

**PROCEDURES for (a) the Promotion and Tenure Process and
(b) the Progress Toward Tenure Process**

University of Kansas School of Music

The following procedures have been established to assist the faculty member who is eligible for (a) promotion and/or tenure or (b) mandatory progress toward tenure review (PTTR). These are extremely important issues to both the faculty member and the School of Music; the most careful consideration and preparation in all stages of the process are strongly recommended. (Familiarity with the Provost's Office guidelines and web site when dealing with these issues is very important. See: Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI. Promotion and Tenure.

(<http://policy.drupal.ku.edu/governance/FSRR#ArticleVI>)

REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

1. First Consideration

A faculty member being considered for mandatory review, or who is contemplating his or her eligibility for promotion and/or tenure, is advised to read the guidelines published in the abovementioned places and promotion and tenure criteria published by the School of Music and to seek counsel from the division director, mentor, dean, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and/or other senior faculty. It is the candidate's task to prepare the dossier, which is a time-consuming process. The candidate should allow ample time for the collection and assembly of all materials. All deadlines published each year will be strictly observed. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure or for mandatory review might begin the process through notification by the provost, a review initiated by the School of Music, or the candidate may initiate the process him/herself.

The Promotion and Tenure Documents (See:

<https://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/promotion-tenure>

Each year the University issues and publishes the forms online that must be utilized in the promotion and tenure process. This form and the accompanying guidelines must be regarded as the most significant influence on the content and organization of the dossier. Thus, the mentor and the candidate should review the content of the current form with the utmost care and work diligently to comply with all applicable sections. Candidates should attend the meetings held by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure to learn of recent developments and current thinking regarding the process.

2. The Dean

The dean shall advise the candidate as to timetable and details. The dean also will contact external evaluators to obtain their agreement to evaluate the candidate's qualifications

(promotion and tenure only). Finally, the dean will invite written comments from the tenured faculty of the School of Music. These will be shared with the candidate in an anonymous collection. Candidates will be given seven calendar days to respond in writing if they so choose

3. The Mentor

The dean shall assign a mentor for each candidate in consultation with the division director and candidate. The mentor will advise and assist the candidate throughout the process.

4. Teaching Evaluations

- a. Student evaluation forms collected during the years since the last promotion shall be included in the dossier. In addition, the candidate may request formal evaluation of his or her teaching by having an evaluator visit classes, rehearsals, or studio lessons. If this option is chosen, peer evaluators will be designated by the dean in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- b. An annual peer evaluation of teaching will be required. These teaching evaluations will include written assessments by at least two colleagues selected by the dean.

5. External Evaluations (promotion and tenure only)

The University requires that the candidate for tenure and/or promotion have his or her research accomplishments evaluated by external evaluators who have no professional or personal connection to the candidate. The candidate will assemble the materials to be considered by these evaluators. The materials should include a current curriculum vita or brief biographical sketch and thorough documentation of the candidate's record of research activity during the period in question, including recordings, DVDs, books, scores, list of performances, etc. The candidate will submit a list of potential external evaluators to the dean according to the timetable established for the process and the School of Music dean will also put forth a list. An equal number of the candidate's and dean's evaluators, not to exceed a total of six, will be selected and contacted by the dean. The external reviewers will hold an academic rank equal to or greater than the rank for which the candidate is being considered. Candidates are not allowed access to external evaluations during or after the review process; however, external evaluators will be informed that in some cases of appealed tenure/promotion decisions, candidates may be given copies of all documents, including external evaluations.

6. The Area Review Committee

For purposes of providing an initial level of review in the School of Music, candidates will be evaluated by a group of faculty from music specializations similar to their own. Specific for Promotion and Tenure Reviews, specializations within the School of Music

are organized into two large groups: Academic Area (3 divisions) – Music Education/Music Therapy, Musicology, Music Theory/Composition; and Performance Area (10 divisions) – Band, Brass/Percussion, Choral, Jazz, Orchestra, Organ/Church Music, Piano, Strings, Voice, Woodwinds. Distinct Area Review Committees (one from the Academic Area and one from the Performance Area) will evaluate candidates, according to the appropriate specialization.

Area Review Committees consist of three tenured faculty members with the rank of associate professor or professor. Committee members will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with Division Directors.

Individuals may not serve on both the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee and an Area Review Committee. This committee shall function as an evaluating body; its task is to evaluate the content of the dossier and to make recommendations to the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee must note that all recommendations concerning promotion and tenure shall be made solely in accordance with the standards and procedures in Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI, and that their deliberations and recommendations are a confidential personnel matter. The committee must ensure this confidentiality.

If a member of the committee has a clear conflict of interest that would compromise his/her impartiality in the evaluation of one or more candidates for tenure and/or promotion, that committee member should recuse him/herself from the evaluation of that candidate. The dean will inform the candidate of which faculty members have been appointed to the Area Review Committee. The candidate may request to the dean in writing for a member of the committee to be removed because of a conflict of interest. The candidate should clearly state why he/she believes that a conflict of interest exists. The dean will decide if such a conflict exists and, if so, appoint another member to the committee. If the candidate disagrees with the dean's decision, the matter will be resolved by the Area Review Committee by majority vote. No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve, participate, or observe on an Area Review Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure.

The committee will receive the candidate's dossier for the review. The committee will accomplish its work and review the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in accordance with the provost's guidelines. The committee's evaluation of the candidate's dossier will be accomplished in accordance with the recommendations and standards described in this document. The dean's office will supply the candidate's position description, to be signed by the candidate. The committee is responsible for reviewing the dossier, rating the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service according to the same scale used by the Promotion and Tenure Committee: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Marginal, and Poor.

7. Candidate's Review and Response

The chair of the Area Review Committee will communicate the recommendations of the area review to the dean, who will provide the candidate with a copy of the committee's written assessment. The candidate may submit to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee a written response to a negative recommendation, or to a final rating of teaching, research/creative activity, or service below the level of "good." Candidates may also respond to, or clarify in writing, statements in the report of the Area Review Committee they believe are inaccurate or in some way misrepresent their productivity and achievements. Candidates will have seven calendar days to submit to the School Promotion and Tenure Committee their response to the Area Review Committee Report. Both the Area Review Committee Report and the Candidate Response will remain in the School of Music.

8. The School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee

The School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of five tenured faculty members with the rank of at least associate professor. The committee shall be elected by the entire music faculty. This committee shall function as an evaluating body; its task is to evaluate the content of the dossier and to make recommendations to the dean. The committee must note that all recommendations concerning promotion and tenure shall be made solely in accordance with the standards and procedures in Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI, and that their deliberations and recommendations are a confidential personnel matter. The committee must ensure this confidentiality.

If a member of the committee has a clear conflict of interest that would compromise his/her impartiality in the evaluation of one or more candidates for tenure and/or promotion, that committee member should recuse him/herself from the evaluation of that candidate. The dean will inform the candidate of which faculty members on the Promotion and Tenure Committee are reviewing the dossier. The candidate may request to the dean in writing for a member of the committee to be removed because of a conflict of interest. The dean will decide if such a conflict exists and, if so, appoint one of the elected alternates to the committee. If the candidate disagrees with the dean's decision, the matter will be resolved by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee by majority vote. No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve, participate, or observe on the Promotion and Tenure Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure.

The committee will receive 1) the candidate's dossier, 2) the candidate's position description, 3) the report of the Area Review Committee, and 4) Candidate Response (if one is submitted). The committee will accomplish its work and review the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in accordance with the provost's guidelines. The committee's evaluation of the candidate's dossier will be accomplished in accordance with the recommendations and standards described in this

document. The committee will make recommendations concerning the award of tenure and/or promotion in rank by majority vote.

9. The Dean and the Candidate's Review and Response

After receiving the report from the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean will review the dossier and the committee's report and indicate separately whether he/she concurs with or disagrees with the recommendation. The dean will then communicate the recommendations of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the corresponding summary evaluation section of the promotion and tenure form. In the event of a negative recommendation that will not be forwarded automatically to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure, the candidate will be informed that he/she may request that the record be forwarded for further review. The candidate may submit to the next level of review a written response to a negative recommendation, or to a final rating of teaching, research/creative activity, or service below the level of "good."

If the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure requests from the School of Music more information on a candidate, the dean will immediately provide a copy of that request to the candidate and will inform the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee of the request. The candidate will have the opportunity to participate in the School of Music's response to this request and may also submit his/her own documentation or comment to the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure.

10. Final Disposition of the Dossier

After all evaluation has been completed, the file will be placed in the School of Music office and all materials submitted by the candidate, such as scores, books, recordings, and reviews will be returned to the candidate. Reference letters that are returned with the file will be destroyed.

REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEW (PTTR)

1. First Consideration

A faculty member being considered for mandatory review is advised to read the guidelines published in the University and the School of Music and to seek counsel from the division director, mentor, dean, members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, and/or other senior faculty. It is the candidate's task to prepare the dossier, which is a time-consuming process. The candidate should allow ample time for the collection and assembly of all materials. All deadlines published each year will be strictly observed. The dean will inform candidates for PTTR when they will take part in the process.

The PTTR Documents (See: <https://facultydevelopment.ku.edu/promotion-tenure>)

Each year the University issues and publishes the forms online that must be utilized the PTTR process. This form and the accompanying guidelines must be regarded as the most significant influence on the content and organization of the dossier. Thus, the mentor and the candidate should review the content of the current form with the utmost care and work diligently to comply with all applicable sections. Candidates should attend the meetings held by the University Committee on Promotion and Tenure to learn of recent developments and current thinking regarding the process.

2. The Dean

The dean shall advise the candidate as to timetable and details.

3. The Mentor

The dean shall assign a mentor for each candidate in consultation with the division director and candidate. The mentor will advise and assist the candidate throughout the process.

4. Teaching Evaluations

- a. Student evaluation forms collected during the candidate's period of work at KU shall be included in the dossier. In addition, the candidate may request formal evaluation of his or her teaching by having an evaluator visit classes, rehearsals, or studio lessons. If this option is chosen, peer evaluators will be designated by the dean in consultation with the Promotion and Tenure Committee.
- b. An annual peer evaluation of teaching will be required. These teaching evaluations will include written assessments by at least two colleagues selected by dean.

5. The Area Review Committee

For purposes of providing an initial level of review in the School of Music, candidates will be evaluated by a group of faculty from music specializations similar to their own. Specific for Progress Toward Tenure Reviews, specializations within the School of Music are organized into two large groups: Academic Area (3 divisions) – Music Education/Music Therapy, Musicology, Music Theory/Composition; and Performance Area (10 divisions) – Band, Brass/Percussion, Choral, Jazz, Orchestra, Organ/Church Music, Piano, Strings, Voice, Woodwinds. Distinct Area Review Committees will evaluate candidates, according to the appropriate specialization.

Area Review Committees consist of three tenured faculty members with the rank of associate professor or professor. Committee members will be appointed by the dean, in consultation with Division Directors.

Individuals may not serve on both the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee and an Area Review Committee. This committee shall function as an evaluating body; its task is to evaluate the content of the dossier and to make recommendations to the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee. The committee must note that all recommendations concerning promotion and tenure shall be made solely in accordance with the standards and procedures in Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI, and that their deliberations and recommendations are a confidential personnel matter. The committee must ensure this confidentiality.

If a member of the committee has a clear conflict of interest that would compromise his/her impartiality in the evaluation of one or more candidates for tenure and/or promotion, that committee member should recuse him/herself from the evaluation of that candidate. The dean will inform the candidate of which faculty members have been appointed to the Area Review Committee. The candidate may request to the dean in writing for a member of the committee to be removed because of a conflict of interest. The candidate should clearly state why he/she believes that a conflict of interest exists. The dean will decide if such a conflict exists and, if so, appoint another member to the committee. If the candidate disagrees with the dean's decision, the matter will be resolved by the Area Review Committee by majority vote. No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve, participate, or observe on an Area Review Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning promotion and tenure.

The committee will receive the candidate's dossier for the review. The committee will accomplish its work and review the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in accordance with the provost's guidelines. The committee's evaluation of the candidate's dossier will be accomplished in accordance with the recommendations and standards described in this document. The dean's office will supply the candidate's position description, to be signed by the candidate. The committee is responsible for reviewing the dossier, rating the candidate's work in the areas of teaching, research/creative activity, and service, each according to the same scale used for PTTR by the Promotion and Tenure Committee: that evidence exists to warrant a continued tenure-track appointment, that another formal review should take place in one year, or that the appointment should not be continued.

6. Candidate's Review and Response

The chair of the Area Review Committee will communicate the recommendations of the area review to the dean, who will provide the candidate with a copy of the committee's written assessment. The candidate may submit to the dean a written response to a negative recommendation, or to a final rating of teaching, research/creative activity, or service requiring improvement or noting insufficient progress toward tenure. Candidates may also respond to, or clarify in writing, statements in the report of the Area Review Committee they believe are inaccurate or in some way misrepresent their productivity and achievements. Candidates will have seven calendar days to submit to the dean their

response to the Area Review Committee Report. Both the Area Review Committee Report and the Candidate Response will remain in the School of Music.

7. The School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee

The School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee consists of five tenured faculty members with the rank of at least associate professor. The committee shall be elected by the entire music faculty. This committee shall function as an evaluating body; its task is to evaluate the content of the dossier and to make recommendations to the dean. The committee must note that all recommendations concerning promotion and tenure shall be made solely in accordance with the standards and procedures in Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations Article VI, and that their deliberations and recommendations are a confidential personnel matter. The committee must ensure this confidentiality.

If a member of the committee has a clear conflict of interest that would compromise his/her impartiality in the evaluation of one or more candidates for tenure and/or promotion, that committee member should recuse him/herself from the evaluation of that candidate. The dean will inform the candidate of which faculty members on the Promotion and Tenure Committee are reviewing the dossier. The candidate may request to the dean in writing for a member of the committee to be removed because of a conflict of interest. The dean will decide if such a conflict exists and, if so, appoint another faculty member to the committee. If the candidate disagrees with the dean's decision, the matter will be decided by the School Promotion and Tenure Committee by majority vote. No students or untenured faculty members, except unclassified academic staff with rank equivalent to or higher than associate professor, shall serve, participate, or observe on the Promotion and Tenure Committee or vote on any recommendation concerning PTTR.

The committee will receive 1) the candidate's dossier, 2) the candidate's position description, 3) the report of the Area Review Committee, and 4) Candidate Response (if one is submitted). The committee will accomplish its work and review the candidate's record of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service in accordance with the provost's guidelines. The committee's evaluation of the candidate's dossier will be accomplished in accordance with the recommendations and standards described in this document. The committee will make one of three recommendations concerning the candidate's work: that evidence exists to warrant a continued tenure-track appointment, that another formal review should take place in one year, or that the appointment should not be continued.

8. The Dean and the Candidate's Review and Response

After receiving the report from the School of Music Promotion and Tenure Committee, the dean will review the dossier and the committee's report and indicate separately whether he/she concurs with or disagrees with the recommendation. The dean will then write a letter that communicates the recommendations of the School Promotion and Tenure Committee to the candidate and provide the candidate with a copy of the

corresponding summary evaluation section of the PTTR form. The dean's letter will then be submitted to the Provost's Office.

9. Final Disposition of the Dossier

After all evaluation has been completed, the file will be placed in the candidate's personnel file and all materials submitted by the candidate, such as scores, books, recordings, and reviews will be returned to the candidate.

CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION, PROGRESS TOWARD TENURE REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE

Recommendations for annual faculty evaluation, progress toward tenure review, and promotion and tenure shall be based on the record of the faculty member in teaching, research/creative activity (hereafter referred to as research), and service. Promotion to full professor is based on substantial additional achievement since the award of tenure and/or promotion to associate professor. Faculty members with tenure are expected to continue to engage in substantial productive activity in the areas of teaching (or professional performance), scholarship, and service. Although there can be some variation, continuing productivity should prepare most faculty members for promotion to full professor within six years of their promotion to the rank of associate professor.

Teaching

It is expected that each member of the faculty will excel in teaching. All faculty members must demonstrate enthusiasm for teaching and the ability to stimulate students to achieve at the highest level possible. To achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must demonstrate effective teaching, as reflected in such factors as command of the subject matter, the ability to communicate effectively in the classroom, a demonstrated commitment to student learning, efforts to improve teaching skills over time, and involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom. For promotion to the rank of full professor the record must demonstrate continued effectiveness and growth as a teacher, as reflected in such factors as mastery of the subject matter, strong classroom teaching skills, an ongoing commitment to student learning, and active involvement in providing advice and support for students outside the classroom.

Research

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 and will achieve national recognition among his or her peers in one or more such fields of activity. To achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must show evidence of a sustainable program of scholarly activity or creative activity and a successfully developing career in the areas associated with his/her field of endeavor. Such evidence shall include a substantial and ongoing pattern of publications or creative activity, external reviews of the candidate's work by respected scholars or

practitioners in the field, the candidate's regional, national, or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly agenda. Promotion to the rank of full professor must include demonstration that the candidate has an established scholarly career, as reflected in such factors as a substantial and ongoing pattern of publication or creative activity, external reviews of the candidate's work by eminent scholars or practitioners in the field, the candidate's national or international reputation, and other evidence of an active and productive scholarly career.

Service

Service refers to activities that utilize the professional expertise of the faculty member. Each member of the faculty is expected to render appropriate service to one or more of the following: (1) the School of Music, (2) the University, (3) the profession, or (4) the public at large. Under normal circumstances, service cannot substitute for appropriate success in teaching or productivity in research or other creative activity. Exceptions will be determined by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member in consultation with the faculty member.

To achieve tenure and promotion to associate professor, the candidate must show evidence of a pattern or service to the University at one or more levels, to the discipline or profession, and/or to the local, state, national, or international communities. Promotion to the rank of full professor must include demonstration of an ongoing pattern of service reflecting substantial contributions to the entities named earlier in this paragraph.

The Criteria

It is not expected that a faculty member will engage in all of the activities listed under any of the following categories. Neither is it expected that a faculty member will be equally active in each of the three categories. The quality of the contributions is of greater importance than the quantity. Prestige and/or scope of the publication or presentation venue are important contributing factors in determining the significance of research and creative activity.

A. Teaching

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of teaching shall include, but not be limited to, student evaluations and peer evaluations. Student evaluations, using University and School forms, will be administered every term by each faculty member. Annual peer evaluations of teaching will be required. These teaching evaluations will include written assessments by at least two colleagues selected by the faculty member to be forwarded to the Associate Dean of the School of Music. The Associate Dean will place the peer evaluations in the faculty evaluation portfolio.

Evidence must include:

1. level of achievement and success of current students; and/or
2. level of achievement and success of former students.

Other evidence may include:

1. written statements by colleagues;
2. written statements by former students;
3. development of new courses, instructional programs, teaching materials, or teaching techniques.

B. Research

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research activity will be examined according to quantity and especially quality of productivity. Such evidence may include:

1. For studio faculty:
 - a) Significant public performance. The significance of public performance, like that of the kinds of public exposure described in other areas, will be evaluated on the basis of location, nature of the audience, quality, quantity, and critical review, if any. Such public performance might include recital appearances as a soloist or as a member of a chamber ensemble, guest solo appearances off campus, or participation in professional performing ensembles.
 - b) Presentations at workshops, seminars, conferences, and contributions to professional journals.
 - c) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.
2. For conducting faculty:
 - a) performances with university student groups that exhibit exceptional activity;
 - b) guest conducting appearances;
 - c) preparation of performances or papers for professional societies;
 - d) scholarly publications such as articles, editions, and arrangements.
 - e) Recordings intended for public distribution including, but not limited to: published audio compact discs, artistic or pedagogical DVD publications, and other publications in electronic media of consequence.
3. For composers:
 - a) commissions, performances, or publication of musical compositions or arrangements;
 - b) publication of books, articles, reviews, chapters in books, monographs, or substantial electronic media;
 - c) presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional societies.
4. For musicologists, music theorists, and music education and music therapy faculty:
 - a) publication as the author, co-author, editor, or translator of books, chapters in books, articles, reviews, monographs, scholarly editions, or substantial electronic media;
 - b) presenting papers, speaking, or participating on panels in meetings of professional associations;

- c) appearances as a guest lecturer or seminar leader on other campuses.

It is understood that a faculty member in any particular area is not limited only to the research 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, each faculty member's primary efforts should be directed towards those activities in the area of his or her appointment.

C. Service

Service is an essential aspect of faculty evaluation. Because of the visibility the School of Music seeks to maintain in the state, region, and nation, the service component is significant.

1. A satisfactory and nurturing environment for teachers and students within the School of Music requires the development and maintenance of studios, ensembles and classrooms with sufficient quality and quantity to support the School's performance and academic programs. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to attract and retain qualified music majors. Evidence of developing and/or supporting recruitment and retention programs may include:
 - a. active and ongoing communication with prospective students by letter, telephone or e-mail,
 - 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 (KMEA, providing information for databases, festivals, Midwestern Music Institutes, etc.),
 - e. participating in the regularly scheduled audition days,
 - f. mentoring student groups.
2. Other evidence to be considered in the evaluation of service may include:
 - a. active participation, elective or appointive leadership roles in professional associations, or attendance at professional meetings;
 - b. student advising;
 - c. serving on committees of the School and University;
 - d. administrative duties, including division director and workshop or institute organizer;
 - e. utilization of the professional abilities and expertise of the faculty members on behalf of continuing education in music or in the service of government agencies, citizens' groups, educational or religious institutions, or charitable organizations at any level;

- f. editorial boards;
- g. conference workshops.

Criteria for Classifying Music Research as Major or Minor

In assessing research during the annual faculty evaluation process, progress toward tenure review, and when a faculty member applies for promotion and tenure, it is necessary to classify research accomplishments as major or minor. The following criteria are to assist the faculty member in making that determination.

Music Composition

One must consider many variable and subjective factors when evaluating the artistic merits of a musical composition, but the following objective criteria should usually be considered when ranking works as having greater or lesser significance.

Major research by a composer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:

1. a work or arrangement of major proportion, including performance length and artistic merit, in any medium that requires substantial creative time and effort by the composer;
2. a commission for a major work in any medium by a highly respected and widely known performance ensemble, conductor, or individual performer;
3. publication and/or recording of a major work;
4. a successfully completed research grant for composition from a national or international foundation or agency;
5. a successful entry in a national or international, impartially refereed composition contest;
6. a performance of the composer's work(s) by a professional or major University ensemble or soloists, or at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional society.

Minor research by a composer typically fits at least one of the following criteria:

1. a work or arrangement of smaller proportion or of lesser difficulty, requiring less time and creative effort to complete;
2. composing original incidental music of smaller proportion or writing an arrangement for a local university event;
3. publication and/or recording of a minor work, arrangement* or transcription**.
4. a performance of the composer's work(s) by an amateur or minor University ensemble or soloist.

* Especially in the field of jazz or commercial music, arranging is, at its most professional level, a reconstruction and, oftentimes, a total transformation of an existing melody and/or harmonic progression. As much creativity can be involved in this process as in the majority of original composition.

** Transcribing is a process whereby one transliterates as closely as possible existing music by another composer, or, more rarely, one's own composition, from one performing medium to another. This process requires careful craftsmanship, knowledgeable taste, and considerable skills as an orchestrator, but it does not normally require the proportional amount of creativity involved in arranging.

Music Performance

In the field of music performance, public performance is equated with publication. When classifying music performance as major or minor, the factors of difficulty of repertory, performance venue, and the performer's role in a given performance should be considered.

The factor of quality pervades all music performance and does not change the classifications of major and minor presented here. A major performance can be unsuccessful; a minor performance can be flawless, but still be considered a minor performance.

Major performances typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. solo performance with a large ensemble or leading role in a vocal production;
2. solo recital or collaborative performance as part of a concert series;
3. recital as a member of an established professional small ensemble in a university setting or as part of a professional ensemble;
5. concert in a major city as a member/participant of a professional ensemble;
6. performance at a professional music symposium, conference, or institute;
7. a solo recording or a recording as a member of an ensemble with some possibility of peer review, such as a review published in a major professional journal, web site, or equivalent.

Minor performances typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. performance as a member of an ad hoc ensemble;
2. minor role in a vocal production;
3. performance as assisting artist in a recital;
4. solo performance or collaborative performance in an informal setting;
5. performance as a member of a community or semi-professional ensemble;

Scholarly Research

Scholarly research in music usually results in publication or the presentation of a paper, lecture, or work in electronic 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 length, form and style of the final product; and the audience for whom it is intended.

Major publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. book, monograph, textbook, book chapter or work in electronic media of substantial significance and scope;
2. a substantial scholarly edition of extant music;
3. a scholarly article published in a refereed journal;
4. a lengthy, scholarly article based on original research written for a major music dictionary or encyclopedia.

Minor publications typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. a relatively brief monograph, textbook, or work in electronic media;
2. a scholarly or performing edition of a relatively brief composition;
3. 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;
4. a review of a book, edition of music, or work in electronic media.

Major papers or lectures typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. a substantial, scholarly paper or lecture selected by committee, presented at a regional, national, or international meeting of a professional society;
2. a substantial, invited paper or lecture presented at a meeting of a professional society or at another university.

Minor papers or lectures typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. a paper or lecture of lesser significance, presented at a state or regional meeting;
2. a paper or lecture presented at a university function or an invited guest lecture in another department of the university.

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.

Conducting

A conductor's performance should be assessed on the musicality and artistic quality of performances.

Major conducting performances typically fit into at least one of the following criteria:

1. Conducting regular university ensembles that exhibit exceptional activity:
 - a. premieres, professional recordings or interdisciplinary projects;
 - b. performances with soloists that demand a high degree of interaction between soloist and ensemble;

- c. off-campus performances, such as invited appearances at meetings of professional societies and at other important venues, and important performances during tours of an ensemble.
2. Guest conducting. Invitations for guest appearances are a measure of a conductor's professional recognition. Relative importance may be measured by the stature and visibility of the inviting organization. Major guest appearances include:
 - a. invited appearances with professional ensembles;
 - b. invited appearances with ensembles at other universities;
 - c. invited appearances at all-state festivals or professional music societies.

Minor conducting performances are typically somewhat less demanding musically and technically; they are often performances in a pedagogical environment or performances that serve as an adjunct to some other activity. Performances of this type typically fit at least one of the following criteria:

1. performances as guest conductor with public school groups and regional music festivals;
2. brief performances with university ensembles at local and regional off-campus events;
3. serving as guest conductor on a recital with other faculty members, such as conducting a large chamber work.