

Guidelines for Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion

Approved by Faculty – October 18, 2016

Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs – May 10, 2017

Revisions Approved by Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs – July 10, 2019

Revisions Approved by School of Music Faculty and Director – July 15, 2021

Edited Revisions Approved by School of Music Faculty – August 20, 2021

Revisions Approved by the Executive Vice President and Provost – December 14, 2021

Revisions Approved by Faculty March 27, 2023

Revisions Approved by Faculty October 12, 2023

Approved by the Office of the Provost February 1, 2024

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction..... | 4 |
| 1.1. Preface..... | 4 |
| 1.2. Document Organization and Resources | 4 |
| 1.3. Statement of Performance Expectations..... | 4 |
| 2. Faculty Review Process | 6 |
| 2.1. Overview | 6 |
| 2.2. Review Schedule..... | 6 |
| 2.3. School of Music Evaluation Committees..... | 6 |
| 2.4. Evaluation Report | 8 |
| 2.5. Outcomes..... | 10 |
| 2.6. Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities..... | 10 |
| 2.7. Merit-Based Salary Increases..... | 11 |
| 2.8. School of Music Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching..... | 11 |
| 3. General Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Tenure-Track Review, Tenure, and Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty..... | 12 |
| 3.1. Overview | 12 |
| 3.2. Assistant Professor/Tenure-Track Annual Review Criteria..... | 12 |
| 3.3. Tenured Faculty Annual Review Criteria | 15 |
| 3.4. General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria..... | 18 |
| 4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion..... | 24 |
| 4.1. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor | 24 |
| 4.2. Teaching Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor | 24 |
| 4.3. Research/Creative Activity Criteria for Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor..... | 24 |
| 4.4. Service Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor | 26 |
| 4.5. Promotion to Full Professor | 26 |
| 4.6. External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates | 27 |
| 5. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation | 28 |
| 5.1. Overview | 28 |
| 5.2. Procedures | 29 |
| 5.3. Teaching..... | 29 |
| 5.4. Research and Creative Work..... | 30 |
| 5.5. Service..... | 31 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 6. Lecturer Faculty (All Ranks) and Professor of Practice Guidelines for Annual Review and Promotion | 31 |
| 6.1. Overview | 31 |
| 6.2. Lecturer and Professor of Practice Annual Review Criteria | 32 |
| 6.3. General Criteria for Lecturer and Professor of Practice Promotion..... | 34 |
| 7. Workload Policy and Definitions | 34 |
| 7.2. Workload Definitions..... | 34 |
| 7.3. Administrative Assignments | 35 |
| 8. Types of Review..... | 35 |
| 8.2. Annual Review/Tenure-Track Annual Review/Non Tenure-Track Renewal..... | 35 |
| 8.3. Tenure-Track 3 rd Year Review (Cumulative Review) | 36 |
| 8.4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Cumulative Review)..... | 37 |
| 8.5. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative Review)..... | 37 |
| 8.6. Promotion to Full Professor (Cumulative Review)..... | 38 |
| 8.7. Lecturer and Professor of Practice Promotion (Cumulative Review)..... | 38 |

1. Introduction

1.1. Preface

This document provides guidelines and criteria for evaluation of performance within the global field of music and in the many specialized fields within that category. It should be understood that allowances must be made for the emergence of new specializations as well as interdisciplinary creative, research, and performance possibilities when these apply to a faculty member's interests.

It is the responsibility of each faculty member to provide context and documentation for the significance and merit of the Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service activities under review, and clearly state how these activities meet the expectations defined in this document, and ways in which they may reflect and align with the UTRGV Strategic Plan. In turn, the appropriate committee and the Director will clarify that same significance to those outside the field of music who will also be making evaluations based on less familiarity with the scope of both the general and specialized fields.

1.2. Document Organization and Resources

- 1.2.1. This document is structured to provide specific criteria for Tenure-Track, Tenured, Professor of Practice, and Lecturer Faculty, as well as an overview of the review process. Faculty should also consult the following UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures and other UTRGV policies:
 - a. [UTRGV Handbook of Operating Procedures](#)
 - 1) [ADM 06-501 Faculty Workload](#)
 - 2) [ADM 06-503-Tenure-Track Faculty Appointments, Evaluations, and Reappointments](#)
 - 3) [ADM 06-504 Tenured Faculty Evaluation](#)
 - b. [UTRGV Best Practices for Creating and Revising Department Evaluation Guidelines for Annual Review, Promotion, and Tenure](#)
 - c. [Office of the Provost: Faculty Resources/Faculty Reviews](#)
 - 1) [Faculty Reviews](#): Pathways for Review Deadlines (updated each year)
 - 2) [Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines](#)
 - 3) [Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors in Practice and Clinical Faculty](#)
- 1.2.2. All of the criteria and procedures in this document are to be used in conjunction with the appropriate sections of the above policies and procedures. Faculty are also encouraged to consult the [Faculty Portfolio Tool Guide](#) and the [Faculty Portfolio Tool Support](#) links on the [Faculty Reviews](#) website for assistance using the Faculty Portfolio Tool (FPT).

1.3. Statement of Performance Expectations

- 1.3.1. **Unit expectations:** It is the expectation of the School of Music that the faculty shall consist of the most highly qualified persons available. Nothing in these guidelines shall be construed so as to prevent the School from acting within Regents, University, and College guidelines and policies in pursuit of this objective. School of Music faculty members are expected to:
 - a. Teach loads as assigned by the Director, in accordance with the faculty workload policy.

Some faculty members will teach a combination of studio and academic classes in accordance with the faculty workload policy.

- b. Provide advisement and mentorship to students as needed.
 - c. Develop and maintain a distinctive program of Research and/or Creative Activity that brings them national, and perhaps international, recognition in one or more areas of endeavor (Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty only).
 - d. Contribute in appropriate capacities of Service to their areas, the School, College, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, and in their professional fields.
 - e. Demonstrate a commitment to professionalism and to the University's mission and vision as outlined in UTRGV HOP Policies [ADM 06-106](#) (Faculty Rights and Responsibilities), and [ADM 06-503](#) which are guided by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) [Statement on Professional Ethics](#).
- 1.3.2. ***Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenure-Track Faculty:*** [ADM 06-503](#) states that UTRGV is committed to awarding tenure to *“those faculty whose work achieves a high standard of excellence and who demonstrate, through the performance of their duties, a sustained commitment to professionalism and UTRGV’s mission.”* The extended commitment inherent in the granting of tenure requires an established record of past achievement and the potential for future achievement. It is expected that each person awarded tenure will have demonstrated a meritorious level of achievement in the areas of Teaching, Research/Performance/Creative Activity¹ (hereafter known as “Research/Creative Activity”), and Service.
- 1.3.3. ***Standards for Acceptable Performance for Tenured Faculty***²: Tenured faculty in the School of Music must maintain a high standard of accomplishment in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that Teaching and Research interests and Service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement, and for the faculty member’s continued commitment to professionalism and UTRGV’s mission, remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the university. A tenured faculty member must achieve a rating of meets expectations (on a scale of exceeds expectations, meets expectations, does not meet expectations, or unsatisfactory) to indicate an acceptable level of performance.

If a tenured faculty member fails to achieve a rating of meets expectations or higher in Teaching, Research, or Service, the faculty member in conjunction with the Director of the School of Music will develop a plan to address the areas of concern. Continued failure to achieve an acceptable level of performance will result in a review by the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Committee and the forwarding of a recommendation to the Director of the School of Music. UTRGV HOP [ADM-06-504](#) (tenured faculty evaluation) states that two consecutive annual evaluations of “unsatisfactory” may trigger the Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation process.

¹ Other frequently used terms for Research/Creative Activity in the music discipline are “Research,” “Scholarship,” “Creative Work,” “Professional Achievement,” “Performance,” and other terms denoting research, Performance, and scholarly activity

² This paragraph addresses annual review standards after the faculty member has earned tenure. The continued failure to meet standards being judged by the annual evaluation committee requires the Director and Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation Committee to become involved.

- 1.3.4. ***Standards for Acceptable Performance for Lecturer Faculty and Professors of Practice:*** Lecturer faculty and Professors of Practice in the School of Music must maintain a high standard of excellence in the area of Teaching (as defined in the [Lecturer and Professor of Practice Faculty Criteria](#) section of this document), which is their primary responsibility, and in Service. Lecturer/Professor of Practice faculty are not expected or required to develop a Research/Creative Activity program. Lecturer faculty and Professors of Practice seeking promotion must demonstrate, through the performance of their duties, a sustained commitment to professionalism and UTRGV's mission.

2. Faculty Review Process

2.1. Overview

- 2.1.1. Annual Faculty Evaluation is the regular review process for assessing the work and professional accomplishments of faculty members. Each faculty member will submit a review dossier via the Faculty Portfolio Tool or to the Director (faculty on a one-year appointment) on the date indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines found on the [Faculty Reviews](#) page of the [Division of Academic Affairs Faculty Resources](#) website. This document details criteria and procedures for multiple types of faculty review: Tenured Faculty: Annual Review, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, and Promotion to Full Professor. Tenure-Track Faculty: Annual Review, 3rd Year Review, and Tenure and Promotion. Non-Tenure Track Faculty: Annual Review and Promotion. The various types of review are detailed under "Annual Evaluation Materials and Types of Review" at the end of this document.

2.2. Review Schedule

- 2.2.1. Each fall semester, all full-time faculty employed during the preceding year at UTRGV will submit a dossier for evaluation via FPT (first-year faculty will be evaluated in their second semester of employment).
- 2.2.2. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to submit materials that accurately and effectively document the member's activities in Teaching, Research/Performance/Creative Activity, and Service for the period of review under consideration. Note that all types of Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion evaluations should follow, with some variation, the format in FPT. Specific materials required for each type of review are listed in the "Types of Review" section of this document.

2.3. School of Music Evaluation Committees

At the department level, all faculty review dossiers will be evaluated by one of two committees: **The School of Music Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee** or the **School of Music Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation/Promotion to Full Professor Committee**. Elections for both of these committees will be held as needed at the end of the spring semester. Review committee membership will comply with the guidelines in [HOP ADM 06-503 and ADM 06-504 Appendix E](#).

2.3.1. School of Music Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee

a. Membership

The core of this committee shall consist of tenured faculty members who are appointed at least half time in the School of Music ([HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E](#)). Two full time lecturers shall also be elected to serve on this committee for the purpose of reviewing dossiers of full-time lecturers only. Members will be elected at the end of each spring semester as needed by a vote of all full-time faculty (members will serve a three-year term). All School of Music Faculty who are tenured at the time of the election are eligible to serve with the exception of the Director of the School of Music and Associate Deans, and all full-time Lecturer Non-tenure-track faculty of the appropriate rank (see 2.3.1.b.2) are eligible to fill the two Lecturer positions on the committee. This committee, including non-tenure-track members, shall serve as the Guidelines Committee for the School of Music, which will revise and update the School of Music Guidelines for Annual Review, Tenure, and Promotion as needed.

Guidelines must be reviewed at least once every six years.

b. Membership Rules

- 1) The committee will be comprised of at least one-third of the tenured faculty members in the School of Music for that academic year ([HOP ADM 06-503 and 06-504 Appendix E](#)) and two full-time lecturers. *Note that this refers to the number of tenured faculty anticipated in the upcoming Fall semester, rather than at the time of election.*
- 2) All members must be tenured at the rank of Associate or Full Professor, except for the two full time lecturers serving to review lecturer dossiers only, who must be at a rank of Lecturer III, Senior Lecturer. School of Music Elections for this committee must be structured to ensure that an appropriate number of committee members are of a rank and title to be eligible to review the necessary number of faculty dossiers as per Appendix E.
- 3) Each committee member will be elected to a three-year term, and terms will be staggered to ensure continuity. Committee members are eligible for reelection to the committee two academic years after completing a term. All eligible School of Music Faculty are automatically nominated for election; however, faculty will be given an opportunity to decline that nomination before the vote.
- 4) If a committee member chooses to step down or is otherwise unable to complete his or her term, a special vote will be held to elect an eligible faculty person to complete the term. The faculty person completing the partial term would be eligible for election to a full term once the partial term is complete.
- 5) Each year, the committee will elect a Chair and, if appropriate, a Co-Chair, following their election in May.

c. Responsibilities

The committee is responsible for reviewing dossiers for Annual Evaluation, Tenure and Promotion, Tenure-Track Annual Review (including 3rd year review), Lecturer/Professor of Practice review and Promotion, Non Tenure-Track Review, (dossiers for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation and Promotion to Full are evaluated by the Promotion to Full/Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation committee). The committee chair will also track committee membership rotation from year to year, and notify the Director of positions that need to be filled in upcoming elections. **The full one-third of tenured faculty are required to review all Tenure-Track Annual Review and Tenure and Promotion dossiers,** however, this committee may be split into sub-committees with a minimum of three

members in compliance with [HOP ADM 06-503 and ADM 06-504 Appendix E](#) for other types of review.

2.3.2. **School of Music Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation/Promotion to Full Professor Review Committee**

a. Membership

The committee shall consist of tenured faculty members at the rank of Full Professor who are appointed at least half time in the School of Music. All Full Professors are eligible to serve with the exception of the Director of the School of Music and Associate Deans. Members will be elected at the end of each spring semester by a vote of all tenured faculty members.

b. Membership Rules

- 1) **The committee will be comprised of at least three members or one-third of the faculty members at the rank of Full Professor in the School of Music for that academic year, whichever is greater** ([HOP ADM 06-503 and ADM 06-504 Appendix E](#)) *Note that this refers to the number of full professors anticipated in the upcoming Fall semester, rather than at the time of election.* Each committee member will be elected to a three-year term, and terms will be staggered to ensure continuity. Committee members are eligible for reelection to the committee two academic years after completing a term. All eligible School of Music Faculty are automatically nominated for election, however, faculty will be given an opportunity to decline that nomination before the vote.
- 2) All members must be tenured at the rank of Full Professor.
- 3) Each year, the committee will elect a Chair following their election in May.

c. Responsibilities

The committee is responsible for reviewing dossiers for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation and Promotion to Full Professor. All other dossiers are evaluated by the Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee.

2.3.3. **General Committee Responsibilities** (adapted from [ADM 06-503 / 06-504 Appendix E](#))

- a. All faculty and administrators involved in the annual review process are responsible for reading all annual review materials, reviewing and evaluating the faculty member's performance thoroughly based on the School of Music criteria, participating in committee discussions, and formulating committee recommendations.
- b. Abstentions should be used only in limited, unusual circumstances, such as a conflict of interest.
- c. Absentee voting is not permitted.
- d. All those involved in the faculty review process shall adhere to the highest standards of ethical and professional conduct; shall focus on factual information; avoid practices that would conflict with the ability to be fair and unbiased; and shall guard against inaccuracies caused by either undue emphasis or omission of information.
- e. All individuals involved in the faculty review process are expected to maintain the confidentiality of the material under review, the substance of review committee discussions, and the final recommendation.

2.4. Evaluation Report

- 2.4.1. Each level of review at the department level will prepare independent evaluation reports (ratings and comments) on each respective faculty member using the Faculty Portfolio Tool. The faculty

member will have the opportunity to review these reports at each level and submit requests for reconsideration via FPT according to the timeline indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines.

- 2.4.2. The reviewers will base the evaluation of each faculty member on criteria according to that faculty member's rank, defined workload, and type of review ([Tenure-Track](#), [Tenured](#), or [Lecturer/Professor of Practice](#)). Evaluation of each category will consider, on balance, both the quantity and quality of work. The Evaluation Report will include a single rating for area of evaluation according to the following scale:
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
 - 3 – Meets Expectations
 - 2 – Does Not Meet Expectations
 - 1 – Unsatisfactory
- 2.4.3. Faculty will also receive an Overall Rating, determined by the ratings in the three evaluation areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Activities, and Service as appropriate to rank. The Overall Rating will be calculated as follows (note that these calculations are different for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty and Lecturer/Professor of Practice Faculty):
- 2.4.4. **Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty** – The Overall Rating for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty will be calculated as follows:
- **Exceeds Expectations:** Faculty must have a “4 – Exceeds Expectations” rating in two of the three areas, and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or “4 – Exceeds Expectations” in the third area.
 - **Meets Expectations:** Faculty must have at least a “3 – Meets Expectations” in two areas and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in the third area. **In the case of a faculty member having received a “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations.”**
 - **Does Not Meet Expectations:** Faculty member received a rating of at least “3 – Meets Expectations” in two areas, and a rating of “1 – Unsatisfactory” in the third area. Alternatively, the faculty member may have received a rating of “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in two areas.
 - **Unsatisfactory:** Faculty member received ratings that do not qualify for a “Does Not Meet Expectations” rating.
- 2.4.5. **Lecturer Faculty and Professors of Practice** – The Overall Rating for Lecturer/Professor of Practice Faculty will be calculated as follows (Note that these faculty will be evaluated primarily on Teaching, with a secondary emphasis on Service. Research and Creative Activity will not be considered in the overall rating. *Lecturers must achieve a rating of “Meets Expectations” in Teaching in order to achieve an overall rating of “Meets Expectations.”*):
- **Exceeds Expectations:** Faculty must have a “4 – Exceeds Expectations” rating in Teaching, and a “3 – Meets Expectations” or higher in Service.
 - **Meets Expectations:** Faculty must have at least a “3 – Meets Expectations” in Teaching and in Service.
 - **Does Not Meet Expectations:** Faculty member received a rating of “2 – Does Not Meet Expectations” in one or both areas of evaluation (Teaching and Service).
 - **Unsatisfactory:** Faculty member received ratings that do not qualify for a “Does Not Meet Expectations” rating.
- 2.4.6. The evaluation report will include a narrative for each area of evaluation (Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, or Service) assessing the faculty member's activities, providing

feedback and suggestions for improvement, and justifying the assigned rating. Reviewers will also include an evaluative summary, assessing the faculty member's overall performance during the period of review. Note that the function of the annual evaluation is both to assess faculty productivity and to encourage faculty development within the context of the faculty member's professional goals, such as tenure and promotion. The purpose of the annual review for tenure-track faculty especially requires an assessment of the progress in each successive year toward the total goals required for the faculty member to gain tenure. While the overall rating will be derived from the area ratings detailed above, both the reviewer and the faculty member should focus on feedback, suggestions, and the faculty member's development.

2.5. Outcomes

- 2.5.1. All ratings of "3 – Meets Expectations" or above (according to the ratings defined above) require no special action or sanction.
- 2.5.2. A rating of "2 – Does Not Meet Expectations" or "1 – Unsatisfactory" in any area of review is considered to be failing to meet academic responsibilities and requires further corrective steps, described below.
- 2.5.3. A faculty member has the right to request reconsideration of the results of an individual evaluation. Requests for reconsideration must be made in writing and submitted via FPT within 10 working days (see Pathways for specific timeline) of receiving the Evaluation Report. Requests for reconsideration must clearly explain the rationale for challenging the determination of the reviewer or review committee.
- 2.5.4. Each faculty member is encouraged to meet annually with the Director to discuss their productivity, evaluation, and expectations for the future. Such meetings are required for all Tenure-Track faculty members as part of the annual review process.

2.6. Ratings Failing to Meet Academic Responsibilities

- 2.6.1. Following the procedures outlined in UTRGV HOP [ADM 06-503](#) and [ADM 06-504](#) (Annual Faculty Evaluation):

If the annual performance evaluation raises concerns about the faculty member's performance in one or more areas, as indicated by "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory," this may indicate that the faculty member could benefit from additional support...A tenured faculty member whose overall annual performance evaluation is "Unsatisfactory" for two consecutive annual reviews may additionally be reviewed under the procedures described in HOP [ADM 06-504](#), Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. The decision to undertake a comprehensive performance evaluation outside of the normal time-frame of six years will be made by the Provost in consultation with the Dean of the college.

- 2.6.2. The School of Music Director shall consult annually with the Dean, and the Dean shall consult annually with the Provost, on the progress of any faculty member who falls within the category of overall failure to meet minimum academic responsibilities.

2.7. Merit-Based Salary Increases

UTRGV [HOP ADM-06-504 D.4.h.i](#) states that “*To be eligible for a merit pay increase, the faculty member must be in good standing, meet or exceed expectations, and meet the requirements outlined in the applicable merit guidelines.*” Merit funds, when available, will be awarded based on the outcome of the faculty member’s most recent Annual Review. Faculty receiving an overall rating of “Meets Expectations” or “Exceeds Expectations” will be eligible for a merit increase, and that rating will then be used to determine the merit calculation at the college level as per the college merit policy. In the event that UTRGV has not awarded a merit increase in an extended amount of time (two or more years), merit eligibility will be based on the College’s policy for multiyear eligibility, outlined in Section 3 of the Merit Distribution Policy.

2.8. School of Music Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching

- 2.8.1. The faculty member is responsible for identifying a peer observer and arranging for the date of the observation to take place. Note that the peer observer should be a UTRGV tenured faculty member, and can be a colleague from the School of Music, or from elsewhere in the university. All faculty should endeavor to provide peer observations from multiple peer observers during the period of review for Tenure and Promotion, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation/Promotion to Full Professor, Lecturer, and Professor of Practice Promotion. For more information, please refer to the [Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching](#) on the Academic Affairs Faculty Resources/Faculty Reviews website.
- 2.8.2. Tenure-Track and Lecturer/Professor of Practice faculty are required to submit at least one Peer Observation of Teaching each year (tenured faculty must submit these reports every three years). The peer observation process is intended to support faculty development and mentorship, and improve student learning.
- 2.8.3. A Peer Observation of Teaching consists of two parts: A Peer Observer Summative Report, written by a tenured colleague chosen by the faculty member, and a responding Faculty Member Report, written by the faculty member. There is not a prescribed format for these reports, however, regardless of the format, the reports should include the following:
 - a. Peer Observer Summative Reports (written by the peer observer) should include a description of the class visited (including the Name and Course Number and, if appropriate, details about the class format or modality), descriptions of the interactions between the professor and students, an evaluation of the success of the specific techniques used by the professor, and constructive advice for improvement.
 - b. Faculty Member Reports (written by the faculty member) should include a narrative describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation, thoughtful responses to the peer observer’s comments, and any plans for improvement or development.

3. General Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Tenure-Track Review, Tenure, and Promotion: Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

3.1. Overview

This section contains the School of Music criteria for Annual Review, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, and Promotion to Full Professor for Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty. Recommendations for Annual Faculty Evaluation, Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation, and progress towards Tenure and/or Promotion shall be based on the record of the faculty member in the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.

3.2. Assistant Professor/Tenure-Track Annual Review Criteria

3.2.1. General Criteria for Annual Review (Tenure-Track)

- a. The Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. See “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” below for more information.
- b. It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.
- c. Activities will be evaluated based on quality as well as quantity.
- d. The lists below in each category are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service as these emerge over time.
- e. Faculty in any particular area are not limited only to the Research/Creative Activities listed in that area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, write, edit, compose, publish, consult, record, and participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, it is assumed that each faculty member’s primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her current appointment. It is up to faculty and to the Director to clarify any changes in previous or current expectations.
- f. Tenure-Track faculty are typically assumed to be on a Research/Creative Activity-based workload (usually 60/20/20 or 60/30/10). Faculty who have elected to take a teaching-focused workload (usually 80/10/10), or have an administrative appointment that affects Teaching or Research/Creative Activity expectations, should clarify their workload/appointment and its effects in the applicant statement and in the appropriate narratives. See the [Workload Policy and Definitions](#) for further information.
- g. Note that it is up to faculty to provide evidence, justification, context, and documentation (if available) for a rating of “meets” or “exceeds” expectations in the following areas.

3.2.2. Teaching Criteria for Annual Review (Tenure-Track Faculty)

- a. Since Teaching is the primary component of a faculty workload in the School of Music (barring administrative appointments), faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible. ADM-06-503 states: “excellence in Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities or Service is insufficient grounds for promotion or tenure in the absence of effective teaching.” All full-time and part-time faculty are expected to demonstrate strong teaching effectiveness.

- b. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in Teaching through the following criteria:
 - 1) Teaching assigned course loads (as determined in the faculty member’s annual workload meeting with the Director).
 - 2) Providing and posting clear syllabi in compliance with UTRGV HOP policies.
 - 3) Receiving a positive annual peer observation of teaching and submit a faculty report reflecting on the observer’s feedback and addressing any suggestions and concerns. Lecturers, Professors of Practice, and Tenure-Track faculty must submit one summative peer observation every year by a tenured faculty-member. Tenured faculty submit one peer observation every three years.
 - 4) Receiving satisfactory course evaluations. An average of 80% or higher Agree/Strongly Agree answers on the five state-mandated questions, or a weighted average score of 4.0/5.0 for the year is recommended, although the faculty member will not necessarily be penalized for a lower score if they provide supporting explanations and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are encouraged to include all course evaluation reports with comments in the supporting documents for Teaching, and may wish to comment on specific student comments (positive or negative) in the Teaching Narrative.
 - 5) Demonstrating a commitment to maintaining a strong and active studio (applied faculty).
 - c. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of Teaching. Qualifying activities may include teaching overloads (uncompensated), mentoring student Research/Creative Activity, student successes at competitions/conferences, and other activities that contribute to student success and to the School of Music curriculum.
 - d. For specific Teaching activities and achievements, please see “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” below.
- 3.2.3. **Research/Creative Activity Criteria for Annual Evaluation (Tenure-Track Faculty)**
- a. Tenure-Track faculty are expected to make consistent progress towards the [Tenure and Promotion Criteria](#) listed below, and should be able to demonstrate that progress each year.
 - b. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in Research/Creative Activity through the following criteria:
 - 1) Academic Faculty: Academic faculty (Music Theory, Musicology, Ethnomusicology, Music Education) are expected to have published 2 major publications (minor publications or other activities that, cumulatively, establish a body of work that equates to 2 major publications in scope and reach, can also be considered to meet the criteria) over the six-year period of review. To meet expectations for the annual evaluation, academic faculty should demonstrate documentable progress each year of the review period, including research activities, paper submissions, research grant applications, (both submitted and successful), acceptances, conference presentations and other activities outlined below. Faculty are expected to be actively involved in scholarship and program building at local and regional levels as well as at national and international levels.
 - 2) Applied and Composition Faculty, Music Technology Faculty, and Ensemble Directors: Faculty in these sub-disciplines are expected to have a portfolio of 4 major performances/works by the end of the 6-year period of review. To meet expectations for the annual review, Tenure-Track studio and ensemble faculty should demonstrate documentable progress each year of the review period. This can include any of the Creative Activities listed below, or other activities appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline (please provide context). It is recognized that the pace of this activity may vary from year to year, however, the accomplishment of at least one major performance (as described

- above) is recommended, as well as consistent activity in regional and local performances.
- c. There are many ways that faculty may exceed expectations in the area of Research/Creative Activity, including activities beyond normal expectations in quality or quantity as related to the overall tenure and promotion expectation, and “beyond what is normal for the UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit.” ([HOP ADM 06-503 and HOP ADM 06-504 Appendix C](#))
 - d. For specific Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, please see “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” below.

3.2.4. Service Criteria for Annual Review (Tenure-Track Faculty)

- a. Service is an essential element of all full-time faculty in the School of Music. Faculty are expected to participate in policy making processes, curricular decisions, recruitment activities, audition evaluation, recital committees, outreach activities, and other essential undertakings that which contribute to the strength, growth, and educational impact of the UTRGV School of Music locally, state-wide, and nationally.
- b. Tenure-Track faculty should actively engage in area, departmental, and college/university, and professional service activities, particularly in the later stages of their Tenure-Track review periods (HOP ADM 06-503). However, Tenure-Track faculty should work with their faculty mentors, area coordinators, and the School of Music Director to ensure that they are not over-burdened with departmental service activities, and that their service obligations are appropriate in size and scope for a Tenure-Track faculty member establishing and maintaining a Research/Creative Activity agenda.
- c. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in the area of Service through the following criteria and faculty activities: attending and evaluating School of Music entrance auditions, providing academic advising each semester, participating in area initiatives, and engaging in appropriate recruitment activities³ to build and maintain an active studio (applied faculty). Tenure-Track faculty should also expect to serve on at least one departmental committee each year (the standing Junior Faculty Committee would be a good example), or other administrative duties, and are strongly encouraged to pursue opportunities for professional service. Note that the School of Music values the time and effort faculty dedicate to advising, recruitment, and other essential services to the school of music equally with the time and effort spent on committee service.
- d. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of Service, including service on multiple departmental committees and/or those that are particularly work- or time-intensive; college or university committee assignments; additional service duties assigned by the area coordinator; or additional service activities to the university or the profession. Factors pertaining to the relative impact and scope of service work (whether in number or by special significance) to students, any UTRGV academic unit, the community, the profession, and the UTRGV mission may be used to determine an “Exceeds Expectations” assessment rating.

³ The School of Music acknowledges that these recruitment activities will depend on the needs of the individual studio and/or ensemble, and will not be of the same quantity, type, or scope for all faculty members. Tenure-Track faculty should detail specific needs or circumstances in the Service narrative. For specific Service activities and achievements, please see “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” below.

3.2.5. **Assistant Professor Tenure-Track Faculty 3rd Year Review**

After completing the second full year of the review period, the faculty member will undergo a comprehensive review of the previous two years. This review should include information on Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service for all two years, and the self-assessment and narratives should contextualize the faculty member's progress towards tenure and promotion. The 3rd Year Review will be evaluated by the CFA College Tenure and Promotion Committee and the office of the Provost as well as by the School of Music Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee, School of Music Director, and Dean. Please refer to the Faculty Tenure and Promotion Policy ([ADM 06-503](#)) for more information.

3.3. *Tenured Faculty Annual Review Criteria*

3.3.1. **General Criteria for Annual Review (Tenured Faculty)**

- a. The Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. See "[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)" below for more information.
- b. It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.
- c. Activities will be evaluated based on quality as well as quantity.
- d. The lists below in each category are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service as these emerge over time.
- e. Faculty in any particular area are not limited only to the Research/Creative Activities listed in that area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, write, edit, compose, publish, consult, record, and participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, it is assumed that each faculty member's primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her current appointment. It is up to faculty and to the Director to clarify any changes in previous or current expectations.
- f. Tenured faculty are typically assumed to be on a Research/Creative Activity-based workload (usually 60/20/20 or 60/30/10). Faculty who have elected to take a teaching-focused workload (usually 80/10/10), or have an administrative appointment that affects Teaching or Research/Creative Activity expectations, should clarify their workload/appointment and its effects in the applicant statement and in the appropriate narratives. See the Workload Policy and Definitions section for further information.
- g. Note that it is up to faculty to provide evidence, justification, context, and documentation (if available) for a rating of "meets" or "exceeds" expectations in the following areas.

3.3.2. **Teaching Criteria for Annual Review (Tenured Faculty)**

- a. Since Teaching is generally the primary component of a faculty workload, faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible. ADM 06-503 states: "excellence in Research/Scholarship/Creative Activities or Service is insufficient grounds for promotion or tenure in the absence of effective teaching." All full-time and part-time faculty are expected to demonstrate strong teaching effectiveness. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in Teaching through the following criteria:
 - 1) Teaching assigned course loads (as determined in the faculty member's annual workload meeting with the Director).

- 2) Providing and posting clear syllabi in compliance with UTRGV HOP policies.
 - 3) Receiving a positive annual peer observation of teaching and submit a faculty report reflecting on the observer's feedback and addressing any suggestions and concerns. Lecturers, Professors of Practice, and Tenure-Track faculty must submit one peer observation every year. Tenured faculty submit one peer observation every three years.
 - 4) Receiving satisfactory course evaluations. An average of 80% or higher Agree/Strongly Agree answers on the five state-mandated questions, or a weighted average score of 4.0/5.0 for the year is recommended, although the faculty member will not necessarily be penalized for a lower score if they provide supporting explanations and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are encouraged to include all course evaluation reports with comments in the supporting documents for Teaching, and may wish to comment on specific student comments (positive or negative) in the Teaching Narrative.
 - 5) Demonstrating a commitment to maintaining a strong and active studio (applied faculty).
- b. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of Teaching. Qualifying activities may include teaching overloads, mentoring student Research/Creative Activity, student successes at competitions/conferences, and other activities that contribute to student success and to the School of Music curriculum.
 - c. For specific Teaching activities and achievements, please see "[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)" below.

3.3.3. **Research/Creative Activity Criteria for Annual Review (Tenured Faculty)**

- a. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in Research/Creative Activity through the following criteria:

Tenured faculty are expected to make consistent progress towards the [Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation](#) and [Promotion to Full Professor](#) criteria listed below, and should be able to demonstrate that progress each year. As noted under General Criteria for Annual Review, faculty on a teaching load or with an administrative appointment should document their Research/Creative Activity expectations as laid out in the workload meeting, and reviewers should consider these expectations in any subsequent reviews. To meet expectations in Research/Creative Activity, faculty are expected to meet the following criteria:

- 1) Academic Faculty: Academic faculty are expected to engage in scholarly activity that results in publication of original research in the form of books, chapters, articles, reviews, or critical editions of music. To meet expectations for the annual review, academic faculty should demonstrate documentable progress towards Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation and/or Promotion to Full Professor each year of the review period (see criteria below), including research activities, paper submissions, research grant applications (both submitted and successful), acceptances, conference presentations and other activities outlined below. Faculty are expected to be actively involved in scholarship and program building at local and regional levels as well as at national and international levels, with the expectation that tenured faculty will work to establish a national and/or international reputation in their field.
- 2) Applied, Composition, Music Technology, and Ensemble Directors: Faculty in these sub-disciplines are expected to show continued development and growth as well as increasing visibility in their scholarly or creative work. Tenured faculty should provide evidence of Research/Creative Activity in sufficient quality and quantity to show a continuing development of a national reputation; and faculty progressing towards promotion to Full

Professor should show evidence that they are developing a national/international reputation in their chosen field. To meet expectations for the annual review, tenured studio and ensemble faculty should demonstrate documentable progress each year of the review period. This can include any of the Creative Activities listed below, or other activities appropriate to the faculty member's discipline (please provide context). Faculty are expected to be actively involved in Research/Creative Activity at local and regional levels as well as at national and international levels.

- b. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of Research/Creative Activity, including activities beyond normal expectations in quality or quantity as related to the overall expectations for Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation and promotion to Full Professor, and "beyond what is normal for the UTRGV, discipline, unit, faculty rank, or any contractual expectations as defined by the unit." ([HOP ADM 06-503 and HOP ADM 06-504 Appendix C](#))
- c. For specific Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, please see "[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)" below.

3.3.4. Service Criteria for Annual Review (Tenured Faculty)

- a. Service is an essential element of all full-time faculty in the School of Music. Faculty are expected to participate in policy making processes, curricular decisions, recruitment activities, audition evaluation, recital committees, outreach activities, and other essential undertakings that ensure the strength, growth, and educational impact of the UTRGV School of Music locally, state-wide, and nationally.
- b. Tenured faculty are expected to provide increasing leadership and service to the School of Music, the institution, and the profession at the local, regional, national, and international levels as appropriate to the faculty member's chosen field. The School of Music defines meeting expectations for Tenured faculty through the following criteria and activities: attending and participating in School of Music faculty meetings, attending and evaluating School of Music entrance auditions, providing academic advising each semester, participating in area initiatives, and engaging in appropriate recruitment activities⁴ to build and maintain an active studio (applied faculty). Tenured faculty are also expected to serve the university on School of Music, College, and University Committees, contribute to Area and School of Music governance where needed, and mentor junior faculty when requested. Note that the School of Music values the time and effort faculty dedicate to advising, recruitment, and other essential services to the school of music equally with the time and effort spent on committee service.
- c. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of Service, including service through additional departmental committee assignments, college or university committee assignments, additional service duties assigned by the area coordinator, service to the profession at local, regional, national, and international levels as appropriate or additional service activities to the university or the profession. Factors pertaining to the relative impact and scope of service work (whether in number or by special significance) to students, any UTRGV academic unit, the community, the profession, and the UTRGV

⁴ The School of Music acknowledges that these recruitment activities will depend on the needs of the individual studio and/or ensemble, and will not be of the same quantity, type, or scope for all faculty members. Faculty should detail specific needs or circumstances in the Service narrative.

- mission will be considered in the faculty member's evaluation.
- d. For specific Service activities and achievements, please see "[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)" below.

3.4. General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria

- 3.4.1. The School of Music Review Committees, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. As stated above:
 - a. It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.
 - b. Activities will be evaluated based on quality as well as quantity.
 - c. The lists below in each category are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of creative-research work and teaching as these emerge over time.
 - d. Faculty in any particular area are not limited only to the Research/Creative Activities listed in that area. It is recognized that many faculty members perform, write, edit, compose, publish, consult, record, and participate in a wide variety of professional activities. Such breadth of activity is encouraged. However, it is assumed that each faculty member's primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her current appointment. It is up to faculty and to the Director to clarify any changes in previous or current expectations.
 - e. Note that it is up to faculty to provide evidence, justification, context, and documentation (if available) for a rating of "meets" or "exceeds" expectations in the following areas.
- 3.4.2. **Teaching**
 - a. Teaching activities/achievements and evidence of teaching effectiveness may include, but are not limited to:
 - 1) Level of achievement and success of current students
 - 2) Level of achievement and success of former students
 - 3) Maintenance of studio size and quality appropriate to the needs of the School of Music. (Applied Faculty)
 - 4) Student Course Evaluations (ratings and comments)
 - 5) Peer Observations of Teaching (see section on Peer Observations)
 - 6) Syllabi that comply with UTRGV policies and reflect required School of Music and/or Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
 - 7) Development of new courses, instructional programs, and teaching materials.
 - 8) Development and implementation of innovative pedagogies, delivery methods, and technologies that address distance, language, culture, and scheduling barriers, and improve access to courses across campuses and platforms.
 - 9) Written statements by colleagues
 - 10) Written statements by former students
 - 11) Teaching overloads or large class sizes, beyond workload assignment
 - 12) Coaching of UTRGV students in non-degree/off campus performances
 - 13) Piano accompanying for students in studio classes, juries/sophomore barriers, lab recitals, studio recitals, degree recitals, or choral/opera performances in compliance with the School of Music Workload Determination Document, the current Collaborative Piano Policies, and as assigned by the Director
 - 14) Teaching-related awards

- 15) Supervision of internal or external undergraduate and graduate scholarship and research (Engaged Scholar and Artist Awards, for example)
- 16) Development or publication of instructional materials
- 17) Mentoring, Advising, and Coaching Students academically and professionally
- 18) Development and implementation of experiential learning opportunities such as service learning, community projects promoting engaged research and creative works, internships/co-ops, or other experiential activities which enhance the academic experiences of UTRGV students and offer experience in future careers or advanced studies.
- 19) Grants or other competitive funding for instructional/pedagogical development
- 20) Attendance at professional development workshops focused on teaching tools and practices.

3.4.3. **Research and Creative Activities and Achievements**

- a. Research may include any of a wide variety of activities depending upon the field of specialization and the interests of the faculty member. It is expected that each faculty member will pursue research or professional activities appropriate to his or her field of specialization.
- b. When planning Research and Creative Activities, faculty may also consider prioritizing work that is aligned with the general mission and the UTRGV strategic plan of the university and collaboratively addresses cultural, scientific, technological, and socioeconomic issues of the region and the world. In addition, faculty could seek to foster sustainable community-university relationships to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activities while addressing critical societal issues and contributing to the public good.
- c. **Evaluating Quality, Impact, and Scope of Research/Creative Activity:**
Please note that evaluating performing, directing/conducting, composing, scholarship, and other Research/Creative Activities involves the consideration of many variable and subjective factors. The committee will evaluate Research and Creative Activity by quantity and, more importantly, by quality, impact, and scope. Evidence to be considered by the committee may include (but is not limited to): the reputation of the publication, conference, or performance venue (to the profession and/or to the specific area of activity); the peer-review/audition process or invitation (if any); nature of the audience/readership; size and selectiveness of funding award; or other factors such as the size or location of a performance or conference. Digital or live-streamed performances and presentations will also be considered using the same criteria. It is up to the faculty member under evaluation to make the case for the significance and merit of Research and Creative Activities under review, and ways in which they may reflect/align with the UTRGV strategic plan. Faculty should also be sure to contextualize activities for reviewers outside the School of Music.
- d. Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of Research/Creative Activity shall include, but not be limited to, activities in the following areas. Please note that faculty may have activities in more than one area (see General Criteria section above).
- e. **General Activities**
 - 1) Performances or Presentations at peer-reviewed conferences, and other scholarly or professional meetings (see scholarly activities for more detailed information)
 - 2) Publications in peer-reviewed media (see scholarly activities for more detailed information)

- 3) Invitations to present workshops or masterclasses at the regional, national, and international level as an invited guest artist/composer (The expertise of Applied Faculty is presented in a public format via master classes, much as researchers present their expertise in conferences. Invited masterclass presentations should then be considered in the Research/Scholarship category).
 - 4) Audio, video, or other digital media intended for professional distribution.
 - 5) Creation of new peer-reviewed educational resources (faculty must provide evidence of peer-review and evaluation of content)
 - 6) Securing external funding through grants and other sources. Funded grants that may be considered major research are typically large, externally funded grants made available to the faculty member by a state, national or international agency. Funded grants that may be considered minor research are normally smaller, internally funded grants from within the university. Successful and unsuccessful grant writing submissions will be considered contributions towards Research-Creative Activity.
 - 7) Performing or presenting at festivals, conferences, or significant events within the discipline (faculty who have an organizational role in these events should differentiate between Service activities and Professional Achievement activities, and clarify/itemize events that fall into more than one area of evaluation).
 - 8) Performances, Presentations, and Research that involve community-based partnerships with constituent groups at the local, regional, and national levels are also encouraged in support of the university's strategic plan.
- f. Performance Activities:** In the field of music, public performance is equated with publication and scholarly research and innovation. Factors such as repertoire, performance venue, critical review, the performer's role in the performance, and other variables listed above are considered when determining the major or minor status of performance activities. It is up to the faculty member under evaluation to make the case and provide evidence for the significance and merit of Research/Creative activities under review. Activities may include:
- 1) Solo/Chamber Activities
 - a) Solo performance with a large professional ensemble
 - b) Role (major or minor) in a professional vocal production
 - c) Recital or performance as a member of a chamber ensemble in a professional setting
 - d) Full-length or partial solo recital
 - e) Performance in recital as a collaborative artist with UTRGV faculty, Guest Artists, or other professional performances outside of general university duties.
 - f) Performance or lecture recital at a music symposium, conference, or institute
 - g) Performance as guest artist on a recital
 - h) Performance as soloist with a collegiate ensemble in a major work
 - 2) Ensemble Activities
 - a) Performance as an ensemble member in a professional ensemble of regional/national renown (note leadership roles such as principal chair or concertmaster)
 - b) Performance or role as a member of a community or semi-professional ensemble
 - c) Performance as a member of a festival or other ad hoc ensemble
 - d) A solo recording or a recording as a member of an ensemble
 - e) Any items listed under General Activities above

- g. Conducting/Directing Activities:** In the field of music, public performance as conductor or director is equated with publication and scholarly research and innovation. Factors such as repertoire, performance venue, critical review, and other variables are considered when determining the major or minor status of performance activities. It is up to the faculty member under evaluation to explain and provide available evidence for the significance and merit of Research/Creative activities under review. Activities may include:
- 1) Performances with university student groups outside of assigned teaching expectations such as international or national venues or other significant invited performances
 - 2) Premieres or interdisciplinary projects
 - 3) Collaborations with artists of national or international renown
 - 4) Guest conducting/clinician/directing appearances at other universities, public schools, all-state/region festivals, or professional ensembles/music societies
 - 5) Guest conducting, music directing, or stage directing engagements for opera/musical theater productions not included in teaching load
 - 6) Performances with university ensembles at local and regional off-campus events
 - 7) Commissions of new works for university or professional ensembles
 - 8) Serving as guest conductor/director on a faculty collaboration
 - 9) Any items listed under General Activities above
- h. Music Composition Activities:** One must consider many variable and subjective factors when evaluating the artistic merits of activities in Composition. In addition to the quantity of output, some of the considerations when determining major or minor activities include scope and significance of the project/work, performance venue, commissioning party, significance of performing ensemble/artist, publisher, recording company, and significance of conference, competition, or call-for-scores. It is up to the faculty member under evaluation to make the case and provide evidence for the significance and merit of Research/Creative activities under review. Activities may include:
- 1) Commissions, performances, or publication of musical compositions or arrangements
 - 2) Publication of books, articles, reviews, chapters in books, monographs, or digital media
 - 3) Presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional societies
 - 4) Audio, video, or other digital media of compositions or arrangements intended for professional distribution
 - 5) Invitations to adjudicate composition competitions/call-for-scores at regional, national, and international levels
 - 6) Any items listed under General Activities above
- i. Music Technology Activities:** Many Music Technology Activities align with the Music Composition Activities and Research Activities, as well as the general activities above. Below are some activities more specific to the Music Technology specialization. Some of the factors considered in the evaluation of Music Technology Activities include the impact of new technologies, the scope of distribution and use, value to the music community, and the originality of newly-developed technologies. Note that the creation of new musical interfaces, instruments, programming languages, and recording techniques/equipment should include documentable evidence of dissemination/publication (including any peer-review process), use, and evidence of value (including reviews or other peer evaluation) to the profession.

- 1) Creation and publication/dissemination of new software for composition, performance, education or pedagogy
 - 2) Creation of new physical musical interfaces or instruments
 - 3) Creation of new music programming languages
 - 4) Recording/Mixing/Mastering recordings for commercial use as well as collaborative projects
 - 5) Creation of new recording techniques or new recording equipment
 - 6) Projects involving film, video games, and art installations
 - 7) Any items listed under General Activities above
- j. Research Activities:** Scholarly research in music usually results in publication or the presentation of a paper, lecture, or work in digital media. The classification of the results of research as major or minor is based on several factors: the topic being considered and its relative scope and importance, the reputation of the publication or conference, the peer-review process (if any) the length, form and style of the final product; and the audience for whom it is intended. Activities may include, but are not limited to:
- 1) Publication as the author, co-author, editor, or translator of books, chapters in books, articles, reviews, monographs, scholarly editions, or digital media (documentary films, podcast series, and other public scholarship)
 - a) Book, monograph, textbook, book chapter, or work in digital media
 - b) A scholarly or performing edition of extant music
 - c) A scholarly article published in a refereed journal
 - d) A lengthy, scholarly article based on original research written for a major music dictionary or encyclopedia.
 - e) An article on a less substantial topic, published in a magazine or regional journal; a brief article based on widely available materials, written for a general dictionary or encyclopedia
 - f) A review of a book, edition of music, or work in electronic media.
 - g) Concert program notes
 - 2) Presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional associations
 - a) A scholarly paper or lecture selected by committee, presented at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional society
 - b) An invited paper or lecture presented at a meeting of a professional society or at another university.
 - c) A paper or lecture of lesser significance, presented at a state or regional meeting
 - d) A paper or lecture presented at a university function or an invited guest lecture in another School of the university.
 - e) A poster presented at a regional, national, or international meeting or conference.
 - f) Appearance as a guest lecturer or seminar leader on other campuses.
 - g) Development of Pedagogical Software
 - h) Public scholarship including Blog/Vlogs, podcasts, educational videos, and radio show publications.
 - 3) Any items listed under General Activities above.

3.4.4. Service Activities

a. Activities considered in the evaluation of Service may include, but are not limited to:

- 1) Recruitment and Student Retention Activities
 - a) Active and ongoing communication with prospective and current students by letter, telephone, e-mail, etc.
 - b) Developing opportunities to work with prospective undergraduate and graduate students
 - c) Active contact with public school and private instructors
 - d) Active involvement in the recruiting activities of the School of Music (providing information for databases, festivals, All-State, Institutes, Festivals, etc.)
 - e) Participating in the regularly scheduled audition days
 - f) Mentoring and coaching student groups
- 2) Student advising
- 3) Instrument inventory, recital lab coordination, or other organizational work
- 4) Serving on committees of the School, College and University
- 5) Administrative duties, including School of Music leadership, program coordinator, area coordinator, workshop or institute organizer, or other coordinating activity.
- 6) Serving as an advisor, lecturer, or speaker to continuing education groups, government agencies, citizens groups, educational or religious institutions, public radio and television stations, or charitable organizations at any level (Faculty must differentiate between Service or Professional Achievement).
- 7) Media appearances or contributions that promote School of Music or other professional activities.
- 8) Accompanying for university performances, rehearsals, or other activities which are not covered as part of a faculty member's teaching load or Research/Creative Activities, including student auditions, faculty searches, or other performance services to the university.
- 9) Organizing festivals, conferences, or significant events within the discipline (faculty who also have a performing/presenting role in these events should differentiate between Service activities and Professional Achievement activities, and clarify/itemize events that fall into more than one area of evaluation).
- 10) Service to the Profession
 - a) Active participation, elective or appointive leadership roles in professional associations, or attendance at professional meetings
 - b) Organizing conference workshops
 - c) Service on editorial boards of juried publications
 - d) Attendance at professional meetings
- 11) Other service activities to the university, community, and profession as described by the faculty member

4. Specific Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

The guiding principle with respect to Research/Creative Activity (and to a lesser extent Teaching) for the two primary stages of faculty advancement, Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Full Professor, should be that of seamless progress in the professional stature of the individual.

4.1. *Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor*

- 4.1.1. The School of Music is committed to awarding tenure to those faculty whose work achieves a high standard of excellence and who demonstrate a sustained commitment to professionalism, and to the development and mission of the School of Music and the University. Candidates seeking Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor must demonstrate a commitment to excellence and in the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service according to the expectations and criteria noted above, as well as evidence of development and growth throughout the six-year period of review.
- 4.1.2. The process and schedule for applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor can be found in the Pathways for Review Deadlines found on the [UTRGV Academic Affairs/Faculty Resources](#) website. Faculty applying for Tenure and Promotion, in collaboration with the Director, will need to supply External Reviews in the Tenure and Promotion dossier. The process and criteria for selecting and obtaining external reviews can be found in the School of Music External Review Guidelines in the last section of this document.

4.2. *Teaching Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor*

- 4.2.1. As noted above, Teaching is the primary component of a faculty workload in the School of Music (barring administrative appointments), and faculty applying for Tenure and Promotion must demonstrate a record of effective teaching. To meet this standard, candidates must consistently and successfully exemplify the criteria above, demonstrate that they have actively addressed any areas of concern noted in previous years' reviews (particularly if this has resulted in a rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" or "Unsatisfactory"), and should demonstrate a commitment to growth through faculty development, course innovations, studio development (applied faculty), evidence of improvements in student outcomes, and other evidence of student success.

4.3. *Research/Creative Activity Criteria for Tenure & Promotion to Associate Professor*

4.3.1. **Academic Faculty**

- a. Academic Faculty (Theory, Musicology, Ethnomusicology, Music Education) can be expected as a bottom line to have a portfolio of 2 major publications, over the six-year period of review. Minor publications or other activities that, cumulatively, establish a body of work that equates to 2 major publications in scope and reach, can also be considered to meet these criteria.
- b. These criteria may be met in a variety of ways. The following would all constitute reasonable records for academic faculty members seeking tenure- promotion, for instance, in Music Education:

- 1) Example 1
Article 1 – Journal of Research Music Education; Article 2 - Music Educators Journal; Conference Presentation at NAFME; Regional NAFME presentation
 - 2) Example 2
Book chapter in edited collection of music education essays in Spanish; Article 1 - International Journal of Music Education; Series of VLOGs on Music Education demonstrating a wide audience of followers (more than a few hundred); Regional NAFME presentation
 - 3) Example 3
Article 1 - International Journal of Music Education; Series of VLOGs on Music Education demonstrating a wide audience of followers (more than a few hundred); Pedagogical Software published as competitive educational software; Conference Presentation at NAFME
- c. The following example would not be considered an acceptable record for a music educator in the area of Research-Creative Work:
- 1) Example 4
Article 1 in a trade journal with regional impact; Article 2 in Music Educators Journal; Speaker at Texas Jazz Educators Symposium; Series of VLOGs on Music Education (95 followers)
 - d. While the above example (4) doesn't quite meet the standard of establishing a national reputation, it would not on its own be considered grounds for denial of tenure, but would require some exceptional achievements outside of the lack of publication. It is conceivable that an exceptional record as a teacher and an educator who is placing students in the community could be considered along with this less prominent research profile as grounds to award tenure.

4.3.2. **Applied Faculty**

- a. Applied and Composition Faculty, Music Technology Faculty, and Ensemble Directors follow the same criterion of developing their professional profiles through performances (or performances of their works), recordings, presentations, workshops, and other activities detailed in the criteria above. It's difficult to quantify an acceptable number for a tenure-promotion portfolio given the variety of possibilities and the limitations on national or international performance due to the academic responsibilities of the individual, however, faculty in these disciplines are expected to have a portfolio of 4 major performances/works by the end of the 6-year period of review. Note that Music Technology Faculty may have a combination of publications and performances/presentations as well as other contributions to the field as outlined in the general criteria, and it is up to the faculty member to establish the value of their Research/Creative Activity to the field.
- b. These criteria may be met in a variety of ways. The following would all constitute reasonable records for applied faculty members seeking tenure and promotion.
 - 1) Example 1
2-3 Performances or presentations at a respected national conference, or performance venue of national scope and influence (i.e. CMS, TMEA, or other Professional Organization specific to the faculty member's discipline). A performance as guest soloist with a professional or semi-professional ensemble, and multiple local and regional performances or presentations.

- 2) Example 2
1-2 Presentations or clinics at a peer-reviewed music education conference of national visibility. Conductor of an ensemble performing by invitation at a festival or conference of national or international scope (i.e. TMEA, ACDA, or other Professional Organization). Invitation to adjudicate for an international music festival. Multiple performances as a member of an auditioned, professional ensemble, and multiple local and regional clinics.
- 3) Example 3
Invited artist for masterclass and/or recital at a national or international music festival. 1-2 presentations or performances at national or international conferences. 4-5 recitals and/or masterclasses at the state or regional level. Regular performance as a member of regional ensembles (Corpus Christi Symphony Orchestra, Laredo Philharmonic, The Valley Symphony Orchestra, or other local or regional ensembles). Multiple conference presentations or performances at the state or regional level, and frequent local performances, clinics, and presentations.

4.3.3. *NOTE: Meeting these expectations for Research/Creative Activity does not guarantee the granting of tenure-promotion since candidates are evaluated on their overall achievement in Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. In all cases, the fulfillment of a record of achievement as detailed in UTRGV Policy [ADM 06-503](#) and [ADM 06-504](#) takes precedence.*

4.4. Service Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

- 4.4.1. As noted above, service is an essential element of activity for all full-time faculty in the School of Music. While the activities of Tenure-Track faculty are appropriately focused on Research/Creative Activity and Teaching, candidates applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor should demonstrate a sustained commitment to serving the School of Music through participation in School of Music faculty meetings, attending and evaluating School of Music entrance auditions when needed, providing academic advising, engaging in recruitment and retention activities, participating in area initiatives, service on departmental or other university committees, engaging in appropriate recruiting or outreach activities, participation in professional organizations and other activities that contribute to the strength, growth, and educational impact of the UTRGV School of Music. (As noted above, time and effort dedicated to advising, recruitment, and other essential School of Music activities is valued equally with time and effort dedicated to committee work.)

4.5. Promotion to Full Professor

- 4.5.1. The same general principles (stated in previous sections) apply to awarding the title of Full Professor. Additionally, while an increase in the quantity of achievements may be slight, an increase in the quality of achievements is expected. It must also be understood that in the case where an applied faculty member has moved primarily into scholarly research, teaching assignments and roles within the School of Music have to be formally reassessed.
- 4.5.2. *NOTE: Meeting these minimum expectations for Research-Creative Work for advancement to Full Professor does not guarantee the granting of promotion since candidates are evaluated on their overall achievement in Teaching, Research-Creative Work, and Service. In all cases, the fulfillment of a record of achievement as detailed in UTRGV Policy [ADM 06-503](#) and [ADM 06-](#)*

504 takes precedence.

4.6. External Review of Tenure and Promotion Candidates

4.6.1. Summary

In the spring semester before the candidate goes up for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate or Full Professor, the candidate will submit four names of potential reviewers for the external review process. The Director will also provide four names. The Dean may also either work with the Director to provide external reviewers or submit her/his own reviewers for possible inclusion. These potential reviewers will be contacted prior to the candidate's application for Tenure and/or Promotion.

4.6.2. Selection of Reviewers

a. During the spring term of the year before a candidate's final review year (normally, Review 5 out of 6 for Tenure-Track faculty, or the year before application for Full Professor for Tenured faculty), the candidate will assemble a list of at least four potential external reviewers to submit to the Director of the School of Music. When compiling this list, the Tenure-Track candidate is strongly encouraged to consult the candidate's mentor, the department's tenured faculty, and the Director. With the list of potential reviewers, the candidate must include their CVs or long bios, a brief explanation of why they are appropriate reviewers, and a description of the candidate's previous interactions (if any) with the recommended reviewers. The external reviewers should represent senior distinguished faculty or leading scholars in comparable academic or research fields to that of the candidate. For those faculty seeking promotion to the Professor rank, the External Reviewers should hold the Full Professor Rank and for faculty seeking promotion to Associate Professor, the External Reviewers should at least be at the Associate Professor rank with tenure. Exceptions to this would be in the case where international artists not associated with a university are reviewing the candidate (but these reviewers should be limited to only one of the full set of reviewers). Reviewers should be selected from peer and aspirational institutions of higher education or from prominent departments/institutions in the candidate's area of expertise. This list and supporting documentation should be submitted to the Director on the date indicated in the Pathways for Review Deadlines found on the Office of the Provost's website under the Faculty Resources tab. The Director will in addition compile a list of four potential external reviewers, consulting with appropriate faculty members or the Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee as needed and likewise compiling the reviewer's CVs or long bios and detailing their respective expertise. The candidate will be informed of all the names on the list in a timely manner, and will have the opportunity to comment on them. The candidate's listing of those he/she wishes to be excluded will normally be honored.

4.6.3. The Review Process

a. The candidate will provide the Director with a copy of the candidate's CV, a summary or statement addressing the candidate's Professional Achievement, Teaching, and Service, and links or attachments of supporting documentation (e.g. programs, recordings, scores, publications, etc.). Within the candidate's statement and the Director's letter it is recommended to briefly address the candidate's department/university responsibilities, service activities, and any other relevant information to give the external reviews a general idea of the candidate's workload.

- b. The external reviewers will provide an evaluation of the candidate’s achievements in the category of Professional Achievement as well as activities in Teaching and Service. External reviewers should address the extent to which the publication(s), performances, and professional activities represent a contribution to the scholarship in the candidate’s field. External reviewers should be asked to provide at least a one to two paragraph evaluation of the candidate’s record of professional activity. They will be asked to assess the quality of the candidate’s reputation (regional, national, or international). Reviewers will send their reviews to the Director and their identifying information will be redacted before they are included in the candidate’s dossier so that the candidate can read the reviews. When possible, the total number of outside reviewers should be distributed in such a way that roughly half of the reviewers are chosen by the candidate and half by the Director.
- c. The School of Music recognizes that university policy requires a minimum of four external reviews be obtained. The faculty member, Director, and Dean are all equally responsible to see that this minimum is met or exceeded through careful planning. However, there may be times when extenuating circumstances (such as outside evaluators failing to meet their obligation) impact the number of reviews collected and this should have no impact on the candidate if the candidate has submitted an appropriate number of possible outside evaluators.
- d. Once reviews have been chosen for inclusion, the Director will forward the redacted reviews to the faculty member to be added to the dossier in FPT. Un-redacted reviews, together with a current CV of the reviewers, will be provided to the appropriate review committee by the Director.

4.6.4. The Role of the External Reviews

- a. The external reviews of a candidate’s scholarly accomplishments are intended to be just one facet of the candidate’s dossier. They are intended to provide internal reviewers with some additional insight into the candidate’s record, especially as a nationally and internationally known scholar or artist. At its best, an external review from an objective professional gives insight into the standards of the field the candidate represents, something that is not always evident to internal reviewers in this age of many specializations.
- b. Outside reviews should not be construed as more significant than the internal reviews, especially those at the department level where faculty have a richer perspective of the candidate’s overall performance in terms of the three areas of review: Teaching, Professional Achievement, and Service.

4.6.5. For more information, see the [Selection of External Reviewers guidelines](#) on the Faculty Resources/Faculty Reviews page.

5. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation

5.1. Overview

- 5.1.1. The purpose of Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation is to provide guidance for continuing and meaningful faculty development, to assist faculty to enhance professional skills and goals, refocusing academic and professional efforts, when appropriate, and assuring that faculty members meet their professional responsibilities to their department. Additional guidelines for this review will be found in the HOP [ADM 06-504 \(Tenured Faculty Evaluation\)](#).
- 5.1.2. All criteria and activities for Teaching, Research, and Service described in the [General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#) sections of this document apply to

Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation. Faculty should also consult the [Annual Faculty Evaluations & Tenure-Track/Tenure and Promotion Reviews Process and Guidelines document](#).

5.2. Procedures

- 5.2.1. All tenured faculty are to be evaluated annually, with a comprehensive evaluation performed every six years after the last successful comprehensive review for tenure, promotion, or PTR. The sixth-year review is to include evaluation of all three areas of professional responsibility (Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service) taken as a whole. Tenured faculty in the School of Music must maintain a high standard of performance in all areas of responsibility. It is recognized that teaching, research interests, and service responsibilities change and develop over time. Regardless of the nature of these changes or the amount of effort allocated to each activity, the standards for achievement remain high throughout the faculty member's tenure at the university.
- 5.2.2. It is important that each faculty member be allowed and encouraged to develop an individual profile, particularly in the area of Research/Creative Activities.

5.3. Teaching

- 5.3.1. In addition to the criteria listed under Teaching in the Annual Review section of this document, tenured faculty should provide leadership in evaluating and updating the curriculum in their areas. Faculty should have an acknowledged record of success in undergraduate teaching.
- 5.3.2. Other possible evidence of teaching effectiveness may include:
 - a. Funding received for teaching innovations
 - b. Teaching awards
 - c. Selection to teach in prestigious programs
- 5.3.3. **Teaching Expectations for Academic Faculty**
Faculty in the areas of theory, musicology, ethnomusicology and music education, should:
 - a. Regularly participate in teaching courses at the undergraduate and graduate (as needed) level.
 - b. Work cooperatively in their areas for equitable assignment of courses and provide leadership in evaluating and updating curriculum in their areas.
 - c. Provide leadership in recruiting efforts for programs in their areas.
 - d. Have an acknowledged record of success in advising students in their academic careers, toward achievement of professional goals, and in honors and thesis work.
 - e. Assist students in special projects, and development of presentations and papers for publication, or other activities that contribute to student success.
 - f. Remain current in recent scholarship in both general and appropriate specialized subject areas, and current developments should be incorporated into course curricula, as applicable.
- 5.3.4. **Teaching Expectations for Applied Faculty**
Applied, Composition, Music Technology, and Conducting Faculty Should:
 - a. Have a record of effort and success in the recruitment and retention of talented undergraduate students to their studios and ensembles. Faculty who teach in areas with more than one studio for the same instrument, must demonstrate cooperative efforts to recruit and retain talented students.
 - b. Have an acknowledged record of success in advising students in their academic careers, toward achievement of professional goals.
 - c. Assist students in special projects and performance opportunities such as competitions,

- summer training programs, graduate study, or other activities that contribute to student success.
- d. Remain current in their field through course development and faculty development activities.
 - e. Work cooperatively in their areas for equitable assignment of courses and provide leadership in evaluating and updating curriculum in their areas.

5.4. Research and Creative Work

- 5.4.1. Faculty are expected to show continued development and growth as well as increasing visibility in their scholarly or creative work. Artistic or scholarly achievements should be supported by substantial publications or equivalent artistic creations and/or performances. Associate Professors should show evidence of scholarly and creative work in sufficient quality and quantity to show a continuing development of a national reputation. Full Professors must show evidence that they are nationally and, where applicable, internationally recognized scholars or creative artists in their chosen field.
- 5.4.2. **Academic Faculty**
 - a. Academic Faculty are expected to engage in scholarly activity that results in publication of original ideas or the results of research in the form of books, chapters, articles, reviews, or critical editions of music.
 - b. Because scholarly work may be in progress over a span of years before it is brought to completion, it is essential that faculty members show continuing, tangible progress in their projects. It is noted that academic faculty members may engage in creative activities. These activities may serve to strengthen the reputation and the scholarly interests of the faculty member, but they are not a specific expectation of academic faculty and should not replace active scholarly work unless a formal recognition of a change of emphasis has been mutually agreed upon in writing by faculty, Director, Dean, and Provost. In some cases, creative work may also include different possibilities and should be recognized. For instance, a composer who teaches music theory must be recognized both for publications of articles or personal creative works as well as performances. Similarly, texts or methods books written by performance faculty that have been published by prominent presses (as opposed to trade publications) also must be given weight.
- 5.4.3. **Applied Faculty**
 - a. Applied Faculty are expected to continue to grow and develop as performers, regularly learning and presenting new repertoire and performing in diverse locations and venues, and other performance activities listed above. Some applied faculty will develop specialties in pedagogical, historical, theoretical, or literature studies pertaining to their area of performance; this work may be disseminated in publications that may or may not be refereed, clinics, conference presentations, or broadcasts. Faculty may also create editions, arrangements, or new compositions. These activities serve to strengthen the performance activities/interests of the faculty member, but they are not a specific expectation of applied faculty, and should not be the primary focus of the faculty member's Creative Activity unless a formal recognition of a change of emphasis has been mutually agreed upon in writing by faculty, Director, Dean, and Provost. As noted above, creative work may include different scholarly possibilities and should be recognized (see section 5.4.2.b above).
- 5.4.4. **Composition Faculty**
 - a. Faculty will produce new compositions regularly and in sufficient quality to maintain visibility and a significant reputation as a composer. While it is not required that

compositions be published, clearly publication will help establish and maintain professional reputation. Faculty are expected to show evidence that their compositions are performed, and it is incumbent on them to demonstrate the importance of commissions and performance venues.

- b. Composition faculty members often have teaching or administrative duties in areas other than composition. Often these other duties will lead to, or be indicative of, scholarly interests. Thus, publication of books, articles, or reviews, and invited participation as a consultant, editor, or referee for presses, journals, or adjudicating panels for grants and awards may be part of the scholarly/Creative Activity for composers. Additionally, some composers may engage in performance or conducting activities.

5.4.5. **Conductors and Ensemble Directors**

- a. The scholarly and creative work of ensemble directors can take diverse paths and is defined by the individual faculty members. Performances with UTRGV ensembles are considered in the evaluation of creative work, particularly when performances are off-campus and invited. Faculty are expected to show continued and/or increasing visibility as conductors or directors through engagements in state, regional, and national venues. They are expected to continue to grow and develop, regularly learning and presenting new repertoire. Other avenues for maintaining visibility and disseminating scholarly or creative work may include publications on pedagogical, historical, theoretical or literature studies; creation of arrangements, editions, or compositions; and presentation of clinics, lectures, master classes, panel discussions, or broadcasts.

5.5. *Service*

- 5.5.1. Tenured faculty are expected to provide increasing leadership and service to the School of Music, the institution, and the profession. In the School of Music, faculty are expected to participate in
 - a. Faculty meetings and committees
 - b. Curriculum development and academic planning
 - c. Area and School of Music governance
 - d. Student and faculty recruiting
 - e. Mentorship (including peer observation) of junior faculty when requested
 - f. Faculty Review
- 5.5.2. Faculty are also expected to engage in professional service that reflects the visibility of their own Research-Creative Work and Teaching.

6. **Lecturer Faculty (All Ranks) and Professor of Practice Guidelines for Annual Review and Promotion**

6.1. *Overview*

This section contains the School of Music criteria for Annual Review and Promotion for Lecturer Faculty and Professors of Practice. Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation and progress towards promotion shall be based on the record of the faculty member in Teaching and Service. Note that faculty on one-year appointments will be evaluated using the same criteria on the schedule for New Faculty in the Pathways for Review.

6.2. Lecturer and Professor of Practice Annual Review Criteria

6.2.1. General Criteria for Annual Review (Lecturer and Professor of Practice Faculty)

- a. The Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee, making evaluations based on the following criteria, are expected to evoke the appropriate openness and gravitas in determining collectively the relative weight of each contribution. See “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” in the previous section for more information.
- b. It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under the following categories.
- c. Activities will be evaluated based on quality as well as quantity.
- d. The lists below in each category are not intended to be exclusive or exhaustive and should be amended to include new paradigms of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service as these emerge over time.
- e. Lecturer faculty and Professors of Practice are typically assumed to be on a Lecturer/Professor of Practice activity-based workload. Faculty who have an administrative appointment that affects Teaching expectations, should clarify their workload/appointment and its effects in the applicant statement and in the appropriate narratives. See the [Workload Policy and Definitions](#) section for further information.
- f. Note that it is up to faculty to provide evidence, justification, context, and documentation (if available) for a rating of “meets” or “exceeds” expectations in the following areas.

6.2.2. Teaching Criteria for Annual Review (Lecturer and Professor of Practice Faculty)

- a. Since Teaching is generally the primary component of a faculty workload, faculty members must demonstrate a commitment to teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible. All full-time and part-time faculty are expected to demonstrate strong teaching effectiveness.
- b. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in Teaching through the following criteria:
 - 1) Teaching assigned course loads (as determined in the faculty member’s annual workload meeting with the Director).
 - 2) Providing and posting clear syllabi in compliance with UTRGV HOP policies.
 - 3) Receiving a positive annual peer observation of teaching and submit a faculty report reflecting on the observer’s feedback and addressing any suggestions and concerns. Lecturers, Professors of Practice, and Tenure-Track faculty must submit one peer observation every year. Tenured faculty submit one peer observation every three years.
 - 4) Receiving satisfactory course evaluations. An average of 80% or higher Agree/Strongly Agree answers on the five state-mandated questions, or a weighted average score of 4.0/5.0 for the year is recommended, although the faculty member will not necessarily be penalized for a lower score if they provide supporting explanations and other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Faculty are encouraged to include all course evaluation reports with comments in the supporting documents for teaching, and may wish to comment specific student comments (positive and negative) in the Teaching Narrative.
 - 5) Demonstrating a commitment to maintaining a strong and active studio (applied faculty).
- c. Lecturer and Professor of Practice faculty are also invited to include performances, presentations, publications, clinics, festivals, or other creative or research-oriented activities that contribute to the pedagogy and artistry in the faculty member’s area of expertise as

- teaching activities. Note that faculty will need to provide context for these activities, and clearly state how they contribute to their teaching effectiveness, student success, and the mission of UTRGV.
- d. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of teaching. Qualifying activities may include teaching overloads, mentoring student Research/Creative Activity, student successes at competitions/conferences, and other activities that contribute to student success and to the School of Music curriculum.
 - e. For specific Teaching activities and achievements, please see “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” in the previous section.
- 6.2.3. **Research/Creative Activity Criteria for Annual Review (Optional)**
- a. Given the usual effort allocation and significant teaching load (up to a 5/5 load, or 30 SCH per academic year), the School of Music does not consider Research/Creativity as part of the overall rating for Lecturer/Professor of Practice, and other Non-Tenure-Track faculty for the purposes of Annual Review.
 - b. However, the School of Music values scholarly and creative contributions by Lecturer Faculty and Professors of Practice, and recognizes the value of these contributions towards the faculty member’s development. Lecturers and Professors of Practice are invited to submit their activities in this area if they wish so that their activity can be recognized. Lecturer/Professor of Practice Faculty are also encouraged to detail any performances, presentation, publications, clinics, festivals, or other activities that give evidence of teaching expertise/development, or service to the School, College, University, Community, or Profession in the narratives of those areas of review (see Teaching and Service Criteria sections).
 - c. For specific Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities, please see “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” in the previous section.
- 6.2.4. **Service Criteria for Annual Review (Lecturer and Professor of Practice Faculty)**
- a. Service is an essential element of all full-time faculty in the School of Music. All full-time faculty are expected to participate in policy making processes, curricular decisions, recruitment activities, audition evaluation, recital committees, outreach activities, and other essential undertakings that ensure the strength and growth of the UTRGV School of Music locally, state-wide, and nationally.
 - b. The School of Music defines meeting expectations in the area of Service through the following criteria and faculty activities: attending and evaluating School of Music entrance auditions as needed, providing academic advising each semester, and participating in area initiatives and recruitment activities. Note that the School of Music values the time and effort faculty spend on advising, recruitment, and other essential services to the school of music equally with the time and effort spent on committee service.
 - c. Lecturer and Professor of Practice faculty are also invited to include performances, presentations, publications, clinics, festivals, or other creative or research-oriented activities that make service contributions to the School, College, University, Community, or Profession. Note that faculty will need to provide context for these activities, and clearly state how they contribute to their service activities and the mission of UTRGV.
 - d. Note that Service expectations for Lecturer and Professor of Practice faculty will depend on workload allocation and teaching load as documented in the Applicant Statement and defined in the Workload Determination Meeting, and reviewers should adjust expectations accordingly.
 - e. There are many ways that faculty members may exceed expectations in the area of Service,

- including service through committee work (particularly those that are particularly work- or time-intensive), additional service duties to the Area or School of Music, or additional service activities to the university or the profession.
- f. For specific Service activities, please see “[General Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service Activities and Criteria](#)” in the previous section.

6.3. General Criteria for Lecturer and Professor of Practice Promotion

- 6.3.1. For Guidelines and Criteria for Lecturer/Professor of Practice Promotion, please refer to the [Guidelines for Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Full-time Lecturers, Professors in Practice and Clinical Faculty](#) on the [UTRGV Office of the Provost Faculty Resources/Faculty Reviews Page](#).

7. Workload Policy and Definitions

- 7.1. Each full-time member of the School of Music faculty member is evaluated in the areas of Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. Expectations for each area of evaluation will vary appropriately according to faculty rank and workload. This section defines workload definitions for the purposes of Annual Evaluation and eventual promotion and/or tenure. Specific expectations for each rank are detailed in the [Lecturer/Professor of Practice](#), [Tenure-Track](#), and [Tenured](#) Faculty sections of this document with appropriate adjustments for differences in workload allocation. Note that this policy is meant to define how workload allocations will be used in this document and for the purposes of faculty review. For information on how workload allocations are determined, please see the School of Music Workload Determination Policy.

7.2. Workload Definitions

- 7.2.1. For the purposes of the Annual Review process, full-time faculty are usually considered to be on either a Research, Teaching, or Lecturer/Professor of Practice workload (defined below), and the workload for the academic year under review is determined by the Workload Review meeting with the Director of the School of Music during the previous spring semester (see the School of Music Workload Policy). If the faculty member and the Director establish a different workload allocation, these expectations should be clearly defined between Director and faculty and included in the Applicant Statement of the dossier.
 - a. Research Load: This is the most common workload for Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty, and entails a 9 semester credit hour (SCH) teaching load per semester, or the equivalent of 18 SCH per academic year. The most usual allocation for this type of workload is 60% Teaching, 20-30% Research, and 10-20% Service. Faculty on this type of workload are expected to maintain Research/Creative Activity standards of Research/Creative Activity appropriate to the tenure and promotion policies of the University and the School of Music.
 - b. Teaching Load: A teaching load entails a 12 SCH teaching load per semester, or the equivalent of 24 SCH per academic year. This workload most commonly applies to Tenured faculty. The most usual allocation for this type of workload is 80% Teaching, 10% Research, and 10% Service. Faculty on this type of workload are expected to engage in Research/Creative Activity in their field, but on a smaller scale appropriate to their larger teaching load.

- c. Lecturer/Professor of Practice Load: This is the most common workload for Lecturer and Professor of Practice faculty, and may entail up to a 15 SCH teaching load per semester, or the equivalent of 30 SCH per academic year. According to UTRGV and School of Music Workload policies, a teaching load of 30 SCH per academic year represents a 100% Teaching allocation (One 3-hour course represents 20% of the teaching allocation per semester, or 10% of the teaching allocation per academic year). Lecturer and Professor of Practice faculty also frequently engage in service activities, and the Director and faculty member will determine the allocation/percentages of effort between teaching and service, based on the needs of the School of Music and the activities of the faculty member, in the annual Workload Determination Meeting. Expectations for annual review should be clearly defined in that meeting and included in the Applicant Statement of the dossier. Lecturers and Professors of Practice are evaluated on their teaching effectiveness and service activities. (See the [Lecturer/Professor of Practice Evaluation Report](#))
- 7.2.2. While these three types of workload are standard, the Director and/or Dean may assign different allocations to faculty based on their individual Teaching, Research, and Service commitments and activities. These allocations, and their specific effects on annual evaluation expectations, should be established in the workload review meeting and thoroughly detailed in the faculty member's Applicant Statement and the appropriate narratives.

7.3. Administrative Assignments

- 7.3.1. Service expectations for faculty who have administrative assignments entailing a course reduction (i.e., Director, Associate Dean, etc.) will remain the same as outlined in the general criteria according to the rank of the faculty member. As noted above, these expectations should be established in the annual workload meeting with the Director, and clearly communicated in the Applicant Statement and appropriate narratives. Faculty with administrative assignments must specify the nature of each contribution or activity, clarify whether the activity is a part of their administrative duty or faculty role, and clearly outline how their duties are divided between the School of Music and other entities.

8. Types of Review

- 8.1. Note that all types of Annual Evaluation, Tenure, and Promotion evaluations should follow the format in FPT (Faculty Portfolio Tool). Information in this section is intended to assist faculty in preparing dossiers for review, and is based on current UTRGV practices. Faculty should consult HOP and other University policies for any updates or changes.

8.2. Annual Review/Tenure-Track Annual Review/Non Tenure-Track Renewal

- 8.2.1. Applies to: All full-time faculty not undergoing a cumulative review.
- 8.2.2. Period of Review: The Previous Academic Year (September 1 through August 31)
- 8.2.3. Materials: This type of review should include (note that these materials are required for all types of faculty dossiers unless specifically noted):
 - a. Applicant Statement and Self-Evaluation
 - b. Approved School of Music Guidelines and Criteria

- c. Curriculum Vitae (updated in FPT)⁵. Faculty are also encouraged to include a personal CV in addition to the FPT-generated CV in the Supporting Documents.
- d. Faculty Professional Growth Plan (All faculty except Full Professors or Senior Lecturers)
- e. Tabular Summary of Teaching Evaluations (no other Tabular Summaries Required)
- f. Peer Observations of Teaching as Required (one per year for Tenure-Track and Lecturer/Professor of Practice (Non Tenure-Track) faculty, and one every three years for Tenured faculty)
- g. Narrative Summary of Teaching Achievements
- h. Narrative Summary Research/Creative Activity
- i. Narrative Summary of Service Activity
- j. Supporting Documents for Teaching, including:
 - 1) Course Syllabi (Required)
 - 2) Student Course Evaluations including Student Comments (Recommended)
 - 3) Other evidence of teaching activities, professional development, and student success to detail and substantiate your summary and narrative (see specific criteria).
- k. Supporting Documents for Research/Creative Activity, including:
 - 1) Performance programs
 - 2) Invitations to perform or present
 - 3) Acceptances to perform or present at peer-reviewed conferences or other venues
 - 4) Examples of scholarly articles, presentations, lectures, or other scholarly work
 - 5) Evidence of application for or obtaining internal or external funding/grants
 - 6) Other evidence of Research or Creative Activity to detail and substantiate your summary and narrative (see specific criteria).
- l. Supporting Documents for Service, including:
 - 1) Documentation of Recruitment Activities
 - 2) Programs or other documentation of performances for service activities
 - 3) Letters of appointment or other evidence of committee service
 - 4) Other evidence of service to detail and substantiate your summary and narrative (see specific criteria).

8.2.4. Reviewed By:

- a. School of Music Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee
- b. Director of the School of Music
- c. Dean of the College of Fine Arts

8.3. Tenure-Track 3rd Year Review (Cumulative Review)

8.3.1. Applies to: Tenure-Track Faculty starting their third year on Tenure-Track

8.3.2. Period of Review: The previous two years on Tenure-Track.

Materials: The review should include all of the materials listed for the Annual Evaluation review, as well as additional materials listed below. Since this is a cumulative review, the faculty member should cover the entire two-year period of review in the Applicant Statement and Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service summaries/narratives, and CV; and should Include Supporting Documents and Peer Observations of Teaching from all three years under

⁵ It is beyond the scope of this document to give instructions on how to enter activities into FPT, however, faculty are encouraged to go to the [Faculty Portfolio Tool Support](#) website for help.

review. In addition to the materials needed for annual review, faculty undergoing a 3rd year review must include:

- a. Previous Years' Recommendations (uploaded by FPT)
- 8.3.3. Reviewed By:
- a. School of Music Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - b. Director of the School of Music
 - c. College of Fine Arts Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - d. Dean of the College of Fine Arts

8.4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor (Cumulative Review)

- 8.4.1. Applies To: Tenure-Track Faculty starting their sixth year on Tenure-Track
- 8.4.2. Period of Review: Entire probationary period on Tenure-Track (usually six years – the previous five years on Tenure-Track, and activities from the sixth year of review that may be submitted at various levels throughout the review process).
- 8.4.3. Materials: The Tenure and Promotion application should include all of the materials listed for the Annual Evaluation review, as well as additional materials listed below. Since this is a cumulative review, the faculty member should cover the entire probationary period in the Applicant Statement, Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service summaries/narratives, and CV; and should include Peer Observations of Teaching and Supporting Documents from the entire review period. In addition to the materials needed for annual review, faculty applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor must include:
- a. Previous Years' Recommendations (uploaded by FPT)
 - b. Redacted External Reviews
- 8.4.4. Reviewed By:
- a. School of Music Annual Review/Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - b. Director of the School of Music
 - c. College of Fine Arts Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - d. Dean of the College of Fine Arts
 - e. University Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - f. Provost
 - g. University President

8.5. Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation (Cumulative Review)

- 8.5.1. Applies To: Tenured Faculty starting their sixth year since their most recent successful cumulative review.
- 8.5.2. Period of Review: Entire period since the last successful cumulative review (usually six years – the five years since the last review, and activities from the sixth year of review that may be submitted at various levels throughout the review process).
- 8.5.3. Materials: The Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation application should include all of the materials listed for the Annual Evaluation review, as well as additional materials listed below. Since this is a cumulative review, the faculty member should cover the entire review period in the Applicant Statement, Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service summaries/narratives, and CV; and should include Peer Observations of Teaching and Supporting Documents from the entire review period. Reviewed By:
- a. School of Music Annual Evaluation/Tenure and Promotion Committee

- b. Director of the School of Music
- c. Dean of the College of Fine Arts

8.6. Promotion to Full Professor (Cumulative Review)

- 8.6.1. Applies To: Tenured Faculty who have held the rank of Associate Professor for at least Five Years who wish to apply for promotion to Full Professor (note that promotion to Full Professor requires that faculty hold the rank of Associate Professor for a minimum of six years).
- 8.6.2. Period of Review: Entire period since promotion to Associate Professor.
- 8.6.3. Materials: The Comprehensive Periodic Evaluation application should include all of the materials listed for the Annual Evaluation review, as well as additional materials listed below. Since this is a cumulative review, the faculty member should cover the entire review period in the Applicant Statement, Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service summaries/narratives, and CV; and should include Peer Observations of Teaching and Supporting Documents from the entire review period. In addition to the materials needed for annual review, faculty applying for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor must include:
 - a. Previous Years' Recommendations (uploaded by FPT)
 - b. Redacted External Reviews
- 8.6.4. Reviewed By:
 - a. School of Music Annual Evaluation/Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - b. Director of the School of Music
 - c. College of Fine Arts Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - d. Dean of the College of Fine Arts
 - e. University Tenure and Promotion Committee
 - f. Provost
 - g. University President

8.7. Lecturer and Professor of Practice Promotion (Cumulative Review)

(Policies for Lecturer, Professor of Practice, and other Non-Tenure-Track faculty titles are being developed at the university level and will be included here when available.)