



Department of Music

POLICY FOR FACULTY PROMOTION, TENURE, AND EVALUATION

&

GUIDELINES FOR ITS INTERPRETATION

Adopted April 12, 2010

Revised December 4, 2015; April 30, 2021; October 21, 2022; April 19, 2024

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Policy for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

I. General Music Department Philosophy of Evaluation.....	1
II. Standards for Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation.....	1
1. Basic Expectations for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation.....	1
2. Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation.....	2
3. Timing of Promotion and Tenure Decisions, Annual and Triennial Evaluations.....	3
4. Minimum Requirements for Promotion and Tenure.....	3
A. Teaching.....	3
B. Creative Activity.....	3
C. Service.....	4
III. Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation.....	4
1. Reviewing Committee.....	5
2. Tenure and Professional Development Plans.....	5
3. The Promotion, Tenure, or Evaluation File.....	5
(a) Department Personnel Committee Evaluation Schedule Announcement.....	5
(b) Relevant File Materials.....	5
(c) External Review Letters.....	6
(d) File Closing Date.....	6
(e) File Contents.....	6
(f) Self-Assessment Narrative.....	7
4. The Committee’s Review of the File.....	8
(a) Fourth Annual Evaluation Professional Development Meeting.....	8
(b) Subsequent Reports.....	8
(c) Faculty Review of the Draft Report.....	8
5. The Chair’s Review of the File.....	8
(a) Sharing Conclusions.....	8

(b) Faculty Review of the Chair’s Evaluation Report.....	9
6. Salary Evaluation.....	9
(a) Merit Recommendations.....	9
(b) Other Considerations.....	10
7. Use, Confidentiality and Disposition of Tenure, Evaluation and Promotion Documents.....	10
Guidelines for Interpreting the Policy for Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation	
I. Basic Expectations for Promotion and Tenure.....	11
1. Meeting and Exceeding Yearly Minimum Requirements.....	11
2. Hallmarks of Professional Accomplishment.....	11
3. Percentages of Effort.....	11
4. Typical Teaching Loads.....	12
5. Workload Reallocations.....	12
6. Consideration for Pre-Policy Productivity.....	12
II. Timing of Promotion and Tenure Decisions.....	12
III. Documentation.....	13
1. Teaching.....	13
2. Creative Activity.....	13
3. Service.....	14
4. Administration.....	14
5. Collaborative and/or Interdisciplinary Work.....	14
6. Synergy of Teaching, Creative Activity, and Service.....	15
Acknowledgements.....	15
Table 1: Department of Music Hallmarks of Professional Accomplishment in Teaching.....	16
Table 2: Department of Music Hallmarks of Professional Accomplishment in Creative Activity.....	17
Table 3: Department of Music Hallmarks of Professional Accomplishment in Service.....	18
Department of Music Student Opinion Data Worksheet.....	19

UND Department of Music Policy for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

I. General Music Department Philosophy of Evaluation

The UND Music Department Philosophy pertaining to evaluation at all levels, including the critical evaluations for promotion and tenure, embraces the University, College and Department missions. Specifically, the Music Department evaluates faculty according to their success in or suitability for teaching, creative activity, and service, as characterized by the following ideals —

1. Teaching

- To foster in students those abilities that contribute to all learning; skills of communication; habits of independent thought, analysis and judgment; and powers of imagination and creativity;
- To provide preparation for specific professions in the discipline of Music;
- To provide courses of study that cultivate a high degree of artistic performance, scholarship, and professionalism in our students;
- To promote ethical behavior in our students.

2. Creative Activity

- To engage in creative activity in music and related disciplines, in order to foster the advancement of knowledge and artistic expression.

3. Service

- To serve the Department, College, University, community, and profession.

II. Standards for Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation

1. Basic Expectations for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

a) The Department of Music adopts this policy and its accompanying *Guidelines for Interpreting the Policy for Faculty Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation*, to align with and interpret the promotion, tenure and evaluation standards of the University of North Dakota within the particular context of music as an academic discipline. In this regard, teaching, creative activity, and service, broadly defined and recognized as overlapping duties, are the three basic areas of expectation for each faculty member.

b) In fulfilling these expectations, faculty should meet the highest standards of professionalism and respect as well contribute to an environment within the Department of Music that facilitates our educational mission and each colleague's professional development. Effective and conscientious communication is perhaps the most important facet of professional behavior because it significantly affects the cohesive operation of the department. It is important in teaching, research, service and administration, and it will be evaluated in the context of all of these categories. Effective communication is difficult to document in a curriculum vitae or reflective statement because it must be demonstrated continuously and often in an *ad hoc* manner to students, fellow faculty members, staff, and other university personnel. Accordingly, professional behaviors will be assessed by the departmental evaluation committee and chair based on their collective knowledge and experience with the faculty member being evaluated. If a problem becomes apparent and consistent, the departmental evaluation committee will solicit and

document additional input from the relevant constituencies (staff, students, administrators, or other faculty). For the purposes of evaluation, documentation of unprofessional behavior should be provided to the review committee and chair at the time of evaluation.

c) Teaching, which in our department falls into three general categories—academic, applied, ensemble—typically forms the largest component of all music faculty loads. Therefore, it follows that teaching is an important part of all music faculty evaluation.

d) While faculty members with annual evaluation ratings of “meets expectations” will normally have a positive recommendation from the Department when applying for tenure/promotion, there is no guarantee that this will be the case. Factors arising during the final year of the probationary period may negatively affect the tenure/promotion candidate’s recommendation. The same is true for candidates for promotion to full professor. Additionally, elements of concern in yearly reviews, which otherwise meet expectations, when reviewed collectively in the tenure/promotion review, may result in the Department not recommending the faculty candidate for promotion/tenure.

2. Criteria for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

- a) It is the responsibility of the faculty member to collect, organize and submit relevant material to the Personnel Committee, other than external review letters (if required) which will be collected by the department chair.
- b) In pre-promotion and pre-tenure evaluations, a faculty member shall demonstrate that they are making progress toward promotion and/or tenure.
- c) By the time of their fourth annual evaluation, a pre-tenure faculty, member shall demonstrate marked teaching effectiveness consistent with expectations required for tenure and promotion to associate professor.
- d) By the time of the tenure and promotion review, pre-tenure faculty except music therapists as referenced below, should be full members of the UND graduate faculty. Music therapy faculty with master’s degrees and board certification in music therapy should be assistant members of the UND graduate faculty.
- e) In post-tenure evaluations, a faculty member, as appropriate to their sub-discipline, should demonstrate sustained engagement and productivity in the teaching, service, and creative aspects of music. This may include making specialized contributions to the Department of Music, the University and/or the discipline that only depth of experience allows.
- f) In reviews for tenure and promotion to associate professor or to teaching associate professor, if the evaluation standards have been altered during the probationary period, consideration will be given to the promotion and tenure policy in place at the time of hire. Similarly, in reviews for promotion to professor or to teaching professor, consideration will be given to the standards in place at the time of the last promotion. In both cases, consideration will also be given to the number of years a faculty member has served under the standards set forth in the most recent policy.
- g) For faculty in rank longer than six years, promotion evaluation will be based on the most recent six years in rank.

3. Timing of Promotion and Tenure Decisions, Annual and Triennial Evaluations

- (a) A tenure-track faculty member should seek tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor simultaneously. This normally occurs in the sixth year in rank. Non-tenure track Teaching Assistant Professors should normally seek promotion to Associate Teaching Professor in the sixth year in rank.
- (b) All evaluations shall take place as implemented by the Department in accordance with the schedule required by the Office of the Provost & Vice President of Academic Affairs and the College of Arts and Sciences.

4. Minimum Requirements for Promotion and Tenure

A. Teaching

- (1) At a minimum, and in accordance with the University standards for promotion, UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-5.1 & 5.2(A), and tenure, UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-8.1.1(3)(b) respectively:
<https://und.policystat.com/policy/13739728/latest/>
 - (a) tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or to Teaching Associate Professor requires marked teaching effectiveness;
 - (b) promotion to Professor or to Teaching Professor requires recognition for teaching excellence
- (2) An effective teacher seeks to develop a self-consciousness about teaching and learning and works to create opportunities or environments conducive to learning in students. An excellent teacher demonstrates a sustained record of marked teaching effectiveness. Indicators of teaching effectiveness may vary from teacher to teacher. Please see this explained in appendix A. *See* UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-5.2(A) for a discussion of effective teaching. Consistent with UND's Policy on Evaluation of Teaching (UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-4.3), teaching effectiveness in the Department of Music requires:
 - (a) respect for students and the learning process,
 - (b) careful preparation for class and other learning environments,
 - (c) appropriate command of the subject and/or breadth and depth of knowledge relevant to music and its associated disciplines,
 - (d) effective oral and written communication of this knowledge to students
 - (e) sustained effort in seeking opportunities for professional growth as a teacher

B. Creative Activity

- (1) At a minimum, and in accordance with the University standards for promotion, UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-5.1 & 5.2(B), and tenure, UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-8.1.1(3)(b) respectively:
 - (a) a grant of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or for promotion to Teaching Associate Professor, when creative activity is allocated load credit requires documented progress toward establishing a national reputation as a music educator, historian, theorist, therapist, performer, conductor, or composer. Indicators of this progress will differ according to sub-specialty, but all faculty, should provide a record of creative work that is productive, sustained, and includes:

- (1) two significant creative products (peer-reviewed or by prestigious invitation or sponsorship), one of which may be replaced by an aggregate of smaller peer-reviewed work at the national level, and
 - (2) other evidence of creative activity, in the nature of, but not limited to conference presentations, posters, book reviews, short commentaries or compositions, invited publications or performances, or less significant contribution to collaborative performances or publication. In the event that a faculty member researches and publishes a scholarly book during the probationary period, this work may be considered as equal to two significant peer-reviewed creative products.
- (b) promotion to full professor or to Teaching Professor, when creative activity is allocated load credit requires demonstrated recognition for creative activity at the national level. Indicators of this recognition will differ according to sub-specialty, but all faculty should provide a record of creative activity that is productive and sustained, and includes:
- (1) two significant creative products (peer-reviewed or by prestigious invitation or sponsorship) within the previous six years of service at rank, and
 - (2) other evidence of creative activity, in the nature of, but not limited to conference presentations, posters, book reviews, short commentaries, invited performances, or minor contribution to collaborative performances. In the event that a faculty member researches and publishes a scholarly book beyond the dissertation, this work may be considered as equal to two significant peer-reviewed creative products.
- (c) Terminal degree or its equivalent as defined by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) will be required for promotion to associate professor or to teaching associate professor, except for those faculty whose initial contract did not require such. Promotion to full professor or to teaching professor requires terminal degree or its equivalent as defined by NASM, except for those faculty whose initial contract did not require such.

C. Service. At a minimum, and in accordance with the University standards for promotion, UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-5.1 & 5.2(C), and tenure, UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-8.1.1(3)(b), respectively:

- (a) a grant of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor or to promotion to Teaching Associate Professor requires sustained contributions to the governance and educational mission of the Department of Music, the College of Arts and Sciences, and of the University as well as to the improvement of the discipline in ways that serves the community.
- (b) promotion to Professor or to promotion to Teaching Professor requires a demonstrated leadership role in serving the Department, the University, and the community.

III. Procedures for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation

These procedures follow the requirements of the University and the College of Arts and Sciences and govern the evaluation of all full-time non-tenure-track, tenured and tenure-track faculty in the Department of Music. They are designed to provide an orderly, transparent,

rigorous, and fair process for implementing this Policy. Interpretative ambiguities should be resolved in favor of the faculty member under review.

1. Reviewing Committee

The Music Personnel Committee, consisting of tenured faculty elected in the manner described in the Department of Music Bylaws, shall evaluate all full-time faculty in the Department of Music. For each faculty member, the Committee will forward its final report, along with the faculty member's Evaluation File, to the Department Chair, who will add a Chair's Statement and complete the departmental evaluation in accordance with the procedures required by the University.

2. Tenure and Professional Development Plans for Tenure-eligible Faculty

(a) By the end of the first year of tenure-eligible service, each pre-tenure faculty member, in consultation with the Chair, should devise an initial plan for fostering the faculty member's professional development. This initial plan will articulate goals for teaching, research/creative activity, and service in the first three years at UND. At the end of the third year the pre-tenure faculty member will develop, in consultation with the Chair, a new three-year plan, which articulates the goals for teaching, research/creative activity, and service in the fourth through sixth years at UND. Both the first through third year and the fourth through sixth year plans should be developed in a way that is consistent with the long-range goal of achieving promotion and tenure. When consulting with the Chair on a Tenure and Professional Development Plan, faculty members hired with tenure credit should be aware that no work completed before their employment at UND will count toward tenure and promotion. Unless otherwise stated in the hiring Letter of Understanding (LOU).

(b) The Tenure and Professional Development Plan is advisory only and can be revised as the faculty member's professional career develops. The Professional Development Plan will serve to highlight long-term work expectations as well as to assist the Chair and faculty member in facilitating their professional development in accordance with both individual and institutional goals.

3. The Promotion, Tenure, or Annual Evaluation File

(a) Department Personnel Committee Evaluation Schedule Announcement. As soon as practicable after the fall semester's start, the chair of the Personnel Committee shall announce the schedule by which faculty members will be evaluated during the coming academic year and the associated Evaluation File Closure dates. Normally, file closure dates are set with reference to the date that the Department's evaluation materials are due to the Dean. Those faculty members going up for promotion must also comply with the process mandated by the Provost and the College, which normally requires initiation in the previous spring.

(b) Relevant File Materials. The faculty member being evaluated has the responsibility to assemble their file.

(i) For annual evaluation of full-time faculty (including those on, and returning from developmental leave), materials should be included for the period since the last evaluation. For first-timers, materials should be included for the period beginning with their UND start date.

(ii) In evaluations for tenure and promotion to associate professor, materials should be included that cover the entire probationary period.

(iii) In evaluations for promotion to the rank of Professor or Teaching Professor, materials from the entire period as Associate Professor or Teaching Associate Professor may be included, but in cases where the faculty member has spent longer than six years at the rank of Associate Professor or Teaching Associate Professor, review will be given to the last six years.

(c)External Review Letters. Faculty with creative activity in load during the six years prior to going up for tenure and for promotion will provide three external letters in support of said tenure and/or promotion. Writers of these letters of reference should be professors of significance who are, or who have been tenured in the particular musical field of the tenure/promotion candidate. Their letters should address the tenure/promotion candidate's accomplishments in relation to the standards for creative activity as set out in the *Department of Music Policy for Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation*. To that end, letter writers will be given a copy of said policy, along with the curriculum vitae of the candidate. The ideal external letter of reference is from an authority in the appropriate musical field and is someone who knows the candidate well enough to highlight their creative accomplishments and to address the unique aspects of the candidate's career. External letters of reference should be solicited by, and sent directly to, the Music Department Chair no later than July 31st of the year in which tenure and/promotion is sought. For promotion of full-time non-tenure track faculty, external letters are required only if the faculty member has creative activity in load. For faculty without creative activity in load, external letters are not required. Information regarding external review letters can be found at: https://arts-sciences.und.edu/files/docs/collegetrppolicy_final_may2018.pdf.

(d)File Closing Date. All materials put together by the faculty member being evaluated shall be delivered in the manner described in below no later than 4:30 p.m. on the scheduled Evaluation File closure date.

(e)File Contents. By or before the file closing date, the faculty member should upload as a single PDF document to the Department's Faculty Evaluation website, all materials in the order required by the College of Arts and Sciences, except for the evaluation form and related reappointment, promotion and tenure forms, if applicable. These forms will be included after they have been completed and signed. Checklists delineating the materials required by the College and their order may be found on the College of Arts and Sciences web site.

(1) The Department requires a narrative self-evaluation for all levels of review, describing the faculty member's activities during the evaluation period as they relate to the relevant standards for their rank or desired rank as defined in this Policy,

(2) Faculty with creative activity in load must provide evidence of said creative activity in summary form (e.g., copies of: the first page of publications, compositions and printed recital/concert programs, the program entry for presentations, the recording jacket or liner notes for recordings) completed in the period under review shall be provided.

(3) All full-time faculty up for annual evaluation must provide a copy of their Academic Record supplement, which has been created in Digital Measures. All faculty are encouraged to maintain and regularly update their curriculum vitae,

according to the format required by the VPAA, as this is required for tenure and promotion.

(4) The Department Personnel Committee will provide each faculty member with a student evaluation of teaching in summary form by means of the Departmental Student Evaluation Worksheet. (See p. 16). This Worksheet is completed with data generated from the faculty member's SELFI forms. Apart from exceptional circumstances (which the faculty member must explain), this summary data should reflect all UND courses taught during the pertinent evaluation period. The only exception is for applied lesson courses. Since these often involve small numbers of students, applied studio teachers should seek student input for their teaching of applied lessons through having students complete the Studio Class (STC) SELFI in lieu of the SELFIs for each level of lesson.

By or before the file closing date, the faculty member should also upload to the Department's Faculty Evaluation website, the following supplementary materials:

- (1) syllabi for all courses taught during the period of review
- (2) representative course documents (e.g., assignments, tests, exams)
- (3) representative student products (may be written or recorded)
- (4) if creative activity is in load, more complete evidence of creative activity as appropriate to sub-discipline (e.g., copies of papers, links to recordings, compositions, presentations—text, Powerpoint, or recording, recital programs, reviews)

Faculty members may upload additional supplementary materials to document aspects of work their feels are not addressed in the required documentation (e.g., informal student feedback on teaching as delineated in the UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §II-4.3.5; unsolicited written approbations of one's work in creative activity, teaching, or service).

Based on prior evaluations, the committee may require additional documentation, especially if there are specific concerns about a faculty member's performance. This may include, but is not limited, to documented data based on formal observation of classroom teaching by the chair and/or faculty peers.

(f) Self-Assessment Narrative. The narrative is the faculty member's opportunity to provide a context within which their accomplishments can be correctly interpreted. As such, it should not be a mere reiteration of the curriculum vitae for the period under review, but it should represent thoughtful consideration of the faculty member's work. For tenure and promotion reviews, an upper limit of 10 single-spaced pages (using 12-point font) is recommended. For annual reviews, an upper limit of 5 pages (using 12-point font) is recommended.

(1) The self-assessment narrative should be organized under headings reflecting areas of responsibility in the position description: for example, teaching, creative activity, and service (for tenured and tenure-track faculty) OR teaching and service (for most full-time special appointment faculty). An introduction and conclusion may be included if desired. The service section should address any activities related to either professional contributions or a demonstrated spirit of concern for society. With appropriate explanation, any evidence offered to

support one area of faculty work (i.e., teaching, creative activity, or service) may also be offered as evidence of work in either or both of the other two areas.

(2) The narrative, including any anecdotal information it contains, is itself part of the faculty member's supporting evidence. In the narrative, the faculty member should explain their activities in such a way that the evaluating committee can determine whether and how they have satisfied the pertinent evaluation criteria based on the percentages in their contract. Any variance from the governing criteria should also be addressed and put in appropriate context.

(3) Of particular importance, especially in the teaching section, is whether the self-assessment evidences thoughtful reflection on the faculty member's experiences. The narrative should grapple with any pedagogical issues arising over the period of the review. A genuine discussion of shortcomings or of less than stellar performance in any area of responsibility, especially when coupled with planned strategies for addressing them, can be very helpful to the Committee's assessment and provide evidence of teaching effectiveness.

4. The Committee's Review of the File. Once the file closes, the Committee will review the submitted materials. The Committee may ask questions of the faculty member, seek additional materials, or ask to meet with the faculty member about the file.

(a) Fourth Annual Evaluation Professional Development Meeting.

The fourth annual evaluation will include a meeting of the faculty member with the committee to discuss their professional development in light of the contents of their file and with special focus on the faculty member's Professional Development Plan.

(b) Subsequent Reports

(1) In the last evaluation prior to the faculty member's anticipated application for tenure, specific reference should be made to the tenure standards in §§I(2)(a) & (4) of this Policy.

(2) In promotion and tenure years, the Committee shall produce a detailed evaluation report showing, in more specific terms and with enumeration of faculty accomplishments, whether the faculty member has satisfied the pertinent promotion or tenure standards in §§I(2)(a) & (4) of this Policy.

(c) Faculty Review of the Draft Report

The Committee encourages correction of misstatements or misunderstandings of the file. A faculty member should discuss a perceived misstatement/misunderstanding by the Committee with the Department Chair, who will draw it to the attention of the Committee. The Committee will make the final decision on their portion (ratings and related statements) of the evaluation report.

5. The Chair's Review of the File. The Committee will forward its final report, along with the faculty member's file, to the Chair on or before the agreed-upon submission deadline. The Chair shall consider the evaluation made by the Personnel Committee as a recommendation but shall make their own evaluation and report based on the evidence presented in the faculty member's Evaluation File.

(a) Sharing Conclusions. If there is a markedly different conclusion regarding the faculty member's performance or potential, this should be discussed with the Committee.

(b) Faculty Review of the Evaluation Report. Once the Chair has finalized their section of the report, the Chair will share and discuss the entire report with the faculty member. Following that discussion, the Faculty member must complete their portion of the evaluation form (titled "Faculty Member"): 1. verifying that they have been given the opportunity to review the contents of their file, have seen the evaluation, and have discussed it with the chair, indicating that they either agree with the evaluation, disagree with all or part of the evaluation, or disagree with all or part of the evaluation and intend to submit a written rebuttal. As stipulated on the form, if the faculty member chooses to submit a written statement of rebuttal, this statement must be given to the Chair within 5 working days. It will be included with the evaluation report in the faculty member's file. See generally UND FACULTY HANDBOOK §§ II-5 & II-8, respectively, for appeals of the final promotion or tenure decision.

6. Salary Evaluation.

(a) Merit Recommendations. Merit recommendations for full-time faculty shall be calculated through application of the following procedure, which is intended to minimize skewing based on load allocation, the types of courses taught or the types of research or creative endeavors, which vary widely.

The Chair shall apply this procedure in years where merit pay is allocated. The Chair will forward the resulting merit recommendations to the Dean, who will make the final determination on salary increases.

UND Music determines merit pay recommendations for faculty using two factors: Percentage of a faculty member's current salary, and annual evaluation ratings. Salary percentage determines 60% of the merit pool, and evaluation ratings determine 40%. Calculations are done by means of a spreadsheet.

If there are separate merit pools for various classifications of faculty, such as tenured/tenure track versus special appointment, then calculations are done separately for each merit pool.

The salary percentage portion is determined by calculating the deviation of a given salary from the Department average. For instance, a salary that is the average of the department has a deviation of 1. A salary that is 10% higher than the department average has a deviation of 1.1. A salary that is 10% lower than the department average has a deviation of 0.9.

The evaluation rating portion is determined by assigning a point system to the ratings of "Significantly Exceeds Expectations", "Exceeds Expectations", etc. on the Faculty Evaluation Forms for that year, using the average between the Personnel Committee and Department Chair ratings. The current point system is 3-2-1-0-0 from best to worst rating. These ratings are multiplied by the percentage allocated to the category in the faculty member's contract, using percentages, not fractions of 1. Summed results will be between 0 and 300 for the above point system. These results, called "scores", are divided into four to five zones, (i.e. 0-3 or 0-4), with 0 being reserved for faculty with a score of 0 or near 0. Zones 1-3 are assigned based on increasing scores, clumping together scores where possible. Faculty in equal zones receive equal merit raises from this portion of the pool. Not every zone need be used each year. The use of zones eliminates extreme skewing of final figures

due to outliers, a desirable outcome since these figures are based on a pool of merit funds for the department, meaning that each person's percentage of the merit pool affects every other person's percentage.

Note: If a faculty member's score is 0 in any contract category, then that portion of the salary is not to be included in merit calculations. The adjustment should happen in the Merit Pay Spreadsheet Column D, resulting in the need to adjust Column O for the remaining faculty members.

See Merit Pay Recommendation Spreadsheet Detail, p. 23 for an explanation of data input and calculations by row.

(b) Other Considerations. Concurrently, the chair will review all faculty salaries for discernible instances of: (a) inequity based on years at rank, and b) salary compression, in relation to i) national averages and ii) Arts & Sciences rank averages. Any disparities should be reported to the Dean of Arts & Sciences for appropriate action as they see fit.

7. Use, Confidentiality and Disposition of Tenure, Evaluation and Promotion Documents

All documents and records related to the evaluation, review, and promotion of faculty members are kept in password-protected files online and/or in the main Music Department office. They are not confidential and can be used by other faculty, administrators, or others who request access based on open records law. The documents are used for the purpose of making evaluation, merit, review, and promotion decisions; and to track performance over time. Upon discontinuation of employment with the University of North Dakota, all personnel documents are retained and/or disposed of per university procedures.

UND Department of Music Guidelines for Interpreting the Policy for Faculty Promotion, Tenure and Evaluation

I. Basic Expectations for Promotion and Tenure

1. Meeting and Exceeding Yearly Minimum Requirements

In compliance with the procedure set forth in the *Faculty Evaluation Form Tenure, Tenure Track, NonTT (i.e. special appointments and instructors included)*, each faculty member's performance is evaluated yearly according to the following five categories relative to the expectations of their Position Description:

- i. *Exceptional Performance*: Designation used in extremely rare cases where the faculty member merits special recognition for unequivocally superior and exceptional performance (i.e., worthy of national, international, or professional award nominations). Strong supporting evidence showing external validation must be presented in the narrative.
- ii. *Exceeds Expectations*: Designation used to indicate that certain aspects of the faculty member's performance substantially and frequently exceed that described in their position description. Supporting evidence must be presented in the narrative.
- iii. *Meets Expectations*: Designation used when the faculty member's performance is of high quality, fulfills expectations, and periodically may exceed them as described in their position description.
- iv. *Requires Development*: Designation used to indicate that certain aspects of the faculty member's performance does not consistently meet expectations and require improvement. The narrative must address specific areas that need improvement and include goals to get there.
- v. *Unsatisfactory*: Designation used in cases where work is below the basic requirements of Page 2 and improvement is required, are not meeting professional obligations, or are simply incompetent. Strong supporting evidence must be presented in the narrative.

2. Hallmarks of Professional Accomplishment

For evaluation purposes, the Music Department recognizes hallmarks of professional accomplishment associated with meeting expectations, exceeding expectations, and exceptional performance in teaching, creative activity and service. These hallmarks as delineated on Tables 1, 2, and 3, are applicable to any faculty rank, although the likelihood of exceeding these expectations or demonstrating exceptional performance is likely to vary throughout one's career. The purpose of the tables is to provide a sense of the importance of specific activities based on the previous experience of senior faculty in the Department and, in general, the items listed within an area of faculty responsibility are listed from higher to lower relative importance. It should be noted, however, that it is easier to agree on what is at the top of these lists, rather than specific rankings of items lower on the lists. Furthermore, it is possible to be categorized as meeting expectations, exceeding expectations or demonstrating exceptional performance without achieving all of the hallmarks in that category. In the end, a preponderance of the evidence must support a given evaluation and placement.

3. Percentages of Effort

The relative expected contribution of individual faculty members in teaching, creative activity, and service will be reflected in the annual Position Description and the

associated percentage of effort in the respective areas of faculty responsibility. A faculty member's percentages of effort as delineated in their Position Description should be keyed to the minimum requirements for promotion and tenure in order to assist the faculty member in achieving them as the policy requires. Thus, the percentages set should help to foster the professional development of each faculty member in accordance with their academic responsibilities and interests, and should be recalibrated, as necessary, to facilitate progress towards promotion and tenure.

4. Typical Teaching Loads

In the Department of Music, each tenured or tenure-eligible faculty member typically teaches a five to six course load annually (three-credit courses or their equivalent). The position description percentage allocations to teaching typically range from 60-70%; the allocations to creative activity typically range from 20-30% and service is typically allocated 10%. Non-tenure-track teaching faculty typically teach an eight-nine course load annually (three-credit courses or their equivalent). Their position description percentage allocations to teaching typically are 90% and their service allocation is 10%. The tables delineating the hallmarks of professional accomplishment were established with these percentage allocations in mind. Where the percentage of effort for a particular area deviates from the departmental norm, this shall be taken into consideration when evaluations are made. Finally, although the hallmarks for not meeting expectations are not listed in Tables 1, 2 and 3, it should be apparent that such an individual would not be achieving the hallmarks and the more hallmarks they fail to meet, the more they are likely to move from requires development to unsatisfactory.

5. Workload Reallocations

Consistent with available resources and the Department of Music's institutional obligations, every effort should be made to offer each faculty member a workload reallocation in the areas of teaching, research, or service, or any combination thereof, to facilitate a faculty member's professional development. This reallocation is particularly important in pre-tenure years but should also be used to promote professional development in post-tenure years. Receiving a workload reallocation does not relieve a faculty member of meeting the minimum requirements for promotion or tenure.

6. Consideration for Pre-Policy Productivity

For faculty hired before adoption of the current policy, the Department's Personnel Committee shall take into account the fact that a portion of the faculty member's productivity occurred before the Faculty's adoption of the express requirements in this policy. Where applicable, any faculty member seeking advancement may provide, and the Personnel Committee shall consider, information concerning pre-policy expectations.

II. Timing of Promotion and Tenure Decisions.

Seeking tenure and promotion in the sixth year of rank is in accordance with University policy (which also provides for early tenure in exceptional cases). The Department's Policy for Faculty, Tenure, Promotion, and Evaluation has been developed with this six-year time frame in mind and reflects the amount of time it typically takes for a Music faculty member to develop a record of teaching effectiveness, creative production, and service activity rich enough to satisfy the criteria of the rank sought.

III. Documentation

1. Teaching

Documenting teaching can be an elusive task, especially attempting to demonstrate the intangibles of personality and style as well as the nature and extent of student learning. Nonetheless, each faculty member should do their best to demonstrate satisfaction of the five requirements of teaching effectiveness (see II. 4. A. 2.) in accordance with the governing criteria. In demonstrating said teaching effectiveness, a faculty member might provide evidence in their narrative and or supplementary materials of their efforts to:

- a. create engaging learning environments,
- b. engage in innovative teaching methods and to take pedagogical risks (which in fact may fail),
- c. listen deeply and actively to students,
- d. maintain high, but reasonable, expectations for student accomplishment,
- e. provide students with appropriate supervision and feedback,
- f. assess students fairly and document successful student learning outcomes,
- g. model professional behavior in and out of class,
- h. be accessible outside of class,
- i. facilitate co- or extra-curricular learning, including counseling students, or advising student organizations,
- j. benefit from peer reviews or other formative assessments of their teaching
- k. engage in interdisciplinary exchange, such as visiting other classes on campus or working on teaching with colleagues from other departments,
- l. make use of the scholarship of teaching and learning in enhancing pedagogy, or
- m. balance workload demands, including new course preparations, substantial course revisions, carrying overloads, teaching courses outside areas of expertise or interest, or course size, especially in labor-intensive classes.

No particular mix of factors is required to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. The faculty member is also free to offer evidence of other indicators of effectiveness not mentioned in this list.

2. Creative Activity

The creative activity criteria for tenure and promotion are designed to clarify expectations, provide fair notice, and to encourage engagement within a broad spectrum of acceptable creative activity, including musical composition, musical arranging, musical editing, conducting and solo and chamber performance, as well as traditional scholarship. In this regard, in addition to more traditional forms of creative activity, the Department of Music continues to value the scholarship of teaching and learning, as well as interdisciplinary collaboration.

The tenure and promotion criteria for creative activity also seek to appraise overall output. Thus, determining whether a faculty member has satisfied these criteria involves a comprehensive and qualitative assessment of their body of creative activity, not a mere enumeration of creative products. In each situation, the faculty member bears the burden of showing how their body of creative activity satisfies the pertinent criteria.

Because creative products are not necessarily of equal weight, it is important for the faculty member to qualitatively assess the “value added” of each work and to demonstrate its degree of impact. In demonstrating the “value added” of each work, a faculty member may reference these or any other indicators of quality:

- a. the work's influence
- b. peer review or critique
- c. the work's originality, complexity, thoroughness
- d. the nature and prestige of the venue
- e. awards or other recognitions
- f. in collaborative work, the extent of their contribution.

Also relevant is the extent to which the creative experience itself contributed to the faculty member's development as a teacher, researcher, or professional.

3. Service

Because of its importance, service work should be more than merely delineated by committee name or project title. In demonstrating the value of service contributions, a faculty member may reference these or any other indicators of quality:

- a. the nature of the committee (or other) appointment (e.g., chair) or of the project undertaken
- b. the committee's workload or the project's requirements,
- c. the number of committee (or other) appointments or projects undertaken,
- d. the committee's accomplishments, or the faculty member's project accomplishments, or
- e. the impact of the committees' or the faculty member's work on the Department of Music, College of Arts and Sciences, University, profession, or community.

Documentation of quality for service may include copies of memoranda or reports drafted or revised and letters or e-mails from those who have worked on service projects with the faculty member. Aspects of administrative work could also be proffered to satisfy service requirements.

4. Administration

The Department of Music values excellence in departmental administration as it is integral to its commitment to shared governance. The Department has set minimum expectations required of faculty in areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service to qualify for promotion and/or tenure. In accepting an administrative position, faculty members may find it necessary to decrease their percentage effort on their position description in teaching, research/creative activity, and/or service to accommodate the administrative duties.

The Department Chair will consider and evaluate the performance of administrative tasks and submit a statement to the Personnel Committee for inclusion in their evaluation process. The Department Chair's work will be assessed by the faculty via a survey conducted by the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee sends a statement regarding those results to the Personnel Committee for inclusion in their evaluation process. The Dean is responsible for evaluating the Department Chair's administrative duties with input from the department.

5. Collaborative and/or Interdisciplinary Work

The discipline of music is highly multi-faceted. The Personnel Committee evaluates collaborations and interdisciplinary work with attention to local, state, regional, national or international profile as well as the amount of time invested in preparation and execution. The faculty member is responsible for providing clarity and documentation concerning their collaborative work.

6. Synergy of Teaching, Creative Activity, and Service

In the field of music, teaching, creative activity and service often naturally intertwine. If the faculty member engages in activities that cross these traditional boundaries, they must explain the overlapping nature of the work. This is particularly pertinent for tenured faculty for whom movement toward the integration of teaching, scholarship and service represents maturation in the discipline.

Acknowledgements

The Department of Music is grateful for the guidance given by faculty evaluation documents from other departments and institutions. In particular, this *Policy* and its accompanying *Guidelines for Interpretation* draw heavily on documents from the University of North Dakota's Department of Biology and School of Law and we would like to acknowledge this contribution.

Table 1
Department of Music Hallmarks of Annual Professional Accomplishment in Teaching

Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceptional Performance
Evidence of good quality teaching as demonstrated in course documents, student products, and the narrative self-evaluation	Evidence of excellent quality teaching as demonstrated in course documents, student products, and the narrative self-evaluation	Evidence of exceptionally high quality teaching (including well defined assessment procedures) as demonstrated in course documents, student products, and the narrative self-evaluation
Good student evaluations (75-84% of students indicate strongly agree or agree on all 4 aspects of teaching documented on the Student Opinion Data Worksheet)	Involvement in curriculum development/implementation and design of program assessment	Leadership in curriculum development/implementation and design of program assessment
	Excellent student evaluations (85-94% of students indicate strongly agree or agree on all 4 aspects of teaching documented on the Student Opinion Data Worksheet)	Superior student evaluations (95-100% of students indicate strongly agree or agree on all 4 aspects of teaching documented on the Student Opinion Data Worksheet)
	Successful procurement of intramural grants in support of teaching	Successful procurement of extramural grants in support of teaching
		Work is worthy of national, international, or professional award nominations or is clearly outstanding in the field

Table 2
Department of Music Hallmarks of Annual Professional Accomplishment in Creative Activity

Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceptional Performance
Active program of creative activity	Active, independent and productive program of creative activity	Vigorous, independent and productive program of creative activity
Making progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion as appropriate to rank and as described in this Policy §II.4.B.1 (a) and (b), or in the case of full professors, documentation of continuing activity within the discipline	Accelerated progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion as appropriate to rank and as described in this Policy §II.4.B.1 (a) and (b), or in the case of full professors, documentation of continuing activity within the discipline at a rate beyond that required in their position description	Greatly accelerated progress toward meeting the criteria for promotion as appropriate to rank and as described in this Policy §II.4.B.1 (a) and (b), or in the case of full professors, documentation of continuing activity within the discipline at a rate significantly beyond that required in their position description
		Work is worthy of national, international, or professional award nominations or is clearly outstanding in the field

Note – The faculty member should provide documentation of this with page proofs, letter from the journal editor, etc. Publications are counted toward expectation when “in press” because of the lag time for actual publication to occur.

Table 3
Department of Music Hallmarks of Annual Professional Accomplishment in Service

Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Exceptional Performance
Effective participation in the service missions of the department, college, university, and community as appropriate to rank	Effective involvement in the service missions of the department, college, university, and community as appropriate to rank	Active and extensive involvement, including leadership roles in the service missions of the department, college, university, and community
Effective advisement of students	Effective advisement and counseling of students	Recognized by peers for effective advisement and counseling of students
Membership in professional organizations	Active involvement beyond membership in professional organizations	Leadership in significant professional organizations
	Significant contributions to the professional development of others	Recognized by peers for the advancement of the professional development of others through mentoring
		Work is worthy of national, international, or professional award nominations or is clearly outstanding in the field

Department of Music Student Opinion Data Worksheet*

Faculty Member: _____

Academic Year: _____

Effective in Promoting Student Learning			
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Course	# of SELFI Responses	SELFI % strongly agree + agree	Weighted SELFI % (Column A x Column B)
Totals			

Divide your Column C Total by your Column A Total

This is the % of your students who agree or strongly agree with this item.

Report that number here: _____

Treated Students With Respect			
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Course	# of SELFI Responses	SELFI % strongly agree + agree	Weighted SELFI % (Column A x Column B)
Totals			

Divide your Column C Total by your Column A Total.

This is the % of your students who agree or strongly agree with this item.

Report that number here: _____

Communicated Ideas/Information Clearly			
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Course	# of SELFI Responses	SELFI % strongly agree + agree	Weighted USAT % (Column A x Column B)
Totals			

Divide your Column C Total by your Column A Total

This is the % of your students who agree or strongly agree with this item.

Report that number here: _____

Course Well Organized			
	Column A	Column B	Column C
Course	# of SELFI Responses	SELFI % strongly agree + agree	Weighted USAT % (Column A x Column B)
Totals			

Divide your Column C Total by your Column A Total.

This is the % of your students who agree or strongly agree with this item.

Report that number here: _____

*The Department recognizes that no definitive conclusions can be drawn from data collected from classes fewer than 10. However, the Personnel Committee requests that such data be included in order that any trends in student opinion may be identified.

MERIT PAY RECOMMENDATION SPREADSHEET DETAIL

Merit Pay Spreadsheet explanation:

Column A: Faculty name

Column B: Salary. At the bottom are calculations for total and average salary for all faculty on the spreadsheet.

Column C: Calculate the percent of the total salary each individual salary is, as a fraction of 1.

Column D: Calculate each salary's deviation from the Department average: Divide the individual salary by the average salary.

Column E: Multiply column D by column F.

Entries in Column F (Base01%) are 1 divided by the total number of faculty on the list. They should all be identical.

Column G (Score): Take each contract category (Teaching, Service, etc.) and multiply the percent allocation (as number between 0 and 100, not a fraction of 1) by the rating scale (this year the rating scale was 0, 0, 1, 2, 3 from worst to best rating). Enter the total sum for each faculty member.

Column H (Zone): There are four or five zones, as described above. Assign a zone to each score in column G, looking for gaps, grouping together scores near each other into one zone where possible. Zone 0 should be reserved for faculty scores of 0 or near 0. Not all zones need to be used. Zones are dependent on how scores are distributed.

Column I (Base02%): Take the sum of all of the zone numbers in column H. Calculate 1 divided by this sum to get the entries in column I. All entries should be the same.

Column J: Multiply column H and column I.

Column K: Empty.

Columns L and M calculations are self-explanatory. Column L represents the salary adjustment portion, and column M represents the evaluation rating portion. The decimals in the headers of these columns indicate the portion of the total merit pool assigned to each. If these figures are changed, they must also be changed in the formulae for the column.

Column N is the sum of L and M. The figure at the bottom of the column is the sum of all of the entries. Ideally, this sum will be 1, but due to rounding, it likely will not be.

Column O contains the figures from column N rounded to the nearest thousandth, adjusted so that all figures in column O sum to 1. It will likely require several adjustments to achieve a sum of one. **THE FIGURES IN**

COLUMN O ARE PERCENT OF MERIT POOL, AS A FRACTION OF 1, FOR EACH FACULTY MEMBER.

A blank copy of the spreadsheet is available for faculty review on the Department shared drive.