CSUF College of the Arts
Department of Music Personnel Standards

I. Department Statement

The California State University, Fullerton Department of Music strives to educate and train its music majors to be diverse and competent musicians. Through experiences in our broad range of programs, responsive to the needs of our students, CSUF graduates shall be musically, intellectually and technologically prepared to be artistic contributors and leaders in the communities in which they live and work. The Department of Music shall also provide both academic and performance opportunities for non-music majors and shall contribute to the University and external communities through outreach and public performance.

The Department of Music recognizes that the key to quality in a department shaped by many diverse programs is an instructional faculty that, both individually and collectively, meets a wide spectrum of academic and artistic needs. The Department of Music seeks to promote excellence in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service by attracting and maintaining such a faculty in order to meet its Mission and Goals.

II. Department Personnel Standards and UPS 210.000.

It is the position of the Department of Music that the maintenance and enhancement of high quality faculty requires clear communication with respect to personnel expectations and evaluation. Therefore, the Department of Music presents this Personnel Standards document, which describes the criteria for assessing productivity in a wide range of artistic and academic activities with respect to retention, tenure and promotion, as consistent with the University Missions and Goals and with UPS 210.000; these Department Personnel Standards shall be understood as incorporating the requirements of UPS 210.000; both these Standards and UPS 210.000 establish the range of activities and levels of performance necessary to meet requirements for positive retention, promotion and tenure decisions. All faculty members subject to performance evaluation shall be responsible for reading and observing the requirements of the current UPS 210.000 as well as the present document.

Probationary faculty members shall compile each year their evidence of performance in the Portfolio to be reviewed by both the DPC and the Department Chair. At various stages of the review process, the Dean of the College of the Arts, the (university) Faculty Personnel Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President (or designee) also review the Portfolio.
III. The Developmental Narratives

In accordance with the UPS 210.000, faculty members hired for fall 2002 and later shall write prospective Developmental Narratives for teaching, scholarly and/or creative activities, and service, not to exceed 500 words each, during their first year of employment. These narratives shall describe the faculty member’s professional goals, areas of interest, resources required and accomplishments expected to achieve in each of the three areas evaluated in order to meet the requirements of these Department Standards and UPS 210.000 for retention, tenure and promotion (RTP).

The Developmental Narratives will be reviewed by the Department Chair and the Dean who will each provide feedback on a timetable to be determined by the College Dean, with a final draft completed prior to May 1. These Developmental Narratives shall be included in the faculty member’s Portfolio that is submitted for retention review during the second year in the tenure-track position.

During subsequent years, the Developmental Narratives may be revised to reflect changes and professional growth that will normally occur during the probationary period.

IV. Mentors

Before the end of the first two weeks of the fall semester, the Department Chair will consult with each newly-appointed probationary faculty member concerning an appropriate faculty mentor and will designate one or more tenured faculty members as mentors. In the event that the Department Chair serves as a mentor, at least one additional mentor shall be designated. At any time thereafter, the probationary faculty member or mentor(s) may request the Department Chair to make a change of assignment.

The primary responsibility of the mentor(s) is to provide guidance, advice and support to the probationary faculty member during the preparation of the Developmental Narrative.

V. Election of the Department Personnel Committee

A. The Department Personnel Committee (DPC) shall consist of three tenured faculty members and one alternate. The Department Chair cannot serve on the DPC. The DPC shall be elected by the tenured and probationary (tenure-track)
faculty members. Elections shall be held no later than the end of the second week of classes in the fall semester. Nominations for the election shall be taken from the floor and election shall be conducted by secret ballot.

B. Members shall be elected for two-year terms. The terms shall be staggered. The one alternate member will be elected each year, to serve a one-year term. Upon completion of a two-year term, a faculty member will not be eligible for re-election to the DPC until a complete academic year has elapsed, unless there are too few eligible faculty members to form a slate of candidates. This includes consideration as an alternate.

C. The Chair of the DPC will be elected by majority vote of the three members.

VI. Evidence of Performance

A. The Portfolio.

1. The Portfolio is the sole basis for all RTP evaluations, recommendations and actions. It shall be cumulative and representative of performance, covering the period from the beginning of probationary service to the first day of the fall semester of the academic year during which RTP action is to be taken. In cases where prior service credit was granted, that time interval shall also be documented in the Portfolio.

2. It is the responsibility of the probationary faculty member to ensure the completeness of his or her Portfolio.

3. The Portfolio shall include the following items:

   a. Table of contents of the Portfolio (available from the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records).

   b. A table of contents of the Appendix to the Portfolio.

   c. A copy of these approved Department Personnel Standards.

   d. Developmental Narratives in each of the three areas of performance—teaching, scholarly/creative, service—in relation to these Department Personnel Standards. Each Narrative shall not exceed 500 words.

   e. The faculty member’s current curriculum vita that covers the entire academic and professional employment history.
f. Narrative summaries that are concise self-assessments of accomplishments in each of the three areas of performance—teaching, creative/scholarly, service—in relation to Department Personnel Standards. (Self-assessment narratives shall not exceed 1000 words for each area.)

g. A blank copy of the student opinion forms (SRI) used by the Department in evaluating the faculty member.

h. Statistical summaries by class of responses to all multiple-choice questions on Department student opinion forms (SRI) for all classes that the faculty member has taught during the period under review, including similar evidence from any prior institutions if service credit years have been granted.

i. Statistical summaries of grade distributions from all classes that the faculty member has taught during the period under review for which students received credit.

j. For probationary faculty, all evaluations, recommendations, responses and rebuttals, if any, and decisions for all previous full performance reviews (supplied by the Office of Faculty Affairs and Records).

4. In addition to the Portfolio, the faculty member shall assemble an Appendix containing supporting materials that are directly relevant to the presentation in the Portfolio.

The Appendix shall include the following items:

a. SRI opinion forms (raw data) for all of the courses that the faculty member taught at CSUF during the period under review, for which the students received credit. These shall be identified clearly by course number, title, semester and year.

b. Representative syllabus and other teaching materials for each course taught.

c. Classroom observations (at least one classroom observation, as arranged by the DPC, in the first probationary year and in the year prior to either a tenure or promotion decision).
d. Supporting materials for accomplishments discussed in the Narrative summaries.

B. Evidence of Teaching Performance

The Department of Music expects that all faculty members shall demonstrate effective teaching at all levels of review. A self-assessment narrative not to exceed 1000 words that shall include a reflective discussion of the faculty member’s pedagogical approach and methods, student responses to instruction, expectations regarding student achievement, ongoing professional development as a teacher and ongoing professional development in the discipline.

Although students’ opinions of teaching are an important means of assessing teaching, also important are peer evaluations and quality of instructional materials.

The Department shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s performance as a teacher:

1. Mandatory Indicators of Teaching Performance:

   • List of courses taught by semester with course number, name and unit value. Assigned time shall also be cited.
   • Representative course syllabi and materials for each course taught.
   • Student Rating of Instruction statistical summaries.
   • Individual SRI student opinion forms for each course.
   • Statistical summaries of grade distributions from all classes.
   • Classroom Observations. (First Portfolio and Tenure/Promotion Years only.)
   • Examples of student concert programs (from ensemble directors and applied instructors).
   • Examples of student work in performance and composition (from private studio instruction) or research/essay papers (from lecture courses).
   • Evidence of currency in the faculty member’s area of expertise.

2. Optional Supportive Indicators of Teaching Performance:

   • Additional evaluations of teaching performance by colleagues or external evaluators. The evaluations may include further Classroom Observations.
   • Evidence of accomplishments by former students.
   • Evidence of ongoing professional development as a teacher.
• New course/curriculum development and instructional technology.
• Examples of student projects/theses.
• Evidence of participation on graduate student committees.
• Evidence of mentoring activities.
• Written (and signed) comments/letters by students.

C. Evidence of Scholarly and/or Creative Accomplishments (Including Musical Composition and Performance)

In a 1000 word self-assessment narrative, the faculty member shall discuss and evaluate scholarly and/or creative achievements. Putting scholarly and/or creative indicators in a well-defined and focused context and defining the professional objectives of the accomplishments is essential. When appropriate, discussion of efforts to involve students, to attract external support and of the relationship between scholarly and/or creative activities and teaching are encouraged.

Among the Department of Music indicators are activities that by their very nature establish a form of peer review. Evaluation of scholarly and/or creative accomplishments, preferably by off-campus sources, should be included.

Scholarly and creative activities vary widely in nature within the Department of Music. They include but are not limited to:

• Regional, national or international solo performances, performances in small, or large ensembles (including conducting ensembles).
• Recordings of solo performances, performances in small or large ensembles (including conducting ensembles) or recording of original compositions or arrangements.
• Composition of solo, small-ensemble, large-ensemble, electroacoustic works.
• Arranging and editing of music.
• Performances of compositions of solo, small-ensemble, large-ensemble, electroacoustic works at the regional, national, or international level.
• Commissions, grants or awards.
• Research books, book chapters, articles, papers, reviews and essays in musicology, ethnomusicology, music theory and analysis, music technology, music education and pedagogy for publication.
• Research/creative papers presented at scholarly/creative conferences at the regional, national, or international level.
• Participating as a moderator, discussant, or respondent at professional meetings.
• Reviewing or editing manuscripts, articles, or books for professional journals or publishers.
• Writing of grant proposals.
• Writing of program notes and CD liner notes at the regional, national, or international level.
• Guest artist residencies at clinics, festivals, workshops, professional meetings.
• Work reviewed or discussed and/or reproduced in off-campus publications.
• Letter of validation by off-campus peers in reference to specific creative and/or scholarly accomplishments.
• Consulting or advising academic or professional music organizations.
• Other scholarly or creative accomplishments appropriate to the field.

In the area of scholarly and/or creative activities, a faculty member may have activity in any one area listed above—performance, composition, scholarship—or any combination therefrom. Documentation of creative accomplishments may take the form of programs, reviews, video or audio recording, etc.

CSUF ensemble performances conducted as an outgrowth of classroom teaching must be included in the category of “teaching,” except in the case of ensemble performances at regional, national and international conferences and conventions that result from peer-reviewed auditions, which may be considered under “scholarly and/or creative activity.”

D. Evidence of Professional, University and Community Service

In a 1000 word narrative, the faculty member shall discuss contributions to the Profession, to the University and to the Community through many different professional and service activities that encourage mutually beneficial working partnerships, serve the needs of the professional and/or external community, enhance the campus’ role as a regional center and/or leads to student opportunities and learning.

The Department shall consider the following kinds of evidence as indicators of the quality of the faculty member’s contributions to the Profession, to the University and to the Community through professional and service activities.

• Organizing symposiums, professional meetings, clinics, workshops and masterclasses.
• Organizing special events.
• Membership in professional societies, including the holding of offices.
• Adjudicating festivals or competitions.
• Chair of CSU System, University, College or Department committees.
• Member of University, College committees, or member of DPC.
• Member of Academic Senate.
• Member of Department committees other than DPC.
• Planning and directing Department outreach and recruitment activities.
• Involvement in University or College boards or subcommittees.
• Lectures, concerts, or other presentations to community groups
• Arts advocacy in the community
• Faculty adviser of student clubs.
• Other appropriate activities

VII. Evaluation of Evidence of Performance

All tenure-track faculty members will be evaluated within three areas: teaching, scholarly and/or creative activity and professional, university and community service. In support of the preeminence of learning mission of the university and in compliance with UPS 210.000, the primary emphasis in the retention, tenure and promotion process shall be on teaching.

A. The materials contained in the Portfolio are the sole basis for RTP evaluations, recommendations and actions. Therefore, the Portfolio must contain all relevant evidence. It is the responsibility of the faculty member under review to be aware of all deadlines and criteria affecting RTP and to complete the Portfolio by the due date.

The DPC and Department Chair shall make evaluations and recommendations based solely on the documented evidence contained in the Portfolio.

B. Scholarly and/or creative performance shall be accorded “Excellent,” “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” as detailed in VII, F, below.

C. All categories of review shall be evaluated on the following: Excellent, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory.

1. A majority of evaluations by the DPC members of Excellent shall constitute a recommendation of Excellent in each area of performance.

2. A majority of evaluations by the DPC members of Satisfactory or one recommendation each of Excellent, Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory shall constitute a recommendation of Satisfactory in each area of performance.

3. A majority of evaluations by the DPC members of Unsatisfactory shall constitute a recommendation of Unsatisfactory in each area of performance.
D. Evaluation of Teaching Performance

Teaching is the most important area under review. The DPC and the Department Chair shall review the mandatory and supportive indicators of teaching and take into consideration the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to the faculty member, and the level and types of classes taught as well as the quality of the faculty member’s performance as a teacher.

1. Student Opinion

The Department of Music has separate Student Response to Instruction (SRI) forms for ensemble classes, applied instruction and academic classes. In organizing and reviewing SRI data, the Department further subdivides academic classes into general education classes and higher-level major academic classes.

Thus, although the DPC will use statistical summaries of SRI’s as one important source of information about candidates, the DPC may assign more weight to trends in SRI’s rather than to overall means. The DPC may also assign considerable weight to consistent patterns of student comments as well as the statistical summaries of SRI’s.

The faculty member’s student opinion rating shall be determined by the average responses on all student opinion forms. Rating norms, however, vary widely from category to category and due care must be exercised by the evaluators in using statistical information for comparisons among categories, classes and faculty members.

UPS 210.000 states that evaluations of SRI’s “shall take into consideration factors such as the number of different courses taught, the number of new preparations assigned to a faculty member, and the characteristics of the classes taught (size, level, required or elective, experimental or traditional pedagogy, etc.). The evaluation also shall take into account the faculty member’s overall level of experience and his or her efforts to improve teaching performances.”

To increase the anonymity of responses, SRI’s for applied instruction will be aggregated across all levels of 193 – 593.

2. Ratings on Teaching Performance

Ratings on teaching performance are assigned as follows:
1. Excellent.
   A faculty member’s average total ratings of instruction on the
   Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) include no less than 85%“excellent” (A) and “good” (B) ratings and the overall review of
   other mandatory and supportive indicators of teaching
   performance are rated Excellent (based upon their organization,
   breadth, and depth).

2. Satisfactory.
   A faculty member’s average total ratings of instruction on the
   Student Opinion Questionnaire (SOQ) include between 70% and
   84% “excellent” (A) and “good” (B) ratings and the overall review
   of other mandatory and supportive indicators of teaching
   performance are rated at least Satisfactory (based upon their
   organization, breadth, and depth).

3. Unsatisfactory.
   A faculty member’s average total ratings on the Student Opinion
   Questionnaire (SOQ) include less than 70% “excellent” (A) and
   “good” (B) ratings or the overall review of other mandatory and
   supportive indicators of teaching performance are rated
   Unsatisfactory (based upon their organization, breadth, and depth).

E. Evaluation of Scholarly/Creative Activities

In the area of scholarly and creative activities, a faculty member may have
activity in any one area – performance, composition, scholarship—or any
combination thereof. The evaluation of a faculty member shall not be prejudiced
by the fact that scholarly and/or creative activities are either narrowly focused or
broad in scope.

Among the Department of Music indicators are activities that result from a form
of peer review. There is a selective and highly competitive process involved in
the participation in recitals and concerts, in the selection for publication by
publishers and professional journals, and in the according of awards and grants.
A common definition of “peer review” for the RTP process shall be:
substantiation of the quality of faculty member’s scholarly and/or creative
activities by qualified individuals, institutions, organizations, publications, or
societies off-campus. Evidence of performance for scholarly and/or creative
accomplishments will be evaluated on quality as well as quantity,
appropriateness, status of venue, contribution of the individual (particularly
within an ensemble performance), recognition (international, national, regional
level), relative merit and evidence of ongoing growth. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide such evidence to the reviewers in the Portfolio or Appendix, wherever appropriate.

Scholarly and/or creative performance shall be accorded “Excellent,” “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” as determined by the following ratings:

1. “Excellent”: appropriate rating when the scholarly and/or creative activities are ongoing, of excellent quality and include activity at an international, national or regional level.

2. “Satisfactory”: appropriate rating when the scholarly and/or creative contributions are ongoing, of excellent quality with activity on a regional level.

3. “Unsatisfactory”: appropriate rating when the scholarly and/or creative activities are intermittent, of marginal quality and limited to local venues and forums.

F. Evaluation of Service Activities

Service shall be accorded “Excellent,” “Satisfactory” or “Unsatisfactory” as determined by the following ratings:

1. “Excellent”
   This rating results from active and ongoing leadership roles in professional organizations or on department, college or university committees.

2. “Satisfactory”
   This rating results from active and ongoing membership on university, college or department committees during the period under review and appropriate professional involvement.

3. “Unsatisfactory”
   This rating results from non-participatory membership on department committees and lack of participation in professional organizations.

VIII. Standards for Retention, Tenure and Promotion

A. Requirements for Retention
The goal of the RTP process is to produce faculty members who qualify for tenure after their probationary employment. To be retained during the probationary period, a faculty member is required to demonstrate progress toward tenure such that a positive tenure decision is likely. A probationary faculty member is required to show appropriate accomplishments, growth and promise in each of the three areas of assessment. Moreover, when weaknesses have been identified in earlier review cycles, a probationary faculty member is expected to address these weaknesses explicitly and show appropriate improvement. The decision to retain (reappoint) a probationary faculty member is an affirmation that satisfactory progress is being made toward tenure; therefore, a probationary faculty member shall not be retained if the cumulative progress toward tenure is insufficient to indicate that requirements for tenure appear likely to be met.

B. Requirements for Tenure

The tenure decision, usually rendered in the sixth probationary year, is designated by UPS 210.000 as the most significant personnel decision. However, the faculty member's overall performance during the entire probationary retention period will be evaluated by the DPC, with an overall rating awarded in each of the three areas of review: (teaching, scholarly/creative, service). To be recommended for tenure, the faculty member's performance in Teaching and in Scholarly/Creative Activities shall receive a cumulative rating of “Excellent” and in Service at least “Satisfactory” by the DPC.

C. Requirements for Promotion to Associate Professor

Promotion to Associate Professor is automatic with the granting of tenure.

D. Requirements for Promotion to Professor

Within the three areas of review (teaching, scholarly/creative, service), documentation of activities for the years following promotion to Associate Professor or the last full review shall be required from each faculty member being considered for promotion to Professor. Tenured faculty members seeking promotion shall demonstrate a record of performance across all three categories that show a sustained commitment to these Standards. To be recommended for promotion to Professor, the faculty member's performance in Teaching and in Scholarly/Creative Activities shall receive a rating of “Excellent” and in Service of at least “Satisfactory” both by the DPC and the DC.

E. Requirements for Early Tenure
Early tenure requires that all expectations for the entire probationary period have been met and that performance for the entire probationary period in Teaching and Scholarly/Creative Activities have exceeded the expectations stated in UPS 210.000 and these Department Personnel Standards.

F. Requirements for Early Promotion

Early promotion to Associate Professor requires that the probationary faculty member has displayed accomplishments, growth and future potential that strongly indicate that expectations for tenure will be met by the completion of the probationary period. In addition, performance in Teaching and Scholarly/Creative activities shall have exceeded these expectations. All of these requirements are to be met for the entire period of review.

G. Early Promotion to Professor.

Early promotion to Professor requires that performance meet the general requirements for promotion to Professor (as stated above in VIII.D.) and that, in addition, performance in each of the three areas (teaching, scholarly/creative, service) receive an evaluation of "Excellent" for the entire period of review.