

Chicago State University

Departmental Application of Criteria

2010 – 2015

College of Arts and Sciences,

Department of Music

I. University and College Intentions

A. University Mission Statement

Chicago State University (CSU) is a public, comprehensive university that provides access to higher education for students of diverse backgrounds and educational needs. The University fosters the intellectual development and success of its student population through a rigorous, positive, and transformative educational experience. CSU is committed to teaching, research, service, and community development including social justice, leadership and entrepreneurship.

B. University Strategic Planning Goals and College Key Performance Indicators

The Key Performance Indicators for the College of Arts and Sciences parallel the University's Strategic Planning Goals. Each of the six CSU strategic goals is aligned with a specific public agenda goal or CSU strategic issue which supports the fulfillment of the University mission. Together, these goals create what the University conceptualizes as **ACCESS** for every University stakeholder. The six goals are Academic Excellence, Teaching and Research; Community Service and Engagement; Cost Efficiencies and Diverse Revenue Streams; Enrollment, Retention and Graduation; Strengthened Infrastructure; and Shared Accountability and Image.

C. Conditions for Employment

All Unit A faculty members must complete the State of Illinois ethics training and are required to have oral English proficiency as mandated by Illinois statute. Unit A teaching faculty are required to attend all department meetings. Where applicable, membership in a professional organization or professional licensure may also be required as a condition of employment at CSU.

D. Degree Requirements

The following are considered to be terminal degrees within the Department of Music in the areas of music history, music theory, music composition, ethnomusicology, and music education (all degrees must be earned at an accredited institution):

Ph.D., D.M.A., D.Mus., Ed.D. or equivalent

The following are considered to be terminal degrees within the Department of Music in the area of music performance (all degrees and hours must be earned at an accredited institution):

M.M., M.F.A., M.M.E., M.S., M.A. or equivalent **plus** 30 semester hours beyond the degree in graduate study, in an appropriate field of study (graduate level credit hours)

E. University Evaluation Criteria

In accordance with the University Evaluation Criteria that took effect beginning with the 2008 academic year, the degree of effectiveness of performance of each faculty member being considered for retention, promotion, or tenure will be evaluated in the areas of teaching/ performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service. Teaching/performance of primary duties will be considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation; however, each faculty member must meet the required level of performance in all three areas to be recommended for the personnel action for which he/she is being reviewed.

II. The Departmental Application of Criteria (DAC)

A. DAC Preamble

The purpose of this document is to provide criteria to evaluate employee performance in three areas – teaching, research, and service. The goal of evaluation is to ensure that University identified standards of excellence are maintained in those three areas. The document is organized according to three sections, with each section representing an area of evaluation. Each section identifies the categories of accepted materials and activities, their relative importance, and the methods of evaluation.

B. Disciplines for the Music DAC

This DAC is for Music Department, College of Arts and Sciences. Faculty whose research/creative activities are interdisciplinary by nature may request to use DAC criteria from another department under consultation with the Music DPC.

C. Evaluation Portfolio

The evaluation portfolio is a collection of materials submitted by the employee in order to substantiate performance in accordance with the DAC. Each portfolio will include a copy of the current Departmental Application of Criteria, a curriculum vitae, peer evaluations, student evaluations, instructional materials, evidence of teaching/primary duties, evidence of research/creative activities, evidence of service activities, and any other materials as set forth in the *Contract*. Below are guidelines each candidate should follow when submitting a portfolio for retention, tenure, promotion, post-tenure review, or a PAI.

1. Only include materials within the evaluation period as stipulated in the *Contract*.
2. A letter of intent should be the first item in the portfolio. The letter of intent should clearly identify the purpose of the submission (i.e. Fourth-Year Retention, PAI). It should be stated if the individual is to be evaluated on a higher standard, such as promotion or tenure by exception. Preceding each area of evaluation (Teaching/Primary Duties, Research/Creative Activity, Service) shall be a summary or outline of supporting materials in the evaluation.
3. A table of contents is required.
4. The candidate should use the same headings and language as that found in the DAC for the three categories. There shall be divisions between each section of the portfolio.
5. The submission and review of portfolios are governed by a process set forth in the *Contract*. In particular, they must be submitted by the requisite deadlines and, once submitted, material may not be added or removed by the faculty in personnel action unless requested by the evaluators.
6. Submitted material shall not include personal information such as social security numbers or irrelevant documents such as the Ethics Training Certificate.

III. Departmental Personnel Committee (DPC)

A. Purpose

The purpose of a Department Personnel Committee shall be to review materials submitted by faculty members of the Department seeking retention, promotion, professional advancement increase (PAI) or tenure and to provide recommendations in accordance with the DAC. The dates for each evaluation process are specified in the annual University evaluation timetable.

B. Composition

The composition of the DPC shall be tenured faculty as well as tenure-track faculty in their second probationary year or higher.

The Department of Music or the Music Program within a larger unified department will have a Personnel Committee consisting solely of tenure and tenure-track Music faculty members for the purpose of evaluation of retention, tenure, promotion, and PAI of Music faculty.

IV. Evaluation Criteria for Unit A Faculty

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each faculty member who is being considered for retention, tenure, promotion, PAI, or post-tenure review, shall be evaluated in the areas of teaching/performance of primary duties, research/creative activity, and service. The criteria by which these areas shall be evaluated are set forth in Sections V-VII of this document. Teaching/ performance of primary duties is considered the most important of the three areas of evaluation as stipulated in *Contract* Article 19.3.a.1.

The Minimum Performance Requirements for Unit A faculty in each of the three areas of evaluation is shown in the table below for each personnel action. These Performance Requirements are as designated in the current *Contract* in Article 19.3.b.2. For a summary of the criteria for each Performance Requirement (Appropriate, Satisfactory, Exemplary, etc.), please see the expanded table on the following page.

Personnel Action	Teaching/ Primary Duty	Research/ Creative Activity	Service
First year retention	Satisfactory	Appropriate	Appropriate
Second year retention	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Satisfactory
Third year retention	Effective	Highly Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory
Fourth year retention	Highly effective	Effective	Effective
Fifth year retention	Significant	Highly effective	Highly effective
Tenure	Superior	Significant	Significant
Associate Professor	Superior	Significant	Significant
Professor	Superior	Superior	Superior
Post-Tenure Review	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary	Adequate/Exemplary
PAI	Superior	Superior/Significant	Superior/Significant

Notes for the table on the following pages:

1. Activity is defined as a unique function occurring within the evaluation period. For instance, maintaining an instrument room counts as one activity, even though there may be multiple instrument rooms. However, in multiple-year evaluations, instrument room maintenance can be counted once for each year that it was performed.
2. Activities in the table are organized on a hierarchy of value labeled as A or B and are coupled with numbers to identify a specific classification of activity to be evaluated.
3. Materials in a higher category can be used as substitutes for lower requirements (where applicable and appropriate, in consultation with the DPC) but shall not diminish the quantity required.
4. "(2) A1" indicates 2 A1 activities are required during the evaluation period. "(3) A2/B1" indicates that any combination of A2 plus B1 activities totaling three is required.

Personnel Action	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/Creative Activity	Service
First Year Retention	Satisfactory rating for A.a plus (1) additional A activity plus (1) B activity (if applicable)	Appropriate rating (1) A1	Appropriate rating (1) A1 plus (1) additional Category 1.
Second Year Retention	Satisfactory rating for A.a plus (1) additional A activity plus (1) B activity (if applicable)	Satisfactory rating (3) A1	Satisfactory rating (2) A1 plus (1) B1 plus (1) additional Category 1.
Third Year Retention	Effective rating for A.a plus (2) additional A activities plus (2) B activities (if applicable)	Highly satisfactory rating (3) A1 plus (2) A2/B1	Highly satisfactory rating (2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (2) additional Category 1 plus (1) Category 2.
Fourth Year Retention	Highly effective rating for A.a plus (3) additional A activities plus (2) B activities (if applicable)	Effective rating (3) A2/B1 plus (1) B1	Effective rating (2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (2) additional Category I plus (1) Category 2
Fifth Year Retention	Significant rating for A.a plus (4) additional A activities plus (2) B activities (if applicable)	Highly effective rating (2) A2/B1 plus (1) B2	Highly effective rating (2) A1 plus (2) additional Category I plus (2) Category 2

Tenure	Superior rating for A.a plus (9) additional A activities plus (6) B activities (if applicable)	Significant rating (7) A2/B1 plus (3) B1 plus (1) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	Significant rating (10) A1 plus (17) additional Category activities with activity in at least 2 of the 3 groups B, C, and D plus (4) Category 2
Promotion/PAI	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/Creative Activity	Service
Promotion to Assistant Professor	Highly effective rating for A.a plus (3) additional A activities plus (2) B activities (if applicable)	Satisfactory rating (4) A1/B2 plus (2) B1 plus (1) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	Satisfactory rating (4) A1 plus (2) additional Category 1
Promotion to Associate Professor	Superior rating for A.a plus (9) additional A activities plus (6) B activities (if applicable)	Significant rating (7) A2/B1 plus (3) B1 plus (1) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	Significant rating (10) A1 plus (17) additional Category activities with activity in at least 2 of the 3 groups B, C, and D plus (4) Category 2
Promotion to Professor	Superior rating for A.a plus (11) additional A activities plus (8) B activities (if applicable)	Superior rating (8) A2/B1 plus (4) B1 plus (1) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	Superior rating (10) A1 plus (20) additional Category 1 activities with activity in at least 2 of the 3 groups B, C, and D plus (7) Category 2
PAI	Superior rating for A.a plus (11) additional A activities plus (8) B activities (if applicable)	Significant or Superior rating (see above to mirror either Promotion to Associate Prof. or Promotion to Professor)	Significant or Superior rating (see above to mirror either Promotion to Associate Prof. or Promotion to Professor)
Post Tenure Review	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/Creative Activity	Service
Adequate	Highly Effective rating for A.a plus (2) additional A activities plus (1) additional B activity (if applicable)	(2) A1 plus (1) B1/A2	(1) A1 plus (1) B1 plus (1) additional Category 1

Exemplary	Significant rating for A.a plus (4) additional A activities plus (2) additional B activities (if applicable)	(2) B1/A2 plus (1) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	(2) A1 plus (2) B1 plus (1) C1/D1 plus (2) additional Category 1
Tenure/ Promotion by Exceptionality	Teaching/Primary Duties	Research/Creative Act.	Service
Tenure, Exceptionality *one of the three areas may be as stipulated for normal tenure*, two must be from the following:	Superior Rating for A.a plus (15) additional A activities plus (9) B activities (if applicable)	(10) A2/B1 plus (5) B1 plus (2) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	(15) A1 plus (23) additional Category activities with activity in at least 2 of the 3 groups B, C, and D plus (7) Category 2
Promotion to Associate Prof., Exceptionality *one of the three areas may be as stipulated for normal promotion*, two must be from the following:	Superior rating for A.a plus (14) additional A activities plus (9) B activities (if applicable)	(12) A2/B1 plus (5) B1 plus (2) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	(16) A1 plus (25) additional Category activities with activity in at least 2 of the 3 groups B, C, and D plus (7) Category 2
Promotion to Professor, Exceptionality *one of the three areas may be as stipulated for normal promotion*, two must be from the following:	Superior rating for A.a plus (17) additional A activities plus (13) B activities (if applicable)	(14) A2/B1 plus (6) B1 plus (2) B2 ----- OR (1) B3	(17) A1 plus (27) additional Category 1 activities with activity in at least 2 of the 3 groups B, C, and D plus (12) Category 2

V. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation for Teaching /Performance of Primary Duties

A record of all teaching and teaching-related activities, supporting evidence, and a listing of workloads (courses and primary duties) by semester is required. Evidence shall include how the candidate meets the established criteria, how (when applicable) assessment results have led to changes in courses, and how faculty-developed activities and initiatives have improved teaching.

The two aspects of the category Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties are to be weighted in their evaluation in proportion to the assignment of CUEs on the faculty workload listing (by semester). Because each of these aspects is quite different, the categories, their importance, the criteria, and guidelines for each will be covered in two parallel sections organized according to the following designations: **A. Teaching** and **B. Performance of Primary Duties**. The teaching section is first and the performance of primary duties follows immediately after, and before the research/creative activities. The materials required to meet the performance standard for each section are listed below.

V. TEACHING/PRIMARY DUTIES CATEGORIES	
A. TEACHING	B. PRIMARY DUTIES
a. Classroom performance	a. Primary duty performance
b. Other teaching-related duties	b. Other primary duty related activities
c. Curriculum development and revision	c. Program development and enhancement
d. Professional development related to teaching	d. Professional development related to primary duty

Teaching Materials to be Evaluated for Type A Categories

A Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a. Classroom performance	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course load/primary duties listed by semester. 2. All peer and chair evaluations during the evaluation period. 3. Summary of student evaluations for each course evaluated during the review period. This includes online and hybrid courses. 4. The course syllabus 5. Evidence of participation in required assessment activities. 6. Additional materials including: Quizzes/exams, handouts, study guides, assignments, graded or ungraded student assignments, signed statements relating to teaching performance, evidence of teaching awards, materials from tutoring or help sessions, evidence of participation in the academic early warnings, results in general education, other relevant materials not covered above.
b. Other teaching related activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evidence of training students in research/creative activities. 2. Evidence of training students as teaching assistants. 3. Evidence of student mentoring. 4. Evidence of assisting with study groups/tutoring groups. 5. Evidence of observing student teaching candidates. 6. engaging in outside activities with students 7. coordination of guest speakers to courses
c. Curriculum development and revision	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Original instructional materials such as homework problems, novel/original learning aids, and new hands-on activities. 2. Updates to lecture material. 3. Evidence of efforts to develop new courses, update existing courses, or change/enhance a program's curriculum.
d. Professional development for teaching improvement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Documentation of participation in professional development activities that contribute to course development and improvement of teaching.

Relative Importance of Teaching (A) Activities and Methods of Evaluation

For all teaching faculty, the evaluation of classroom performance is the most significant activity. Evaluation of a candidate's teaching will include consideration of the candidate's effectiveness in the following areas: execution of assigned responsibilities; command of the subject matter or discipline; and ability to organize, and analyze and present material clearly and effectively. Below are specific instructions regarding the evaluation of A activities:

Course Syllabi

Syllabi are expected to clearly define the following: course description; course objectives/outcomes; assessment methods; the name of the text and other required materials; instructor's name, phone number, e-mail address, office location and office hours; class meeting time and location; a calendar of activities for the course; ADA statement; material to be covered in the course; policies concerning attendance and tardiness; grading standards, frequency and relative weights of exams, quizzes, homework, papers, and other materials; and link to the University student evaluation site <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>. In addition, it is expected that syllabi will be professionally produced with a minimum of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors, that all instructions and conditions are internally consistent, and that the course content and prerequisites reflect the catalog description. All syllabi will be in the HLC format and will include items required for specific accrediting agencies when appropriate. For courses where a 4000-level class meets with a 5000-level class, it is expected that the two classes will have different syllabi, different learning outcomes, and different assessment measures.

Course Materials

Representative exams, quizzes, and other materials submitted for evaluation are expected to reflect the following qualities: balanced coverage of the assigned material, questions which are clearly stated, questions which are appropriate for the level of the course, a length which is appropriate for the time allotted, and a minimum of spelling, grammatical or typographical errors. Materials submitted will be evaluated with regard to their value in assisting student learning, their originality, and their appropriateness for the course. Regular revisions and updates to course materials shall be valued more than repetitive, unrevised materials over a multiple-year period.

Student Evaluations

Faculty teaching larger course sections shall give all students the opportunity to evaluate their teaching effectiveness through the student evaluations provided online by the University Evaluation Website: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>.

For applied lessons (individual instruction) and courses/ensembles with low enrollment, student evaluations will be conducted through the Department and administered by the Chair or assisted by a student enrolled in the course.

The faculty member shall advise students of the evaluation procedure by placing an item in their syllabi that informs the student about the online evaluation procedure and gives the University Evaluation Web Address. The results of these evaluations will be provided to the faculty member only after the course grade has been submitted. The faculty member will place in their portfolio the evaluations for each course evaluated during the review period.

The following numerical system will determine the rating of student evaluations in the aggregate:

Satisfactory:	2.0 – 2.4
Effective:	2.5 – 2.9
Highly Effective:	3.0 – 3.4
Significant:	3.5 – 3.9
Superior:	4.0 – 5.0

When considering student evaluations, attention will be given to the nature of the class being evaluated (music major course, private instruction, ensemble, general education, etc.). In examining the student evaluation results, the DPC will consider the differences in course characteristics. Generally speaking, faculty members may demonstrate a greater proficiency in some areas than they do in other areas.

Teaching Assessment Activities

Assessment instruments may be required for some courses as designated by the department. Faculty administering such instruments must compile the results and return them to the Assessment Coordinator on a timely basis. Effectiveness will be measured by the quality of reports submitted for evaluation.

Peer/Chairperson Classroom Visitations

Two peer teaching observations will be required. One evaluator will be selected by the DPC from its membership to most closely represent expertise in the area of teaching to be evaluated. In consultation with the DPC, the second evaluator will be selected by the faculty member being evaluated. It is preferred that evaluators be at an equal or higher rank than the faculty member under review. However, considerations will be given to an evaluator's area of expertise.

One chairperson evaluation will be required. The chairperson will schedule a teaching observation with the candidate at a mutually agreed upon time.

A faculty member being evaluated in the area of musicology/music history may include teaching observations from members of the University history or art history faculties; a faculty member being evaluated in the area of world music/ethnomusicology may include teaching observations from members of the University anthropology or geography faculties; and faculty members being evaluated in the area of music education may include teaching observations from members of the College of Education faculty. No more than half of the teaching observations may be from evaluators outside the DPC.

The evaluators will each provide a written summary of her/his observations using the standard form adopted by the DPC. These evaluations will be given to the chairperson of the DPC, the faculty member being evaluated, and members of the DPC prior to the evaluation meeting.

Curriculum Revision and Development (A.c)

These activities include, but are not limited to: new course development, new instructional material development and new option development. Effectiveness as measured by adoption and implementation of the proposed courses and options should be documented.

Professional Development Activities for Teaching Improvement (A.d)

Activities include but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, attainment of additional degrees, sabbaticals, fellowships, and other teaching-related, educational experiences. Documentation of participation must be provided for consideration.

The three **most important** criteria for evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be:

- 1) Classroom (peer) observations
- 2) Instructional materials (including syllabi)
- 3) Student evaluations

Primary Duty Materials to be Evaluated for Type B Categories

Types of B Activities	Materials to be Evaluated
a. Research Release Time	1. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty. 2. Letter of evaluation.
b. Program Coordinator or Administrative Release Time	1. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty. 2. Letter of evaluation.
c. Academic Release Time	1. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty. 2. Letter of evaluation.
d. Assessment Release Time	1. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty. 2. Representative assessment reports. 3. Evidence of attendance at assessment meetings. 4. Letter of evaluation.
e. Advising Release Time	1. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty. 2. Summary of completed advisor surveys (where available). 3. Evidence of activities related to the primary duty. 4. Letter of evaluation.
f. Other Type of Release Time	1. Synopsis of activities related to the primary duty. 2. Letter of evaluation.

Relative Importance of Primary Duty (B) Activities and Methods of Evaluation

The acquisition of resources, activities directed at program improvement and other professional development activities that are associated with these activities must be evaluated. Compensated duties or other activities where release time has been provided do not diminish the importance of direct instructional activities, but should be viewed as significant in accord with one's professional development and the mission of the University. Below are specific instructions regarding the evaluation of B activities:

Letters of Evaluation

A letter of evaluation for each primary duty should include a statement of assigned duties, a listing of goals and objectives for the release time, and an assessment of the faculty's member performance of the duty. An evaluation should be completed and included in the portfolio by the direct supervisor of the activity for whom re-assigned time has been provided. For activities spanning multiple years, only one letter of evaluation for each activity is required. If the direct supervisor of the activity is the chairperson, the chairperson may include their evaluation of the primary duty in their overall narrative of the candidate.

Synopsis of Activities Related to the Primary Duty

Documentation of attendance at activities related to the assigned primary duties is required. Additional documentation includes: the maintenance of appropriate and accessible records, copies of progress reports submitted, attendance at workshops, training courses or other development programs related to the primary duty. If release time has been granted for research, then a narrative summary of the research performed must be included in this section even if details of the conduct and product of research is reported in the research section. If release time has been granted for being a program coordinator, then the results of being a program coordinator may still be reported in the service section.

Program Improvement/Acquisition of Resources

Significant improvements to a program and/or acquisition of resources to improve a primary duty activity should be documented and explained (example: an advisor develops a method for improving the quality and efficiency of advising).

Professional Development for Program Improvement

These activities include, but are not limited to: participation in short courses, conferences and workshops, and other programs related to professional development in the area of expertise of the candidate. Documentation of participation in professional development activities must be provided for consideration to be given in the portfolio.

VI. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation for Research /Creative Activities

Faculty members shall not be restricted or limited in areas in which they engage in scholarly activities, as long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the faculty member's research and her/his areas of expertise. This includes the relationship by both academic and performance-based faculty members. "The creative production and professional work of performers, composers, and other applied faculty should be accepted as equivalent to scholarly publication or research as a criterion for appointment and advancement in all institutions." (*National Association of Schools of Music Handbook*, p. 59). Academic and performance-based faculty are encouraged to become involved in a variety of scholarly activities to enhance their abilities as instructors at the university level. Professional performance and related activities are encouraged, but when submitted for evaluation for a personnel action, they should be presented in a manner that clearly exemplifies how each activity relates to advancement of an academic profession.

Relative Importance – Professors Seeking Professional Advancement Increases (PAI), Tenured Candidates Seeking Promotion, and Tenure-Track Candidates seeking retention: The most significant criterion for evaluation shall be evidence that the faculty member is active and engaged in his/her discipline and may include publication in academic journals, evidence of research, membership or leadership in discipline-based organizations, and developing or co-developing funded grants/fellowships or activities as well as relevant juried or reviewed concerts, solo performances or recitals, etc. Few limitations are to be placed on the kinds of research/creative activity activities selected, as long as there is a demonstrable relationship between the faculty member's research/creative activity and his/her academic area. Self-published works/recordings shall have documented commercial success and/or academic review and outlets in order to be given credit.

The department recognizes that research within music may differ significantly in those disciplines and, further, that a variety of different kinds of creative activities may be appropriate within each discipline. The activities listed within each category are meant to be illustrative of the kinds of activities that may be considered and their relative ranking in accordance with section 19.3a (3) (b) of the Faculty Agreement.

These lists are not meant to be either definitive or exhaustive. A faculty member may suggest the appropriate category in which a particular activity should be counted. Each faculty member is encouraged to consult with the DPC concerning his/her activities, their category rankings, and the appropriate documentation.

Quantity and quality are taken into consideration in evaluation. For example, nomination for a Pulitzer Prize for a composition, gaining notoriety for a published textbook, or nomination for a Grammy award may constitute just as high achievement (or possibly higher) as the publication of several non-refereed articles, self-produced recordings or self-published writings, etc.

Methods of Evaluation: To meet the contractual evaluation standards, the Department of Music will evaluate faculty on qualitative and quantitative measures for the Research/Creative Activity's merits.

For the purpose of promotion, PAI and/or tenure, only completed work or work in progress at the time of the evaluation may be submitted for consideration by the DPC.

The Department recognizes that the evaluation of a faculty member's research/creative activities and contribution to the intellectual life of the department and the University cannot and should not be reduced to a simple or mechanical tabulation of categories represented. Both quality and quantity shall be taken into consideration.

All research and creative activities submitted in the portfolio will fit into one of the five categories listed on the previous page: A1, A2, B1, B2, or B3. Activities in B1, B2 and B3 represent a higher level of research/creative activities achievement by clearly documenting the product of research while activities in A1 and A2 are those scholarly activities necessary for and leading to scholarly productivity. The ranking of the categories of research/creative activities is (highest to lowest) B3 > B2 > B1 > A2 > A1. For the purposes of fulfilling the performance standard, extra activities in a higher category can be used to fulfill the performance requirements of a lower category.

In all categories, the quality, scope, and professional stature of the activity will be judged by the DPC and chairperson as to whether the performance standard indicated has been fulfilled. Candidates will not only be judged on meeting the minimum quantity of activities required to fulfill the performance standard indicated, but also the quality of the activities. It shall be the responsibility of the candidate to clearly articulate how they meet the performance standard. In cases where the quantitative standard has not been met, a candidate can make an argument as to why their activities meet it qualitatively, and when demonstrated may be deemed acceptable.

The following is a list of scholarly activities (A1/A2) and research/creative productivity (B1/B2/B3). ***This list is not meant to be exhaustive***, but rather representative of the types of work being considered.

In terms of the scope of an activity, locality does not necessarily dictate a "local" venue. For example, the Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the Green Mill Jazz Club are "local", but are Nationally recognized.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES:

A1: (lower achievement)

- Writing a research/creative activities agenda
- Reporting progress in research/creative activities
- Attending a Scholarly Conference or a Research Skills Workshop
- Completing a Literature Review in a Research-Related Area
- CSU Presentation, Performance, or Exhibition
- Panel Discussant or Panel Moderator/Chair
- Unsuccessful or Submitted Internal Grant Proposal
- Composition Outline or Sketch
- Outline and Timetable for a New Recording Project
- Outline for a New Performance Venue
- Final reports corresponding to scholarly activity (research projects/grants/fellowships)

A2: (higher achievement)

- Demonstration of Significant Progress on Research/Creative Activities (e.g., IRB approval, copyright permissions, reading lists, interview transcriptions, artwork/photographs, exploratory fieldwork, pre-contract surveys from publishers, copyediting, etc.)
- Completed Review of Book, Recording, Video
- Serving as a Grant/Manuscript Reviewer (blind review)
- Editor of a Research-Related refereed Journal
- Invited Review of Research-Related or Original Creative Works
- Non-Peer Reviewed E-Media Publication
- Participatory Research Project
- Organizing a Research-Related Professional Conference
- Adjudicator for a Performance or Local/Regional granting/fellowship agency
- Evaluation of academic materials and/or institutions/programs including unpublished peer reviews for journals, evaluations done for publishers
- Submission of a proposal/abstract to present at a local/regional conference
- Awards for local/regional achievement
- Academic talks given off campus (local/regional significance)
- Commissions awarded by local groups
- Local/regional awards (achievement, honorary, etc.)
- Participation in a master class
- Community projects that draw upon one's scholarly expertise

RESEARCH/CREATIVE PRODUCTIVITY

B1: (lower achievement)

- Submitted External Grant/Fellowship
- Submitted Peer-Reviewed Manuscript
- Successful Internal Grant
- Presentation/Performance at a Local/Regional Conference
- Invited Conference Presentation or Lecture
- Successful Non-Peer-Reviewed Journal Article/External Grant
- Student Research/Creative Activity Training
- Student Thesis/Project Supervision
- Activities related to a multi-year grant/fellowship not claimed as B2
- Original Translation of Scholarly Importance
- Published short-form essay in a peer-reviewed book or journal
- Activities related to the successful submission of a grant not claimed as B2
- Submitted Proposal or Abstract to Perform or Present at a National/Int'l Venue or Conference
- Musical Works Performed or Directed in Local Venues (note: locality does not necessarily dictate "Local": Ex. Chicago Symphony Orchestra, Green Mill Jazz Club are "local" but Nationally recognized)
- Musical Recordings: Audio and/or Video (production)
- Professional Musical Performances (no restrictions shall be placed on musical genre)
- Commissions awarded by national/international groups
- Academic talks given off campus (national/international significance)
- Outside review/mention of faculty member's work
- Statements from professionals outside the university or evidence that a faculty member's work is regarded as significant within his/her discipline

- Other non-reviewed publications (program notes, liner notes, newsletter pieces, etc)
- Archival projects
- National/international awards (achievement, honorary, etc.)
- Production of research-related A/V materials (e.g., ethnographic films/recordings, documentaries, CD-ROMs, CDs, fieldwork videos/DVDs, software programs)
- Publication of a Book, Recording, Video, etc. Review
- Development of a multimedia educational website with lesson plans for public school teachers
- Completion of a dissertation

B2: (higher achievement)

- Published Book Chapter in Discipline-Related Research Area
- Published Small-Scale Composition/Arrangement
- Published Composition
- Published Journal or Encyclopedia Article in a Discipline-Related Research Area
- Funded Peer-Reviewed External Grant or Fellowship Related to Research Agenda awarded by a local/regional agency or foundation
- A Performance or Work (Composition, Article, etc.) Presented at an National/International Venue (must meet DPC approval to be considered as national/international)
- Externally Reviewed Musical Recordings: Audio and/or Video
- Editor of a Research-Related refereed journal
- Adjudicator for a national/international granting/fellowship agency or foundation
- Published original translation of a book chapter, article, etc. in research area
- Editor of book series (when the editor is not a contributor)
- Presentation at a National/International Conference
- Publication of a Peer-Reviewed Article

B3: (highest achievement, may substitute for lower categories)

- Published Book, Monograph, Textbook, Edited volume or anthology (when the editor is a contributor) in Research Area
- Full-Length Recording with a Major Record Label
- Published Large-Scale Composition
- International Acknowledgement of Composition, Writing, Recording, or Discipline-Related Achievement (e.g. Grammy Nomination, Pulitzer Prize Nomination. Must be verifiable that the award is of international recognition. Subject to DPC acceptance.)
- Funded peer-reviewed Grant/Fellowship Related to Research agenda awarded by a national/international agency or foundation (Guggenheim, Fulbright, NEH, etc.)

VII. Categories of Materials and Activities, Relative Importance, and Methods of Evaluation for Service Activities

A record of all service activities and supporting evidence should be organized according to the four categories listed below. The list is not meant to be exhaustive, rather illustrative of the types of service activities to be included in the portfolio. Faculty members applying for promotion or retention should review the language in the DAC and consult with colleagues and DPC members to ensure that items included in the portfolio are appropriate for one of the following groups:

- A. Service to the Department
- B. Service to the College and the University
- C. Service to the Community
- D. Service to the Profession, Discipline, or Field

Classification of Service Activities

The candidate should submit a portfolio that includes documentation organized according to the following list of activities. The list below is not meant to be exhaustive but illustrative of the types of service activities which may be included. A Category 1 departmental service activity would be referred to as an “A1” service activity.

In evaluating the service of a professor, tenured faculty member, or tenure-track candidate, the Department will consider such materials as the following: extent and nature of leadership; degree of participation; quality and length of service; extent and nature of national, state, or local recognition of service to the employee’s assigned responsibilities and to the University. Evidence may include minutes of meetings attended, letters from committee chairpersons detailing a candidate’s significant achievements on the committee, and other evidence of material contributions by the candidate.

All service activities in the four groups (A-D) above will be placed in a Category based on the effort required of that activity. Category 1 activities shall consist of activities that require time and effort commensurate with the reasonable expectation of the faculty member involved in the activity. Category 2 consists of service activities that require time and effort above and beyond that expected in the normal performance of a Category 1 activity in the same service group. For a service activity to reach the level of Category 2, members of the DPC must accept the faculty member’s claim that his/her performance of the activity rose to the level of leadership or extraordinary effort. For example, serving as a member of a committee (Category 1) normally requires a lower level of effort when compared to chairing the same committee (Category 2).

A. SERVICE TO THE DEPARTMENT

Category I (lower level of effort):

- Participation in Department committees
- Maintenance of departmental equipment
- Classroom observation of peers
- Mentoring faculty
- Lending professional skills or expertise to the department for the advancement of the departmental mission
- Letters of support/recommendation for students or colleagues
- Search Committees

- Department overhead, including equipment/instrument maintenance, curriculum development, accreditation-related work, linkages with other institutions, etc.
- Career counseling
- Assistance with student groups
- Guest speaker, master classes, and other event planning/hosting/facilitating of on-campus events (colloquia, seminars)
- Preparatory work in ERG (enrollment, recruitment/retention, graduation)

Category II (higher level of effort):

- Chairing a Department committee that met regularly and required effective planning, organization, etc.
- Organizing Departmental seminars
- Organizing public events sponsored by the Department
- Developing written material for or performing evaluations of new initiatives in the department
- Service on a Department committee which met regularly and required significant work of its members outside the meetings, such as Program Review committees and accreditation committees
- Service on a department committee which required authorship of significant documents, such as a grant or NEPR committees
- Assistance with departmental music promotional activities (such as marketing, box office administration, calendar management, coordination with the Office of Events Management and Planning, etc.)
- Applying for grants for departmental equipment/materials and activities
- Advising student organizations
- Student recruitment activities, including school visitations
- Active involvement in ERG (enrollment, recruitment/retention, graduation) through documented assignment

B. SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY

Category I (lower level of effort):

- Participation on College/University Committees
- Speaker at College/University seminars
- Formally representing the University at external events
- Lending professional skills or expertise to the College/University in advancement of the College/University Mission
- Commencement-related assistance
- Performances at university events
- Speaking to classes in other departments within and outside the college
- Guest speaker, master classes, and other event planning/hosting/facilitating of on-campus events (colloquia, seminars)
- ERG work (committee or organized otherwise)

Category II (higher level of effort):

- Assistance with other academic programs at the University
- Service on a University or college committee which required authorship of significant documents
- Significant documentation of ERG work through committee assignment that required high level of documentation

- Organizing public events sponsored by the College/University
- University Faculty Performances
- College and University Committee offices
- Faculty Union Service
- Service on a University of College committee which met regularly and required significant work of its members outside of the meetings, such as accreditation committees, UPC, and the IRB

C. SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

Category I (lower level of effort):

- Professionally related volunteer work
- Speaking engagements in the community
- Volunteer work that draws upon one's expertise in one or more academic area(s)
- General community outreach

Category II (higher level of effort):

- Board membership in community agencies related to the individual's professional discipline or specialization
- Completing a major project with a community organization
- Involvement in community activities drawing upon one's academic or professional skills, with a high level of time commitment as compared with Category I
- Involvement in committees and boards to further the cause of music literacy, to promote higher education, and to provide greater visibility for CSU
- Speaking engagements in the community and around the state, nation, and world
- Organizing public events sponsored by the community

D. SERVICE TO THE PROFESSION, DISCIPLINE OR FIELD

Category I (lower level of effort):

- Service to professional societies and journals (unpaid academic service such as peer reviews, outside evaluations, evaluations for publishers, letters of reference, etc.):
- Invitation to review creative works from a professional agency
- Invitation to review grants or manuscripts from a professional agency or journal
- Participation in planning and implementing professional conferences or activities
- Assisting in the publication of professional newsletters
- Maintaining active membership in a professional organization through attendance at meetings or participation in public forums.
- Editing/reviewing journal articles and books not directly related to research activities

Category II (higher level of effort):

- Participation in professional societies as an officer, member/head of a committee, or other administrative function
- Conference planning and hosting
- Service on boards, accreditations teams, committees, councils, task forces, or advisory boards of professional organizations
- Serving as a leader on a review panel

Relative Importance of Service Activities and Methods of Evaluation

Care must be taken when evaluating service to consider the committee assignments and work available to the faculty member, the place of the faculty member in his or her professional growth, and the nature of the faculty member's academic background. Not every discipline lends itself to the same service opportunities, particularly service opportunities in the general community, as well as the professional or academic community of the discipline. It is also anticipated that the amount of service activities engaged in by a faculty member may vary from year to year.

On occasion, a faculty member may receive CUE's for one of the services on the list. The department considers this to be in recognition of the importance of the service activity. It is not to be construed as a reallocation for the activity to Teaching/Primary Duties.

VIII. Unit B Faculty:

In accordance with the University Evaluation Criteria for B Unit Faculty that will take effect beginning with the 2008 academic year, the degree of effectiveness of performance of each faculty member being considered for retention will be evaluated in the area of teaching/ performance of primary duties.

Teaching/Performance of Primary Duties

The annual evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall be based upon:

- 1) Classroom observations
- 2) Instructional materials
- 3) Student evaluations

1. Classroom Observations

One teaching observation will be required. One evaluator will be selected by the DPC from its membership to most closely represent the expertise in the area of teaching to be evaluated.

One chairperson teaching observation will be required. During the first year of employment, the evaluation will occur during the first semester. Thereafter the evaluation will occur annually during the fall or spring term. The chairperson will schedule a teaching observation with the candidate at a mutually agreed upon time.

The evaluators will each provide a written summary of her/his observations using the standard form adopted by the DPC. These evaluations will be given to the chairperson of the DPC, the faculty member being evaluated, chair of the department, and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

2. Instructional Materials

The faculty member shall provide instructional materials used in teaching. Materials submitted must include syllabi, which are expected to conform to the adopted "Generic Syllabi Format", and are expected to clearly define grading, attendance requirements, required texts and materials, quizzes/examinations, and accessibility of the instructor outside of class. Other course materials may be included at the discretion of the faculty member being evaluated.

3. Student Evaluations

Faculty teaching larger course sections shall give all students the opportunity to evaluate their teaching effectiveness through the student evaluations provided online by the University Evaluation Website: <http://www.csu.edu/course-eval>.

For applied lessons (individual instruction) and courses/ensembles with low enrollment, student evaluations will be conducted through the Department and administered by the Chair or assisted by a student enrolled in the course.

The faculty member shall advise students of the evaluation procedure by placing an item in their syllabi that informs the student about the online evaluation procedure and gives the University Evaluation Web Address. The results of these evaluations will be provided to the faculty member only after the course

grade has been submitted. The faculty member will place in their portfolio the evaluations for each course evaluated during the review period.

The following numerical system will determine the rating of student evaluations in the aggregate:

Satisfactory:	2.0 – 2.4
Effective:	2.5 – 2.9
Highly Effective:	3.0 – 3.4
Significant:	3.5 – 3.9
Superior:	4.0 – 5.0

When considering student evaluations, attention will be given to the nature of the class being evaluated (music major course, private instruction, ensemble, general education, etc.). In examining the student evaluation results, the DPC will consider the differences in course characteristics. Generally speaking, faculty members may demonstrate a greater proficiency in some areas than they do in other areas.

4. Primary Duties

Faculty members with a Primary Duty other than teaching must show evidence of successful completion of reassigned activities.

3. University Service

Unit B Faculty members are encouraged to attend and participate in department meetings and required to administer all required course assessments. A record of such activities is to be provided and kept current on the vita used in the evaluation process.

IX. Evaluation of Unit A Research Faculty

Research Faculty are faculty hired as experienced, independent researchers who have qualifications comparable to those expected of tenurable ranks, but are not tenure track. The appointee is expected to make significant contributions to the research mission of the University, and they are appointed on a nontenurable basis based upon available grant funding. The chair/director and dean will evaluate the performance of Research Faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the University evaluation timetable.

The degree of effectiveness of performance of each employee being considered for reappointment or promotion as a research faculty member will be evaluated in the areas of research activity and possibly teaching/performance of primary duties and service as defined by the appointment and work assignments. If teaching/primary duties or service requirements are specified in the letter of appointment and annual work assignments, accomplishments in these areas will be considered of less importance than his or her research productivity.

Performance Standards for Research Faculty

The performance standard for continued annual appointments is defined as “highly effective” for all activities in the appointment for the first three years. The details of the “highly effective” standards are described in this DAC. After three years, it is expected that research faculty will demonstrate

performance at the “significant” level for research/creative activities in every year thereafter for continued annual appointments. The details of the “significant” standards for a one year evaluation period are described in this DAC.

Research Faculty are also eligible for rank and promotion in titles such as Term Professor, Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Research Professor.

1. For promotion to research assistant professor: highly effective research/creative activities; highly effective teaching/performance of primary duties and/or highly effective service through the evaluation period.
2. For promotion to research associate professor: significant research/creative activities; significant teaching/performance of primary duties and/or significant service through the evaluation period.
3. For promotion to research professor: superior research/creative activities; superior teaching/performance of primary duties and and/or significant service through the evaluation period.

X. Evaluation of Unit A Clinical Faculty

Clinical Faculty are hired to supervise students in a clinical, experiential, or practicum setting, in addition to being engaged in teaching, research, and service depending on the nature of the appointment. Clinical Faculty qualifications shall be comparable to those expected of tenurable ranks and their promotion pathways parallel those of the tenurable ranks. They are eligible for annual reappointment and multiple-year appointments contingent upon, successful performance evaluations, program need and availability of funds. They are not, however, eligible for tenure.

The DPC, chair, and dean will evaluate the performance of clinical faculty annually. The timetable for portfolio submission will be published in the University evaluation timetable.

Performance Standards for Clinical Faculty

For Reappointments (retention) Clinical Faculty must meet the standards stated in the *Contract* germane to their appointment. Reappointment standards for the first five years are identical to the retention standards for tenure-track faculty for this first five years. These standards are listed in Section IV of this document. Reappointment is subject to available funding.

The performance standard for annual reappointment in clinical year six and beyond: “effective” teaching/performance of primary duties; “effective” research/creative activity; and “effective” service during the evaluation period.

Clinical Faculty who have attained five or more years of instructional service with the University are eligible for renewable three-year contracts if they have earned “superior” performance evaluations for their teaching/primary duties and “significant” performance evaluations for either their research/creative activity or service in the preceding five-year period, and “highly effective” in the remaining area. The performance standards for maintaining three-year renewable clinical appointments are: “highly effective” teaching/performance of primary duties, “highly effective” research/creative activity, and “highly effective” service.

Clinical Faculty are eligible for clinical rank and promotion in titles such as Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor, and Clinical Professor; however, they are not eligible for tenure.

1. For promotion to clinical associate professor: superior teaching/performance of primary duties; significant research/creative activity; and significant service through the evaluation period.
2. For promotion to clinical professor: superior teaching/performance of primary duties; superior research/creative activity; and superior service through the evaluation period.

XI. Distance Education Policy for the Department of Music

1. The Department of Music considers Distance Learning Education to be any course that is completely online (internet course), television link-up, or interactive TV workshop between a location on campus and remote sites off campus. Such courses may be offered for credit and non-credit.
2. Distance education for credit courses: These courses are those whose course descriptions (CSU Catalogue) do not include a performance component and may include lecture courses that are currently used to meet:
 - a. General Education requirements (1000 level)
 - b. Undergraduate requirements (1000 and 2000 level)
 - c. Course electives both inside and outside the Department which may be used to fulfill course requirements for undergraduate degrees.
3. The department will not permit more than 20% of the above courses to fulfill the requirements for a degree.
4. The Department will determine which Music courses are offered within the CSU Distance Education Program:
 - a. The Chair of the Department shall poll the faculty to determine who may wish to offer courses within the Distance Education Program.
 - b. The faculty member will present to the faculty his/her proposal for a Distance Education course. The faculty member must demonstrate that he/she has the technical ability to provide such course by providing evidence for the use of technology in a traditional course offering. If an internet course is proposed, evidence of web-enhanced teaching would be appropriate. To offer a Distance Education course, departmental approval, administration approval (Chair, Dean, Provost), and Distance Learning approval are required.
 - c. If the course is being developed only for Distance Education, a full course proposal is necessary. Departmental approval, followed by University Curriculum Committee, administrative approval and Department of Distance Learning approval are required.
 - d. The department may offer as many Distance Education courses per semester as is appropriate to satisfy program needs of the department and university.
 - e. The faculty member should notify the Department of Distance Learning of any special technical needs of the course offering in obtaining Distance Learning approval.

- f. The Music Department Chair and the instructor will set an enrollment maximum to ensure that all students are provided with quality training.
 - g. The Department Chair will formulate a roster of faculty who wish to teach a Distance Education course in the event that the demand for teaching assignments exceeds the support from Distance Learning. This roster will be developed in a manner similar to those developed for teaching assignments in the summer session.
5. The Department will evaluate the effectiveness of a Distance Education course by the use of three groups of evaluators.
- a. Three members of the Department Personnel Committee shall assess the quality and currency of the materials. The course materials should contain a syllabus summarizing information concerning the objectives, operation, and management of the course. If one of the objectives is research, it should contain a list of research materials and a description of how to use these resources.
 - b. The Distance Learning Department shall assess the effectiveness of the course offerings, materials, and the timely responses of the instructor from a technical perspective.
 - c. Enrolled students shall assess the effectiveness of the course offerings, materials and the timely responses of the instructor and support staff. A student assessment form shall be developed which will provide effective evaluation of the use of the instruction medium by the instructor.

approved 4-1-00
revised 11-6-03
revised 2-26-04
revised 3-22-07
revised 6-08
approved 9-15-08
revised 9-7-12