitment activities in the different areas of the SoM (applied, education, history/theory).

Some recruitment events are centralized at the school level and others function at a local level (ensemble, division, studio, etc.). It is expected that all SoM faculty members are active and engaged in recruiting in ways germane to their areas and/or functions within the school. Further, we acknowledge that some recruitment activities overlap with the areas of research; however, we view recruitment as an essential component of teaching on our School.

#### **Section IV: Evaluating teaching effectiveness for over a sustained period of time for the purpose of promotion**

For purposes of promotion, teaching effectiveness is considered over a period of time. The SoM Annual Evaluation document articulates unit level expectations in teaching over a 12-month period and the Report of Annual Evaluation qualitatively and quantitatively articulates the Department Personnel Committee's evaluation of a faculty member's teaching in the review period. The aggregate achievements of a faculty member are contained in multiple years of Reports of Annual Evaluation.

#### **Section V: School of Music Evaluation Criteria for Creative and Scholarly Research**

The following criteria are considered creative and scholarly research in the School of Music. These activities are abbreviated from the School of Music Annual Evaluation document, but are included here for ease of reference. It is expected that for promotion a faculty member engage in the activities below over a sustained period of time in a manner that yields increasing significance, reputation and a sustained level of high quality.

Scholarly and creative research—listed in alphabetical order—includes, but is not limited to:

1. Activity as a guest clinician or conductor.
2. Commissioning new works.
3. Conference attendance and/or professional development in area of research.
4. Electronic publication (include venue and review, if available).
5. Interdisciplinary and/or collaborative research.
6. Internal and external grants, research awards, and/or fellowships, applied for and/or received.
7. Paid or unpaid performance of off-campus solo, chamber, ensemble, concerto, lecture recital, or lecture documented by invitation, program, recordings, and/or review. In providing documentation, the faculty member should categorize performances by type and location (“Solo performance in the state” or “Orchestral performance in the region” etc.). Note: Some faculty members will have multiple listings in this area that reflect multiple artistic endeavors. The breadth and depth of a faculty member’s activity will be considered by the Department Personnel Committee in the annual evaluation process.
8. Participation in or invitation to a professional conference as a speaker, presenter, panelist, performer or evaluator.
9. Performance by a student ensemble in significant off-campus venues. Faculty can claim student performances as research/creative activity or teaching but not both.
10. Post publication activities, specifically as applied to major works of scholarship.
11. Premiering new works as a soloist or a conductor.
12. Published authored, co-authored or edited book, article, monograph, arrangement (performed or published), chapter, edition, or recording (live or studio). The School of Music recognizes the scope of recordings ranges from self-published to contracted.
13. Serving in the capacity of adjudicator/juror in discipline for activities at state, regional, and/or international level.
14. Translation of scholarly works.
15. Work-in-Progress: Progress of research/creative activity that is either in preparation, in review, or pending publication may be included as evidence of ongoing study and professional development. Thorough documentation of the activity, including representative work (outlines, drafts, excerpts, descriptions, and proposals) as well as a projected timeline for the work will provide important evidence of progress toward completion.

The School of Music articulates how faculty engagement in the above research activities correlates to annual evaluation scores in the Annual Evaluation document, Section 3b, “Measuring Scholarly and Creative Research Activity,” which is excerpted here:

To meet expectations for research activity and earn a three (3), a faculty member will document activity in at least one area annually.

If a faculty member engages in additional research activity in one or more categories, they exceed expectations and their annual evaluation score will be a four (4).



In the SoM, an annual evaluation score of a five (5) is reserved for significant achievement, including, but not limited to: receiving an award or recognition by the university or a professional organization; receiving a national award for research or creative activity; being selected for performance by peer review or through refereed process, publishing a book (or other substantial research) in a peer-reviewed, or refereed context; acquiring a recording contract for which the faculty member is compensated; recording on a major recording label, i.e. NAXOS, that is internationally distributed. Faculty members who earn a five (5) far exceed expectations.

Faculty not meeting expectations will receive annual evaluation scores in the following manner:

- Not engaging in any research activity falls short of meeting expectations and earns a score of two (2);
- A second consecutive evaluation period of no research activity does not meet expectations and earns a score of one (1)

Further, the School of Music Annual Evaluation document explains how faculty members present for evaluation the significance of their research. This is also from Section 2b:

Faculty members will thoroughly document the significance of their research activity to assist the Department Personnel Committee in making an informed evaluation of contributions. (Documentation should be available upon request). Significance of works will be determined by, but are not limited to, the following:

1. The prestige and/or visibility of the publication, recording, presentation, or performance.
2. The forum (local, regional, national, international) of the publication, recording, presentation, or performance.
3. The selection process for the publication, recording, presentation, or performance (peer review, invited, blind review, etc.).
4. Evidence of ongoing peer recognition either within or outside the SOM as a performer or scholar (such as repeated invitations to perform or present, evidence of publication, or distribution of compositions / arrangements).

Regional or national significance is not strictly defined by proximity to Hattiesburg, but rather by the prominence of the activity within the area of expertise and the geographic scope of participants. The SoM values international level performances and endeavors by faculty and sees that such activity builds the professional profile of a faculty member and also increases the visibility/reputation of the university and the SoM. “International” level activity can be defined by the scope and size of the participants in the applied areas. A festival, conference, etc. labelled as “international” will be reviewed by the Department Personnel Committee in terms of this criteria. In the non-applied areas, “international” can also be defined in terms of the scope of the governing board/review board. In the annual evaluation process, the SoM is concerned with the impact and significance of such

activity.

### **Section VI: Evaluating creative and scholarly research over a sustained period of time for the purpose of promotion**

For purposes of promotion, creative and/or scholarly research is considered over a period of time. The SoM Annual Evaluation document articulates unit level expectations in research over a 12-month period and the Report of Annual Evaluation qualitatively and quantitatively articulates the Department Personnel Committee's evaluation of a faculty member's research in the review period. The aggregate achievements of a faculty member are contained in multiple years of Reports of Annual Evaluation.

For promotion, a consideration is made for the definition, development and growth of one's research agenda. A professional evaluation is made at the unit level as to the refinement of one's artistic voice and /or scholarly inquiry. Unit level committees are looking for substantive evidence of excellence and for how a faculty member's research agenda (creative and/or scholarly) serves the mission and meets the needs of the School of Music.

At the point of Pre-tenure review, the faculty member should demonstrate the promise of a focused creative and/or scholarly research agenda as well as promise of a distinguished career.

For promotion to Associate Professor the faculty member should demonstrate sustained and focused effort and activity in creative and/or scholarly research agenda that indicates the beginning of a distinguished career. This is paired with a developing reputation in the profession and among peers.

For promotion to Full Professor the faculty member should demonstrate a significant scope and/or depth of their creative and/or scholarly research and that they have made an impact on the field. Sustained and substantive efforts and activity in creative and/or scholarly research is expected.

The unit will review the two external letters provided by the faculty member in order to better and more thoroughly assess that faculty member's establishment in the field.

### **Section VII: School of Music Evaluation Criteria for Service**

Service activities below are abbreviated from the School of Music Annual Evaluation document, but are included here for ease of reference. It is expected that for promotion a faculty member engages in professional service activities listed below over a sustained period of time in a manner that yields increasing significance and impact and that demonstrates a commitment to sharing one's professional knowledge with the field.

All faculty members are expected to participate in the shared governance of the unit/institution. Service activities include non-paid contributions made to the school, college, university, profession and/or community. Activity that receives remuneration is not considered service; sometimes such activities are considered teaching and at other times research. Service activities are typically non-credit and/or educational in nature and are within the faculty member's professional expertise. Service activities are always those in which the faculty member is called upon for their professional expertise.

Service to the school is necessary work that reflects a commitment to shared governance at the most local level. Service at the school level also demonstrates a respect for collegiality and working with peers.

Service to the institution (at the school, college or university level) is necessary work that provides for the advancement and maintenance of the institution for which the faculty receive no load credit. Service is participating in the shared governance of the institution.

Service to the profession is invited activity with professional organizations that represent the scope of the field. These organizations can be local to international.

Service to the community is invited activity in which faculty use the knowledge and skill of their discipline – without compensation – to help a community organization.

Service to the school, college and institution takes many forms and an extensive listing of service activities can be found in the SoM Annual Evaluation document. Evaluating service over an extended period for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion is closely linked to collegiality. (See Section VIII. C below).

## **Section VIII: Definition of Tenure**

### **A. University Standards for Tenure**

The *Faculty Handbook* in section 9.6.8 defines the Standard of Evaluation for tenure as this: “The award of academic tenure is a privilege. Tenure is awarded after a thorough review that culminates in the University acknowledging the faculty member’s professional excellence and the likelihood that excellence will contribute substantially over a considerable period of time to the mission and anticipated needs of the University. Professional excellence is reflected in the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service, including the faculty member’s ability to interact appropriately with colleagues and students. A faculty member might meet the criteria for a given promotion in rank, and achieve promotion, but fail to merit the privilege of tenure. Promotion in academic rank does not necessarily imply that one merits academic tenure.”

In section 9.6.2 of the *Faculty Handbook*, tenure is defined as requiring “excellence in performance and the promise of continued excellence in teaching, research and service.”

The School of Music will formally evaluate progress toward tenure during the third year of

University employment as a full-time, tenure-track faculty member. Faculty members will undergo tenure review in the sixth year of full-time employment. If awarded, tenure is granted at the beginning of the seventh year of employment.

#### B. Departmental Standards for Tenure

Tenure is awarded after a probationary period and careful consideration of the candidate's commitment to the university, college, and departmental mission and goals. It recognizes that a person has demonstrated the promise of a continued commitment and long-term dedication to teaching, creative/scholarly research and service to the school and profession. It further recognizes the possibility of faculty members achieving a high level of recognition in their chosen area in the future. Thus, the standard for tenure is one of demonstrated achievement and success in the areas of teaching, research, and service that supports the likelihood of significant and continuing contributions in the future.

Tenure carries with it the qualified expectation of continuing employment (*Faculty Handbook*, p. 84). Tenure does not release senior faculty members from the responsibility to be productive in the evaluative categories. In fact, it is expected that they be leaders in these areas. (See D. below, Post Tenure Review.)

The relationship between Departmental annual evaluations and Departmental standards for tenure and promotion that they are inextricable. The criteria and standards the School of Music has set articulated for annual evaluation are the same as those required for tenure and promotion.

#### C. Collegiality in the School of Music

The School of Music is concerned with collegiality when it reviews a faculty member for tenure. In the School of Music, collegiality is the ability of a faculty member to cooperate with students and colleagues, to treat students and colleagues with respect and to exercise critical self-discipline. It is through the lens of collegiality that service is considered when a faculty member is under review. Collegiality is further demonstrated through civility and civil engagement, and full and active participation in the governance of the School of Music.

### **Section IX: Relation of this Document to other Pertinent Documents**

The Faculty Handbook, Chapter Nine, serves as the umbrella governing document in matters of tenure and promotion for the entire University. Everyone involved in any way in these processes should consult the Handbook and become familiar with its provisions. In the unlikely case of any apparent conflict between the SoM document and the *Faculty Handbook* (Handbook), the Handbook will prevail.

The Handbook mandates that the details of guidelines, policies, or criteria governing tenure or promotion in rank within an academic unit must be developed by that same academic unit. In the College of Arts and Letters, the “academic unit” is understood to mean the department or school in which the faculty member holds his or her appointment. The Handbook provides a baseline for evaluations; the written standards developed by departments and schools can, and often will, extend beyond the minimum standards articulated in it.

## **Section X: School of Music Procedures**

All tenured members of the School of Music (SoM) faculty are to participate in each appropriate promotion and tenure review, as well as third year reviews. The SoM Promotion and Tenure Committee is a committee of the whole with voting members being at or above the rank being sought. The following schedule outlines the events in these parallel processes:

1. Each spring, before April 15, the director will post a notice asking for all faculty members wishing to be considered for promotion to the associate level plus tenure, or for promotion to full professor to schedule individual appointments with the director. At those meetings, the director will give the candidates the written instructions for preparing their dossiers. This process takes place early each fall semester for those undergoing pre-tenure reviews. All other procedures for pre-tenure reviews are as detailed in the *Faculty Handbook*.
2. By the end of the third week of the following fall semester the director shall call a meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee as that committee is defined in the *Faculty Handbook*. At this meeting the director shall announce the names of the candidates for promotion and for tenure. The Promotion and Tenure Committee shall then elect a chair from among its membership. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will lead the remainder of the meeting and all subsequent meetings of the committee. The faculty shall also elect subsidiary chairs who will prepare the faculty summary report for assigned candidates. The subsidiary chair not only prepares the letter, but also should provide input to the faculty undergoing review about any errors to their dossier. The subsidiary chair may opt to seek input from non-tenured faculty members, especially in cases where there is no tenured representation in the Tenure and Promotion Committee. (In such cases, the dossier, remains the main document of a faculty member’s work.) Each of these subsidiary chairs will characteristically be a senior member from the division to which a candidate belongs. If there is not a senior member of the appropriate division on the Tenure and Promotion Committee, an alternative chair may be selected from within the membership. All tenured faculty shall participate in the process of promotion to associate professor and tenure. Only full professors may vote on candidates applying for full professor rank.
3. Candidates for promotion and tenure shall prepare dossiers for consideration by the Promotion and Tenure Committee according to departmental and college guidelines. The dossiers will be made available to committee members for review. Dossiers will be due no

later than two weeks prior to the scheduled meeting of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

4. Upon reviewing the dossiers of candidates, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide comments for each candidate. These comments will be submitted electronically to the subsidiary chair. The comment forms are compiled by the SoM Administrative Assistant, then forwarded to the appropriate subsidiary chair. Subsidiary chairs will compile a summary of the comments. The Promotion and Tenure Committee will then reconvene to discuss each candidate. During this meeting the summaries of each candidate are to be shared with the committee, and committee members will have the opportunity to openly discuss the candidates and the final summary. Such discussions must be directed exclusively towards specific criteria for promotion and tenure. The Director of the SoM may be present for the discussion, unless the assembled faculty votes otherwise. The participating faculty will vote on the approval of the candidate's final summary, with edits. After the discussion and summary vote, ballots will be distributed, and a confidential vote recommending for or against promotion and/or tenure of each candidate will take place. In such meetings a quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the tenured faculty (or, in the case of votes for promotion, a simple majority of the tenured full professors).
5. Chairs for each candidate will then write summary reports in which the votes of the participating faculty and their consensus opinions are reported. These summaries will be presented to the director. The director will then write his/her own evaluation and recommendation. The director's recommendation and the summary from the chair for each candidate will be shared with the candidate and submitted as part of the dossier to the College Council. Individual faculty comments remain confidential and will be archived in the SoM.

#### Appendix A: Guidelines for soliciting and submitting letters of support in the dossier.

This process of submitting letters of support at the point of promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor and at the point of Pre tenure review is intended to:

1. Include the faculty member undergoing review in an active manner through seeking out letter writers
2. Provide feedback to the faculty member under review in terms of their professional development
3. Assist in developing the professional network of individual untenured faculty members.
4. Provide formative feedback at the pre-tenure, and promotion to Associate level.
5. Provide school, college and university committees with additional information that will aid in their evaluation of the promotion dossier. This process is intended to inform promotion deliberations, not tenure. Tenure is best decided by the faculty with whom the candidate works.

A School of Music process for external evaluations at the point of pre-tenure review and promotion to Associate Professor is this:

1. The faculty member under review seeks out reviewers (internal or external) who will write a letter of support after reviewing the promotion or pre-tenure dossier. The focus of the letter may or may not be suggested by the faculty member.
2. The external reviewers may be given the SoM Tenure & Promotion document to provide context.
3. The letter should state the professional relationship between the faculty member and the letter writer.
4. The faculty member under review can opt to contextualize their external review and solicit feedback/evaluation on specific areas, to include but not limited to teaching, research, service, instructional strategies, recruitment efforts, research scope, research agenda development, etc.
5. This external review happens prior to the dossier being submitted to the school.
6. Each external reviewer completes their review and their resulting letter of evaluation is provided to the faculty member under review. Letters are included in the dossier.

This process is not intended, in any way, to dilute the review at the local through university levels.

## ARTICLE XIV

### SCHOOL of MUSIC LOAD FORMULA

---

*Approved by School of Music Executive Committee November 18, 2015*

#### **Section 1: Load credit for lecture and applied instruction.**

The USM Faculty Handbook in section 4.4 defines the expected faculty teaching load during a regular semester as *four courses or 12 credit hours per semester*. The following credit-weighting system is utilized to assist with determining faculty loads in the School of Music, where instruction takes many forms, including applied lessons.

Faculty in the School of music who are research intensive are reassigned .25 of their load for creative/scholarly research. With this, a 100 percent teaching load (1.0) might comprise four 3-credit hour courses for classroom instruction, or eighteen contact hours for applied teaching. As is prescribed by the National Association of Schools of Music, six one-contact-hour per week private lessons are given the same teaching load credit (0.25) as one (1) traditional lecture course. Some faculty hold administrative position that are factored in to their load.

Due to available resources and school needs, sometimes loads are figured across semesters with one semester being in uncompensated overload and the other being under full load. While this will remain the intended policy, circumstances may, from time to time, prevent strict adherence to the policy. In fact, at the present time, most faculty members are engaged in