

SCHOOL OF MUSIC
POST-TENURE REVIEW PROCEDURES

1998

I. General Procedures

Procedures given below are in compliance with regulations on post-tenure review established in the University Faculty Manual. If any question should arise between procedures given in this document and regulations given in the Faculty Manual, the Faculty Manual will take precedence.

II. Faculty Eligibility for Post-Tenure Review

Each tenured faculty member, regardless of rank, and including those in administrative positions (other than the Dean), will be reviewed every six years unless, during the previous six-year period, the faculty member has been reviewed and advanced to or retained in a high position (e.g., Dean or chaired professorship). The post-tenure review will be waived for (1) any faculty member who has notified the School of Music Dean of retirement within three years of the next scheduled review or (2) any faculty member who has been successfully promoted to the rank of professor or associate professor within the previous five years.

III. Post-Tenure Review Committee

A Post-Tenure Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the Committee) and Committee Chair will be selected by the Chair of the Tenure and Promotion Committee, with the approval of the Dean, for each individual faculty member undergoing a post-tenure review. The Committee will consist of three tenured full professors who will act as a sub-committee of the School of Music Tenure and Promotion Committee. Tenured full professors who are having a post-tenure review and faculty who will be on leave of absence will be excluded from membership on a committee during that year. The Dean is eligible neither to vote nor to serve on a committee.

IV. File Documentation

The faculty member being reviewed will submit a post-tenure review file to the members of his committee. While the faculty member may include any documentation he/she believes to be pertinent, the following material must be included:

A. Teaching

1. A listing of all courses taught during the previous five years;
2. All available student evaluations during the previous five-year period, with a summary, prepared by the Chair of the Committee, of the student course evaluations for each of the courses listed;
3. A peer evaluation in the form of a teaching review, conducted in accordance with CHE regulations.

B. Research/Scholarship

1. A listing, with available documentary evidence, of scholarly and performance activities conducted during the previous five years;
2. Peer evaluations of research/scholarship from outside the School of Music (although not necessarily outside the University).

C. Service

1. A listing, with available documentary evidence, of service activities conducted during the previous five years.

D. Additional materials

1. Copies of all annual performance evaluations conducted by the Dean and/or the School of Music Tenure and Promotion Committee which have accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review;
2. A copy of the official report of sabbatical activities, if applicable.

V. Committee Procedure

- A. The chair of the Committee will ensure that peer reviews (from within the School of Music) of the faculty member's teaching and peer reviews (from outside the School of Music) of scholarly activities are conducted in a timely manner. It should be noted that the publication of refereed scholarship is considered as having fulfilled the peer review of scholarly activities requirement.
- B. Following review of the faculty member's file, each member of the Committee will submit a written evaluation form which rates the faculty member's performance in four areas: teaching, research/scholarship, service, and overall performance. In each of the four areas the committee member will rate the faculty member's performance as superior, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory.
- C. For purposes of this review, the performance rating terms will be defined as follows:
 1. Superior: performance at a satisfactory level with significant distinction;
 2. Satisfactory: performance which meets the expectations for the awarding of tenure in the School of Music;
 3. Unsatisfactory: performance which, taken as a whole, fails to meet relevant School of Music standards for the awarding of tenure.
- D. In a meeting of the Committee, the chair will collect the performance evaluation forms and tally the ratings in each evaluation area as defined in section V.C. A majority evaluative rating is achieved when two committee members have cast a ballot with the same rating.
- E. After the performance votes have been tallied and the results announced to the Committee, the chair of the Committee will draft a report of the post-tenure review which will include

the Committee's rating of the performance for each of the four evaluation areas indicated in section V.B with sufficient comments to aid the faculty member in his/her professional growth and development. Individual votes in each evaluation area will not be revealed, and individual written evaluations will be destroyed by the Committee chair after the report is approved by the Committee.

- F. A copy of the Committee report must be sent to the faculty member and to the Dean of the School of Music for inclusion in the faculty member's personnel file. In the event of an unsatisfactory review, a copy of the report and the development plan described below must also be sent to the Provost.
- G. If the performance rating for each evaluation area as defined in V.B is either "superior" or "satisfactory," the evaluation is concluded with the distribution of the report to the faculty member. If it is determined that the faculty member's overall performance is satisfactory but that his/her performance in either teaching, scholarship/performance, or service is unsatisfactory, the Committee must include in its report recommendations to assist the faculty member in restoring performance in that area to a satisfactory level. A generally satisfactory review which includes an unsatisfactory rating in only one of these areas does not require the development plan described under section V.H.
- H. An Unsatisfactory Review
 - 1. If the Committee determines that the overall performance evaluation rating is "unsatisfactory," the Committee must include recommendations in order to assist the faculty member in restoring his/her performance to a satisfactory level. The Committee will also act as the faculty member's Development Committee.
 - 2. The Dean of the School of Music, in consultation with the faculty member and his Development Committee, will formulate a development plan which includes an improvement timetable for the faculty member. While the timetable is at the discretion of the committee and is necessarily dependent on the nature of the development plan, in no case will the development plan timetable be less than one year nor more than two years in duration.
 - 3. In accordance with the timetable established in the development plan, the development committee will review the faculty member's updated file and will submit an evaluation of progress to the School of Music Dean, who will determine whether the goals of the development plan have been met, in general or in any particular.
 - 4. The Dean, in addition to making the final determination on the progress, or lack thereof, of the faculty member in meeting the goals of the development plan, will determine whether or not further measures may be necessary. The Dean will conform to the timetable established in the development plan, and will file periodic progress reports with the Provost.
 - 5. Failure to make substantial progress toward meeting the performance goals of a development plan established through the post-tenure review process may expose a faculty member to proceedings for termination.

VI. Appeal Procedures

- A. A faculty member who receives an unsatisfactory review and disagrees with the evaluation or any aspect of the recommendations may appeal to members of the School of Music Tenure and Promotion Committee at equal to or higher rank than the faculty member, in general or in any particular. The findings of the School of Music Tenure and Promotion Committee, together with its recommendations for action and a statement by the faculty member, will be forwarded to the Dean for final determination of the evaluation.

- B. If the faculty member disagrees with the development plan produced by the School of Music Dean, he/she may appeal specific aspects of the development plan to the Provost. The Provost will make the final determination of the adequacy of an appealed development plan.