SECTION I: Mission Statement

A. The mission of the Department is to provide research and creative work, teaching, and service to the campus, university, community, state, and disciplines. Within the broad outlines of the mission statement, the Department seeks to work cooperatively with other departments and university units to further the study, understanding, creation and/or production of music and theatre, and scholarship in music, theatre, and performance studies.

B. The Department is committed to providing an educational and work climate that is conducive to the personal and professional development of each individual. To fulfill its mission, the Department encourages a climate that values and nurtures collegiality, diversity, pluralism, and the uniqueness of the individual within our state, nation and world. The Department also strives to protect the rights and privileges and to enhance the self-esteem of all its members. The Department will assure that people are given equal opportunity without regard to race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national/ethnic origin, age, handicap status, or veteran status.

SECTION II: Administrative Structure

A. Department Head who is appointed by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts shall administer the Department of Performance Studies. The faculty will be consulted with respect to the appointment of the Department Head, as specified in University Rules. Such consultation is advisory and directed to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts (*University Rules 12.99.99.M6).

B. Upon the completion of a Department Head's term (usually four years), the faculty will be consulted with respect to the re-appointment of the Department Head, as specified in university policy. Such consultation is advisory and directed to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts.

C. The Department Head will appoint an Associate Head. If the Department Head is from the Theatre Program, the Associate Head will be from the Music Program; if Department Head is from the Music Program, the Associate Head will be from the Theatre Program. When such appointments are made, the Department Head will define, in writing, the appointees’ duties and responsibilities. A list of these duties and responsibilities will be distributed to the faculty. The faculty will be consulted annually with respect to the appointment or re-appointment of the Associate Head. Such consultation is advisory and directed to the Department Head.

SECTION III: Faculty Meetings

A. The Department of Performance Studies faculty meetings will be held at least once a semester. Additional meetings may be called at any time and with any degree of
frequency at the discretion of the Head or by petition of three or more faculty members. Agendas shall be distributed to the faculty at least forty-eight hours prior to the meeting. Minutes shall be taken at all meetings and must include any decisions made in the meeting. Minutes shall be distributed before and approved/corrected at the next meeting.

B. Faculty meetings are open to all full-time or part-time faculty without regard to rank.

C. It is expected that the recommendations of the department's standing committees or ad hoc committees shall be brought before the whole faculty for debate and discussion prior to implementation by the Head or other administrative officers. While department faculty meetings normally operate through consensual decision making, any member of the faculty has the right to call for a formal, recorded vote, submitted by written secret ballot, on any issue brought forward for consideration.

D. When formal votes are taken on matters concerning the appointment of tenure-line faculty, only tenured and tenure-line faculty shall have voting rights. On all other matters, only full-time faculty (tenure track, tenured, or non-tenure) shall have voting rights. Part-time faculty may be granted voting rights on matters related to their expertise when so empowered by a majority vote by the full-time faculty.

SECTION IV: Committee Structure

A. The Department of Performance Studies shall have the following standing committees.

1. Curriculum Committee: The curriculum committee is primarily responsible for the undergraduate curriculum. Such matters as new courses, changes in titles of courses, the content of courses, liaison with the College Curriculum Committee and other matters directly affecting undergraduate instruction are handled by the curriculum committee. The chair of this committee shall be the department’s representative to the College Curriculum Committee.

2. Promotion and Tenure Committee: The promotion and tenure committee is composed of all tenured faculty members in the Department. This committee is responsible for advising the Department Head on the periodic review of non-tenure-line faculty. In all cases of tenure and/or promotion review, each member of the promotion and tenure committee shall have a vote. In cases of promotion to full professor, only those currently holding that rank shall have a vote.

B. The Department Head may, from time to time, appoint such other ad hoc committees—including search committees—as the Department Head deems necessary. All ad hoc committees will cease to exist upon completion of the task/s for which they were originally constituted.

C. Committee Membership.

1. All members of the faculty may accept committee assignments for which they are eligible.
2. The Department Head shall appoint both the chairs and the membership of each standing and ad hoc committee. The Department Head on an annual basis shall review all such appointments. While committee meetings normally operate through consensual decision-making, any member of the committee has the right to call for a formal, recorded vote, submitted by written secret ballot, on any issue brought forward for consideration.

SECTION V: Departmental Activities and Responsibilities

A. The Department Head shall appoint a Departmental Representative to the Evans Library who shall be responsible for staying abreast of the issues involving library funding and policies. The representative is also responsible for attending any meetings called to discuss library matters and is to facilitate faculty members’ requests for the purchase of books, journals, and other library materials.

B. Service to the College of Liberal Arts and to Texas A&M University in general is expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Such service includes, but is not limited to:
   1. Membership on the Liberal Arts Council.
   2. Membership on one or more of the standing committees of the Liberal Arts Council.
   3. Membership on the Dean's Advisory Committee.
   4. Membership in the Faculty Senate.
   5. Membership on ad hoc committees with appointment by theDean of the College, the Provost, or the President of the University.

These By-laws can be amended at any time by a two-thirds vote (submitted by written secret ballot) of the faculty at a specifically called meeting for which a 21-day advance notice has been given. Such a meeting may be called at any time at the discretion of the department head or by petition of three or more faculty members (See III, A).

If any of the above provisions shall be found to be in conflict with the latest "Procedures for Review, Tenure, and Promotion" of the College of Liberal Arts, or the University Rules, those portions shall be considered severable and shall not affect the status of the remaining provisions.

Appendix: Definitions of Faculty Positions.

1. Full-time faculty: a full-time faculty member is any member of the teaching faculty who is budgeted at 100% time on the university payroll.
   A. Tenured: a tenured faculty member is any member of the teaching faculty who has been awarded tenure by authority of the Texas A&M System Board of Regents.
   B. Tenure-line: a tenure-line faculty member is any member of the teaching faculty who holds a tenure-accruing position.
   C. Non-tenure-line: a non-tenure-line faculty member is any member of the teaching faculty who does not occupy a tenure-accruing position (e.g.
distinguished lecturer, senior lecturer, lecturers, assistant lecturers, and visiting professors).

2. Part-time faculty: A part-time faculty member is any member of the teaching faculty who is budgeted at less than 100% time on the university payroll.

   A. Emeriti and retired faculty
   B. Assistant Lecturer
   C. Associate faculty
   D. Adjunct faculty

DEPARTMENT OF PERFORMANCE STUDIES
GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL REPORTS AND REVIEWS,
THIRD-YEAR, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND POST-TENURE REVIEWS
(revised by PERF February 2013)

The personnel decisions for the Department of Performance Studies (CLA) shall be governed by these guidelines, which in turn are governed by policies of the Texas A&M University and the College of Liberal Arts. University policy regarding faculty evaluation, most especially in regard to matters of annual reports, annual reviews, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review, is outlined in the University Rules (12.01.99.m2). The University Rules operate as a general guideline to maintain high productivity and quality performance of duties among tenured and promoted faculty; at the same time, they are sufficiently flexible to allow for the specific needs arising from the unique characteristics of each college, department, and program. College of Liberal Arts policy regarding faculty evaluation is set forth in the College's memorandum, Procedures for Review, Tenure, and Promotion. In cases of conflict between the Department of Performance Studies Guidelines and the University or College policies, this department document is superseded.

I. ANNUAL REPORTS AND ANNUAL MERIT REVIEWS. The Department Head shall conduct annually a review of each faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching, research or creative work, and service; in the case of tenure-track assistant professors, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will also review performance and supply its recommendation to the Head. In preparation for each year's review, the faculty member will submit a report of the activities and accomplishments during that calendar year to the Head, along with any supporting documentation deemed appropriate. The Head may wish to consult with faculty members about their reports, or faculty members may wish to schedule conferences with the Department Head and/or Associate Head for the same purpose. The conferences can serve to clarify the nature of a faculty member's work. These conferences are not mandatory and should be viewed as a way of supplementing the written report and enhancing communication between the Head, Associate Head, and the faculty member. The Head will write and convey an evaluation of the annual report to the faculty member. The criteria for the evaluation are provided in Section IV of this document. The Head’s evaluation shall serve as the basis for the recommendation for merit salary increases. This review shall take into account the results of any prior informal and formal reviews completed for purposes of contract renewal, midterm and end-of-term tenure review, and
promotion consideration. Along with prior information, reviews for salary recommendations shall consider the most recently available information supplied by the faculty and generated by the Head.

Salary recommendations shall be based on the three criteria of research or creative work, teaching and service. Other considerations may include salary inequity, compression, and inversion. Procedures for appealing salary recommendations are discussed in the University Rules **"Faculty Grievance Procedures not Concerning Questions of Tenure, Dismissal, or Constitutional Rights"** (12.01.99.M4).

With regard to the relative merits of the three broad areas of concern in the evaluation of faculty members, no absolutely fixed criterion or "weighing factor" can be sensibly adopted. Accordingly, the use of a criterion for determining the relative merits of research or creative work, teaching and service in evaluating faculty must be sensitively and intelligently applied. Ordinarily, however, research or creative work should count 50%, teaching should count 30%, and service should count 20%. The department head in consultation with the faculty member will determine any variation from this formula. For example, if a faculty member carries an especially heavy teaching load during a given year, his or her research activity would probably not be as productive. If a faculty member is engaged in full-time research, there would be no basis for evaluating his or her teaching.

Performance in each area will be evaluated as follows:

- **Excellent:** Well above departmental expectations.
- **Very good:** Above departmental expectations.
- **Satisfactory:** Meets departmental expectations.
- **Marginal:** Minimally acceptable, but in need of improvement.
- **Unsatisfactory:** Unacceptable, far below departmental expectations.

It is to be noted that the above ratings are not based on Departmental averages: satisfactory performance is determined not by what other faculty members achieve, but by what constitutes reasonable expectation. It is not unreasonable to think that usually a majority of the department will be found to perform at a level above departmental expectations.

The breadth of activities that may count in the three areas of research or creative work, teaching, and service is great and cannot be fully covered in brief lists of evaluative criteria. Evaluation in all areas will take into account the unique contributions of each individual.

**II. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR THIRD-YEAR REVIEWS, TENURE REVIEWS, AND REVIEWS FOR PROMOTION**

(revised by PERF April 2013)

**A. Introduction.** The Department Head shall assess the status of all faculty members in the Department annually for purposes of determining eligibility for Third-Year, Promotion and
Tenure, and Promotion reviews. This determination should be done with the assistance provided by informal consultation with the faculty. Individual faculty members may also request a review. After consulting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Department Head shall appoint a Review Subcommittee from the Tenure and Promotion Committee for each faculty member to be reviewed (See II, B). Such a subcommittee shall consist of a chair from the candidate’s program or a related field, and at least three additional faculty members, a majority of which shall be from the candidate’s program or from related fields in other departments/programs as appropriate. One or more of the members will be responsible for writing a report on the candidate’s performance in each of three areas: research or creative work, teaching and service. All members of the Review Subcommittee are expected to review the candidate’s credentials in each area and contribute to the written report. External letters or other documentation may be solicited to supplement the report in each area for third-year review. For tenure and promotion cases, external letters must be solicited for the research/creative work report. At least half of the solicited letters should be from a list the candidate provides, and none from the candidate’s “Do Not Ask List.” The results of each stage of a candidate's review process shall be made known to the candidate as the review proceeds.

It is the expectation of the Department of Performance Studies that candidates for tenure will have served the full probationary period to which they are entitled. In cases of clearly exceptional accomplishment, those that significantly exceed the normal standards, the department may wish to propose a candidate for early tenure. Such instances will be rare and must be supported by especially convincing evidence to gain approval.

B. Materials for Review Provided by the Faculty Member. It is the faculty member's responsibility to provide as complete a documentation of his or her work as is possible and to do so in the light of the policies, procedures, and criteria described below. This information shall be provided to the Review Subcommittee. The faculty member should submit a complete up-to-date vita which includes the items listed in the College's Procedures for Review, Tenure, and Promotion.

The faculty member should also provide the Review Subcommittee with a list of unpublished proposals, and working papers, an enumeration of research projects and creative work in progress with an indication of the stage of completeness. The file presented to the Review Subcommittee should also contain copies of publications and records of performance and/or productions, teaching scores and other teaching-related data, plus any additional supporting evidence, such as unsolicited letters, documents, syllabi, and examinations.

In addition, faculty members will submit a 3-page, single spaced personal statement placing the above materials and the faculty member's own career in whatever perspective seems appropriate. The faculty member must provide a list of potential external reviewers, and a list of any people who should not be asked for reviews.

C. Review Subcommittee. The Review Subcommittee shall prepare four draft reports: a research or creative work report, a teaching report, a service report, and a summary report. The chair of the Review Subcommittee is responsible for the summary report which shall reflect the
discussion of the three individual reports and the full committee’s evaluation and recommendation. Any member(s) of the Review Subcommittee may submit a minority report which shall be appended to the summary report.

**Research or Creative Work Report.** The Research or Creative Work Review Subcommittee, consisting of one or more members of the Review Subcommittee, shall review the Research or Creative Work qualifications of the faculty member. The subcommittee shall write a report, using the criteria and considerations found in Section V of this document. All information gathered shall be forwarded to the Review Subcommittee.

**Teaching Report.** The Teaching Review Subcommittee, consisting of one or more members of the Review Subcommittee, shall review the teaching qualifications of the faculty member. The committee shall write a report, using the criteria and considerations found in Section V of this document. All information gathered shall be forwarded to the Review Subcommittee.

**Service Report.** The Service Review Subcommittee, consisting of one or more members of the Review Subcommittee, shall review the service of the faculty member. The subcommittee shall write a report, using the criteria and considerations found in Section V of this document. All information gathered shall be forwarded to the Review Subcommittee.

**Summary Report.** This report, which is prepared by the chair of the Review Subcommittee, should highlight the most important features of the three subcommittee reports, summarize the discussion, and provide a recommendation.

**D. The Promotion and Tenure Committee.** The Promotion and Tenure Committee for third-year reviews and tenure reviews shall consist of all tenured faculty members in the Department. For the purposes of reviewing a candidate for promotion to the rank of Professor, the committee shall consist of all members of the Department who hold the rank of Professor.

The committee shall receive the report of the Review Subcommittee for the faculty member and vote on whether to continue, tenure, and/or promote the faculty member. The four reports prepared by the Review Subcommittee will form the basis for consideration of a case by the Promotion and Tenure Committee along with the candidate’s dossier for review. Following open discussion by the committee, the decision shall be by majority vote, submitted by written secret ballot. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for ensuring that the final version of the four reports represents the faculty voice. The chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee shall forward its vote, final report, and material from the Review Subcommittee, to the Department Head.

**E. Absentee Ballots**
Members of the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee who are unable to attend the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee meeting because of professional conflicts (e.g., teaching conflict, briefly out of town on university business with an appropriate travel and leave request on file) may cast an absentee ballot prior to, but not after, the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee meeting.

Members of the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee who are unable to attend the meeting for a reason covered by formal university leave policy (e.g., sick leave, jury leave) may cast an absentee ballot prior to the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee meeting. If the reason for the absence arises within the twenty-four hours immediately prior to the start of the meeting and makes it impossible for a ballot to be obtained and cast before the meeting (e.g., emergency hospitalization), the absent committee member will be given twenty-four hours after the start of the meeting to obtain and cast an absentee ballot. In this context, the results of the Promotion and Tenure (or Personnel) Committee vote will not be announced until after all absentee ballots are cast.

All absentee ballots must be accompanied by a written and signed statement from the person casting the ballot certifying that the person casting the absentee ballot has reviewed the complete dossier of the individual under consideration, including the external letters of evaluation.

F. Department Head’s Reports. After reviewing the committee’s report, the Department Head shall prepare a report for the Dean which includes a report of the vote of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, and an independent personal recommendation regarding the faculty member, which will be shared with the chair of the Review Committee and the Associate Head. The Department Head will also ensure that the candidate's dossier includes the reports of the three review committees and the report of the chair of the review committee and all supporting materials provided by the faculty member.

G. Performance Report to Faculty Member. A written performance report containing all relevant information shall be given to the faculty member after the third year or mid-term review. This report is to be prepared by the Department Head in consultation with the Associate Head and shall note, in addition to observed strengths, areas of performance where particular improvement is expected. This report should contain the kind of detail that will assist a faculty member in demonstrating appropriate accomplishment at the next formal college-level review. In addition, it will assess the faculty member’s progress and likelihood of attaining promotion and tenure during the probationary period.

For the midterm review, the dossier, department’s Promotion and Tenure Committee’s report and the Department Head’s report are forwarded to College for review by the Dean’s Advisory Committee and the Dean.

H. Review guidelines. The specific guidelines for review procedures are stated in the University Rules.

III. PEER REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY
All faculty are evaluated each year by the Department Head. Three consecutive unsatisfactory reviews will lead to post-tenure review, as noted in Section IV. In addition, tenured faculty must be peer reviewed at least once every six years, according to the procedures outlined below.

A. Eligibility for Peer Review

Under normal circumstances, peer reviews of tenured faculty will take place in the sixth year after promotion and every sixth year thereafter, and will cover the period since the last review. Any tenured faculty member may request peer review more frequently.

B. Selection of Faculty Members to be Reviewed

During the fall semester, the Head will call for volunteers to be reviewed by peers as well as by the Head. Faculty members who have not undergone peer review within the past six years will be notified that they will undergo the process by the end of the spring semester. However, depending upon the number of tenured faculty and the years since an individual’s last peer review, it is possible that in some years no review will take place.

C. Peer Review Committee

A committee comprised of three faculty members will constitute the Peer Review Committee for tenured faculty in a given year. Required ranks of committee members will be determined based on faculty to be reviewed, as noted below.

- Two Professors will review Professors undergoing peer review.
- The full committee of three will review Associate Professors undergoing peer review.

Normally, one representative will be appointed by the Head from the Music Program and one from the Theatre Arts Program, with the third member to be elected at large by the tenured faculty using a secret, written ballot. In any given year, those tenured faculty who are undergoing peer review will not be eligible for election to the committee, but all tenured faculty will be eligible to vote for the committee members. If the list of eligible faculty members is insufficient to assemble the required committee, committee members acceptable to a majority of the voting (tenured) faculty may be recruited from tenured faculty outside the department.

D. Head and Peer Review Committee Reviews

The Head will provide committee members with the written criteria for meeting the standards of satisfactory performance as listed in the Department of Performance Studies Guidelines for Annual Reports and Reviews, Third-Year, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Reviews. The
Head will also provide the annual review materials turned in by the faculty members to be reviewed, along with annual review forms from the previous five years or since the last peer review, whichever the candidate prefers. Faculty members undergoing review may include materials in addition to those called for in the regular annual review process.

The Peer Review Committee will produce a report indicating a “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory” performance to the Head, with explanation. Reports of “unsatisfactory” require unanimous agreement by the Peer Review Committee.

The Head will produce an independent evaluation of performance as “satisfactory” or “unsatisfactory.”

If either the committee report or the Head’s independent evaluation is “unsatisfactory,” the committee and Head will proceed as follows:

E. Procedure in cases of “unsatisfactory” reviews

If the Head’s or the Peer Review Committee’s assessments are that the faculty member’s performance is “unsatisfactory,” then the Department Head and the Peer Review Committee, if engaged this year, shall (together or separately, at the faculty member’s discretion) informally discuss the assessment with the faculty member.

After the discussion(s) with the faculty member, if the Department Head’s and the Peer Review Committee’s (if involved) assessments of “unsatisfactory” performance are unchanged, then prior to sending an official letter of evaluation to the faculty member, the Head shall share information about the faculty member’s performance with all members of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee at the rank of the faculty member and above. The Head shall ask for a vote concerning the assessment of unsatisfactory performance. A majority vote of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee, excluding those who have served on the Peer Review Committee, shall determine whether the Head and the Peer Review Committee have demonstrated with a preponderance of the evidence that the faculty member’s performance is unsatisfactory. The outcome of this vote shall be conveyed to the faculty member. No evaluation of “unsatisfactory” may be transmitted to the Dean as part of the peer-review of tenured faculty unless the Head and the Peer Review Committee satisfy this burden of proof.

According to University policy, a faculty member who receives three consecutive annual reviews of “unsatisfactory” must undergo a professional review by an ad hoc review committee appointed by the Dean. (See University Rule 12.06.99.MI, Post-Tenure Review, http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.MI.pdf; see also “Section III. General Procedures for Post-Tenure Review,” in the Department of Performance Studies Guidelines for Annual Reports and Reviews, Third-Year, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Reviews.)

Occasions when faculty fail to meet professional responsibilities in ways that are grossly unprofessional, negligent, or illegal are covered by specific TAMU policies and may result in immediate action by the department head. This review policy does not apply in such situations.
A faculty member may request “Voluntary Post-Tenure Review” as provided in the University’s post-tenure review policies at any stage (http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.06.99.MI.pdf; see also “Section III. General Procedures for Post-Tenure Review,” in the Department of Performance Studies Guidelines for Annual Reports and Reviews, Third-Year, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Reviews.) Voluntary Post-Tenure Review would mean that a professional review would be conducted by an ad hoc faculty review committee appointed by the Dean. Such a request will halt the procedures leading to an assessment of unsatisfactory performance as anticipated by this departmental procedure.

F. Report of Peer Review to Faculty Member
The Department Head’s annual review report to the faculty member undergoing peer review must incorporate the Peer Review Committee’s assessment.

IV. GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE REVIEW
(Perf approved October 21, 2009)

The general procedures for post-tenure review are specified in the University Rules (http://rules-saps.tamu.edu/PDFs/12.01.99.M2.pdf). There it is stated that a professional review will be initiated when a tenured faculty member receives three consecutive unsatisfactory overall annual reviews. The professional review procedures as spelled out in the University document will apply.

In keeping with the traditional concept of appropriate cause for dismissal, a rating of unsatisfactory is inappropriate unless the performance of a faculty member clearly falls below accepted standards of professional competence or exhibits utter disregard for professional responsibilities. Unsatisfactory performance does not consist, then, in being the lowest-rated teacher in the department, or in failure to publish or perform. Rather, it is constituted by failure to perform professional and academic duties and by complete absence of intellectual growth and productivity. Given the standards a faculty member must satisfy to qualify for tenure (see Section V. CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH OR CREATIVE WORK, AND SERVICE), it is to be expected that such cases will be extremely rare. In the absence of mitigating circumstances, the following might be taken as indications of unsatisfactory performance:

Research or Creative Work - Failure to stay abreast of one's field; failure to participate in the intellectual life of the department and profession.

Teaching - Failure to meet classes; failure to teach competently; failure to evaluate student performance in terms of rational standards; substandard student course evaluations.

Service - Failure to participate in service activity.
Where the performance of a tenured faculty member in a given area is in danger of falling below the level of acceptability, the Department Head and Associate Head (if appropriate) should take action to assist in rectifying the problem. Where possible, the faculty member's responsibilities may be adjusted to take account of the situation. In all cases, the appropriate resources of the University should be made available for improving an individual's performance.

V. CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING, RESEARCH OR CREATIVE WORK, AND SERVICE
(approved PERF 4/29/09)

The University Rules state general criteria for the evaluation of teaching, research or creative work, and service. Those criteria are broad and general, and in clarification, the following standards apply to faculty members in the Department of Performance Studies.

Multidisciplinary/interdisciplinary work will be considered equal to discipline-specific work of comparable quality and impact.

Interdisciplinary appointments may be evaluated according to review criteria that diverge somewhat from these bylaws, as agreed upon by the heads of the specific units and approved by the Dean’s Office.

A. Research or Creative Work. Research or Creative Work includes investigative activity relevant to the discipline presented in professional or peer-reviewed venues. Research and creative work in music includes traditional scholarship in such areas as history, literature, theory, criticism, ethnography; composition and arranging; creation of software tools for composition, performances, and improvisation; solo and ensemble performances; directing/conducting of musical ensembles and productions. Research and creative work in theatre includes: traditional scholarship in such areas as history, literature, theory, and criticism; acting, directing, playwriting, costume, lighting, and scenic design; costume and technical direction; the creation of software tools. Research and creative work in performance studies includes: traditional scholarship in such areas as history, literature, theory, criticism and ethnography as well as creative activity. Research and creative work should be distinct from teaching activities and demonstrate a positive pattern of professional development. That is, research and creative work are evaluated separately from teaching.

Evidence of strong research or creative work is shown by:

- Publication of research in refereed journals.
- Publication of new historical analysis, theory, criticism or literature in publications otherwise focused on pedagogy.
- Publication of books, monographs, original musical compositions, or recordings in well-regarded academic presses, commercial publishing houses, and recording labels.
• Revising, editing and publishing of scholarly articles or collections, including critical editions or performance editions of music, historical analysis, theory, criticism, or literature.
• Delivery of papers in professional settings.
• Publication of reviews of scholarly or creative work in well-regarded venues.
• Invited appearances/residencies in nationally visible and professional venues such as, but not limited to work as an actor, choreographer, composer, conductor, designer, director, lecturer, playwright, performer, dramaturg.
• Invited performances of original musical compositions or works for the stage in well-regarded professional venues.
• Invited papers and other scholarly or creative presentations.
• Any acting, composing, conducting, designing, directing, performing and writing of/in musical or theatrical activities appropriate to the faculty member's professional pursuits in nationally visible, professional venues.
• Commissions and honors; competitive prizes and awards.
• The creation and breadth of adoption of software tools by composers, conductors, designers, directors, improvisers or performers.
• Editorship of a national journal.
• Citation of one's work by other scholars and artists.
• Participation in paper-reading sessions, seminars, colloquia, or other activities at professional meetings.
• Significant self-development activities (e.g., faculty development leave) leading to increased research or creative work, publication, or performance effectiveness.
• Critical professional and peer approval.
• Securing of grants, contracts, and other evidence of competitive support for research and creative activities with attention to the degree of competitiveness of awarded grants, contracts, etc.
• Research and activity that is well received by scholars or other experts who are recognized authorities in the field.
• Collaborative and interdisciplinary research is recognized and encouraged.

Research or creative work itself may constitute satisfactory work if it is leading towards, but has not yet culminated in, publication or performance; for example, a faculty member may spend considerable time pursuing scholarly or creative work before publication or performance. Ultimately, however, the final publication or performance is the result upon which evaluation is based.

In evaluating research or creative work, both quantity and quality are considered. There is no fixed quantity of research or creative work that is required for adequate performance, and there is no quantity of research or creative work that can substitute for quality. Quality can be assessed by the standards of the profession.

In addition to quantity and quality, research or creative work is evaluated with respect to its intellectual and creative coherence and promise for future development. Indications of growth and development beyond points achieved in the past are desirable, as are indications that the
body of work over time amounts to a substantial contribution to the field, as evidenced by
citation by other scholars and published reviews of one's work. Creative work should
demonstrate a high level of skill obtained through experience, study and observation.

B. Teaching. Teaching includes (1) classroom performance in all of its aspects, as well as (2)
various types of more individualized instruction and activities. The first category includes
participation in team-teaching, revising current courses, developing new courses, developing
new teaching techniques, and serving as a guest lecturer. The second category includes such
activities as individual tutoring, directing “problems courses,” participating in thesis and
dissertation direction, advising students, directing Honors Program projects, and leading Honors
Program group presentations.

Evidence of good teaching is recognized through:

- University, College or other teaching awards.
- Positive peer evaluations (including classroom visitation or other types of direct
  observation).
- High student ratings.
- Written testimony from current or former students.
- Student achievements, including progress in subsequent courses.
- Publication of texts, workbooks, software or other instructional materials.
- Publication of books or articles on pedagogy.
- Development of new courses or course materials and significant revision of existing
courses or course materials.
- Receipt of grant funding for teaching, curriculum development, etc.
- Success of students and student projects in independent study courses.

The nature of each course taught should be considered in determining competence in teaching. A
large section presents particular challenges, especially when taught without the assistance of
graduate students or student workers, as does any course with a high percentage of non-majors
taking the course to satisfy a requirement. The level of course (100, 200, 300, and 400) also
should be considered, as also whether the course is designated specifically for Honors students.

Regarding student course evaluations, consideration should be given to the fact that teaching
styles vary greatly from individual to individual and that some subjects are more popular with
students than others.

C. Service. Service includes service to the University, the College, the Program, and the
discipline, as well as the community, the city, the state, the nation, and the world.

Evidence of effective service includes activities such as:

- Referee for publishers of books, journals, and music.
• Service as editor for professional publications.
• Participation as an adjudicator on panels/committees for outside funding agencies, performance organizations, tenure and promotion reviews of faculty at other universities, etc.
• Service for professional organizations.
• Service as an adjudicator of professional musical or theatrical competitions or festivals.
• Service on Program, Department, College and University committees.
• **Active** participation in the Faculty Senate and Liberal Arts Council.
• Administrative activities within the University.
• Special contributions to the development of the university or its programs.
• Service on graduate student committees.
• Advising undergraduate students.
• Advising student clubs and other groups.
• Adjudicating student musical or theatrical competitions or festivals.
• Public sector service such as production of recordings, archival work, and the development of local, regional, or national public sector music and theatre programs including but not limited to artist-in-residence programs and music and theatre festivals.
• Invited speeches and other presentations in public, non-academic settings utilizing professional expertise.
• Community service in, or applying one’s areas of, expertise.

Less obvious but still important indicators of service include establishment of professional ties to colleagues in other departments, colleges, universities, and other professional institutions and organizations. This is especially important if such ties are related to activity germane to the goals of the Department (for example, the goal of furthering interdisciplinary work involving both the Department and other academic entities). Emphasis is given to service efforts which promote internationalization and/or campus diversity and which demonstrate recognition in national and international venues.
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