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PREAMBLE

VALUES

The School of Music is committed to promoting the values of free and bold intellectual inquiry, meaningful musical expression, vibrant civic engagement, respect for diversity, and an understanding of the rich musical heritage of our nation and the world.

MISSION

The School of Music at the University of Tennessee is a diverse community of teachers, learners, scholars, and performers who seek to advance knowledge of and excellence in the craft, expression, understanding, and interpretation of music. We train the next generation of music professionals (e.g., composers, educators, performers, and scholars) and aspire to be a leader among professional music schools.

As part of its mission, the School:

- enriches the musical and educational lives of its students, the university community and citizens of Tennessee;
- develops technical and artistic excellence in performance and pedagogy;
- fosters critical understanding of theoretical, historical and cultural studies of music;
- promotes effective and innovative skill in music education.

VISION

The School of Music faculty, students, and alumni will have a significant role in the musical culture and the musical dialogues of the nation and the world.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

These Bylaws are based on the principle of shared governance. In this context, it is the responsibility of the School of Music (SOM) administration to communicate freely, frankly, and in a timely fashion with all faculty members of the SOM on important decisions affecting the mission and operations of the SOM. Such decisions include, but are not limited to, approval of new academic programs and discontinuation of existing ones, budgetary planning, establishment of long-range goals and strategies, and the selection and retention of administrative officers, including the Director, Undergraduate and Graduate Directors, and Area Coordinators. It is the responsibility of the SOM’s tenured and tenure-track faculty to play a role in these administrative decisions through participation in committees and faculty meetings. As stated in the UTK Faculty Handbook (Chapter 5.1), all faculty members have the right to seek redress when these Bylaws are not upheld by the SOM administration.
DEFINITION OF GOVERNING AND VOTING FACULTY

Governing and Voting Faculty are defined as all tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, and lecturers who hold a 75% appointment or more.

Voting Exceptions:
- Promotion to Senior Lecturer: All Senior/Distinguished lecturers and tenure-track/tenured faculty vote
- Promotion to Distinguished Lecturer: All Distinguished lecturers and tenure-track/tenured faculty vote
- Tenure/retention for tenure-track faculty: only tenured faculty vote
- Promotion to Associate Professor: only Associate/Full Professors vote
- Promotion to Full Professor: only Full Professors vote

VOTING GUIDELINES

Absentee Votes -- Faculty may vote absentee within 24 hours after the close of a meeting.

Method of Voting -- electronic through an anonymous survey (e.g. Google Drive), with the exception of closing a meeting

Prioritized Voting Procedure -- Any non-P&T vote where abstentions outnumber yes or no votes will automatically be tabled. In the case of a recommendation vote (e.g. tenure and promotion), the recommendation will be passed to the next level. For example, in the instance of a non-P&T vote where the outcome is 2 Yes, 3 No, 3 Abstentions, the motion would be tabled. Chair would not vote in this scenario, since the original vote had more abstentions than Yes or No vote.

Quorum -- 50% + 1 of voting faculty for any meeting

Simple Majority -- 50% + 1

Ties in Voting -- Chair only votes in case of a tie. Example: 2 Yes, 2 No, 2 Abstentions - chair would vote to break tie. If the chair abstains, the motion is tabled.

PROCEDURAL RULES FOR ANY SOM MEETING

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER: Chair

PRESENTING A MOTION: There must be a quorum present for the synchronous discussion (in-person or virtually) in order for a vote to take place.
Create a motion Any voting member
Call for support Chair
Voice support Any voting member
Further Discuss Motion Creator of Motion
Call Discussion Chair

In Discussion, amendments may be made to the proposal, which will become part of the proposal unless someone verbally objects. In case of an objection, the group will discuss and vote on a written amendment or alternative amendments, if appropriate. The vote would pass by a simple majority. Otherwise the original proposal will stand and can result in any of the following “Possible Outcomes After Discussion.”

POSSIBLE OUTCOMES AFTER DISCUSSION INCLUDE:

**Table Proposal:** Original proposal will be brought back to the group at a later date with minor revisions if necessary. Reason(s) for tabling will be clarified to the presenter of the motion prior to the end of the meeting. If reason(s) are addressed the proposal will be discussed and voted on (if merited) at the next meeting. If not, it will not be discussed.

Reasons to table could include: not enough time in meeting for full discussion, more information needed due to discussion, information incorrect in proposal, information discussed in meeting needs to be further addressed in area meetings, etc.)

Call for tabling motion Any voting member
Call for support of tabling Chair
Voice support Any voting member
Call Vote Chair

Motion passes: 50% + 1 of voting members.

**Refer Proposal Back to Committee:** Proposal needs extended time for revisions. The proposal must be reworked by the initiating area or committee and go through the process again as a new proposal.

Call for referral of proposal Any voting member
Call for support of referral Chair
Voice support Any voting member
Call Vote Chair

Motion passes: 50% +1 of voting members.
Close Discussion on Proposal To Call Vote:
Call for closing conversation on proposal Any voting member
Call for support of closing discussion Chair
Voice support Any voting member
Call Vote Chair

Motion passes: 2/3 of voting members. Chair breaks all ties.

Vote on Proposal:
Move on to vote on proposal Two voting members agree
Call Vote on proposal Chair

Committee votes require 50% + 1 vote of the votes cast to pass.
SOM full faculty votes require 2/3 of the votes cast to pass.
If the number of abstentions outnumber the majority or minority, the issue is tabled.

MEETING CALLED TO A CLOSE: Use in special circumstances when there is not a defined ending time for the meeting.

SCHOOL OF MUSIC BYLAWS

I. GOVERNANCE AND ORGANIZATION

A. EXECUTIVE STRUCTURE

1. DIRECTOR

Appointment
The selection, evaluation, and reappointment of the SOM Director will follow the guidelines outlined in the UTK Faculty Handbook, sections 1.4.4, 1.4.5, and 1.4.6.
Responsibilities

**General Administration**

a. Serves as principal administrative officer for the School. Represents the School to the upper administration.
b. Chairs Advisory Committee and faculty meetings.
c. Is responsible for the general efficiency of the SOM.
d. Must understand and advocate for the needs of the SOM.
e. Consults with faculty regarding program and curriculum development.
f. Reports to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and appropriate accrediting agencies such as NASM and SACS.
g. Upholds admission requirements.

**Personnel**

a. Is responsible for faculty assignments and workloads in cooperation with area coordinators.
b. Is responsible for staff assignments, yearly performance reviews and personnel policies.
c. Makes recommendations regarding faculty appointments, reappointments, promotions, and tenure as outlined in UTK Faculty Handbook and this document.
d. Hires faculty with less than a 75% appointment in consultation with appropriate area coordinator as outlined in Chapter III of this document.
e. Assists the faculty in carrying out their duties and attends to their concerns.
f. Is responsible for faculty performance evaluations.

**Budget**

a. Is responsible for budgetary planning and the allocation and control of available funds.
b. Will give annual financial report to the faculty, including scholarship distribution, status of endowed funds, and operations.

**Public Relations and FundRaising**

a. Represents the SOM in the community and throughout the state of Tennessee.
b. Represents the SOM at state and national conferences and in state and national organizations.
c. Is responsible for fundraising from alumni and the private sector, including, but not limited to, working with the Office of Development and School of Music Board of Advisors.

**Other**

a. Attends to students' concerns as necessary while adhering to the expectations of procedural due process.
b. Serves as an ex-officio member of all School committees.
c. Represents the SOM at the meetings of NAMESU (National Association of Music Executives of State Universities).
2. DIRECTOR FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Appointment

The Director for Undergraduate Studies serves at the will of the Director, and can be reappointed by the Director. The Director for Undergraduate Studies is appointed by the Director for a five-year term eligible for renewal one year after the Director’s appointment/reappointment.

Near the end of the Director for Undergraduate Studies’ term, the Director will solicit input on the performance of the Director for Undergraduate Studies from the faculty and staff. The Director then will have the option to reappoint the Director for Undergraduate Studies or solicit nominations for this position from among eligible faculty. The Director for Undergraduate Studies must be a tenured faculty member.

Responsibilities
Serves as representative of the Director and is responsible for the general administration of the School under the direction of, or in the absence of, the Director.

Undergraduate Studies Responsibilities
a. Coordinates undergraduate registration, advising, and academic discipline.
b. Supervises the collection of SOM course syllabi for accreditation purposes.
c. Is responsible for annual revisions and updates of undergraduate catalog material and coordination with the webmaster to update relevant online information.
d. Is responsible for coordination of orientations and entrance examinations for new and transfer students.
e. Is responsible for preparing special reports relating to undergraduate studies.
f. Serves as Co-Chair and ex-officio member of the Curriculum and Policies Committee.

Other
a. Fulfills teaching responsibilities as assigned.
b. Serves as a member of the Advisory Committee.

3. DIRECTOR FOR GRADUATE STUDIES

Appointment

The Director for Graduate Studies serves at the will of the Director, and can be reappointed by the Director. The Director for Graduate Studies is appointed by the Director for a five-year term eligible for renewal two years after the Director’s appointment/reappointment.

Near the end of the Director for Graduate Studies’ term, the Director will solicit input on the performance of the Director from the faculty and staff. The Director
then will have the option to reappoint the Director for Graduate Studies or can solicit
nominations for this position from among eligible faculty. The Director for Graduate
Studies must be a tenured faculty member.

Responsibilities
Serves as representative of the Director and is responsible for the general
administration of the School under the direction of, or in the absence of, the Director
and/or the Director for Undergraduate Studies.

Serves as Coordinator of Graduate Studies
a. Coordinates graduate recruiting, admissions, assistantships, fellowships,
scholarships, advising, examinations, and committees.
b. Is responsible for annual revisions and updates of graduate catalog material
and coordination with the webmaster to update relevant online information.
c. Prepares and revises degree plan outlines and the School of Music Guide to
Graduate Studies.
d. Prepares special reports relating to graduate studies.
e. Provides information on grants and research funding involving graduate
students.
f. Serves as a liaison with the Graduate School.
g. Serves as Co-Chair and ex-officio member of the Curriculum and Policies
Committee.

Other
a. Fulfills teaching responsibilities as assigned.
b. Serves as a member of the Advisory Committee.

B. SCHOOL OF MUSIC STRUCTURE

1. AREAS
a. The School of Music shall consist of the following areas:
   ● Brass and Percussion
   ● Conducting
   ● Jazz
   ● Keyboard and Collaborative Piano
   ● Music Education
   ● Musicology
   ● Strings
   ● Theory and Composition
   ● Voice and Opera
   ● Woodwinds

Faculty with teaching responsibilities in more than one area are considered members
of each area in which they teach.
b. Areas shall set proficiency requirements, rotation of courses, jury schedules, recital hearings, audition schedules, and other matters of concern primary to the areas.

Major ensemble auditions will be coordinated by the respective Directors of Band, Choral Studies, Jazz, Opera, and Orchestral Studies.

c. Areas shall recommend to the faculty as a whole, through appropriate standing committees, any alterations in curricula, new programs, enrollment goals, and other matters that impact the School of Music.

2. AREA COORDINATORS

Appointment

Each area shall be led by an Area Coordinator, elected by the area faculty for a three-year term. The Area Coordinator must be a tenured or tenure-track faculty member.

Responsibilities

a. Chair area meetings.
b. Serve as the primary advocate for students in area.
c. Coordinate admissions, advising, and recruiting within their respective areas.
d. Will provide budgetary information, including scholarship distribution, to the area at least once annually in the fall.
e. Shall plan with the Director and, when necessary, Undergraduate and Graduate Directors the scheduling of courses and teaching assignments.
f. Serve as a member of the Advisory Committee.
g. Shall have load credit as assigned by the Director.
h. Consults and comes to mutual agreement with the director on hires in the area of half-time appointment or less.

3. FACULTY AS A WHOLE

Membership

The faculty includes both tenured and tenure-track faculty with tenure homes in the SOM and non-tenure track faculty appointed in the SOM.

Meetings

The faculty shall meet as a whole at least two times per semester.

Charge

a. The faculty should vote on matters that affect the School of Music including:
   ● Curricula
   ● Personnel
● Student Awards
● School vision (5-year plan, enrollment management, etc.)
● Policy changes brought by SOM committees

b. All matters brought before the faculty that require faculty approval shall be decided by a majority of the voting faculty either present or represented by an absentee ballot at the time of the vote.

c. Personnel decisions regarding retention, promotion and tenure shall be considered by tenured faculty.
   ● Promotion shall be considered by all tenured faculty of rank equal to or above the promotion consideration.
   ● Retention and tenure shall be considered by all tenured faculty regardless of rank.
   ● Before voting, a faculty member is expected to read the report of the mentoring committee and/or the dossier of the candidate.

4. STANDING COMMITTEES

All standing committees should make a brief report at each meeting of the whole faculty regarding issues under discussion and upcoming action items. If a representative is not able to attend a meeting, they should send a substitute from their area if possible. With the exception of the Advisory Committee, all standing committee meetings are open to any faculty member and will keep written notes electronically that are available to the entire faculty.

All standing committee representatives and area coordinators are elected by their area faculty for three-year terms. It is recommended that no one serves more than two consecutive terms on a committee or as area coordinator to encourage a variety of representation, equity, and diversity in the governance of our school. With the exception of Advisory Committee and CAP Committee, committee chairs are appointed by the director for no more than two consecutive three-year terms.

Any seat vacated during a term will be filled by the area for the remainder of that term.

a. ADVISORY COMMITTEE

   Membership & Meetings
   i. Is chaired by the director.
   ii. Comprises the area coordinators and one representative from large ensembles
   iii. Meets at least once per month with the director.
**University of Tennessee School of Music Bylaws**

**Charge**

i. Advises the director on current and future issues relevant to the operation and mission of the School.

ii. Members serve as representatives of their areas and therefore are responsible for taking information back to their areas that is discussed in the meetings, as well as bringing area concerns to the Advisory Committee.

**b. CURRICULUM AND ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (CAP)**

**Membership & Meetings**

i. The Director for Undergraduate Studies and Director for Graduate Studies will serve as appointed co-chairs of the committee.

ii. The CAP Committee consists of one member from each area of the School of Music.

iii. It is recommended that the CAP Committee meets three times per semester.

**Charge**

The committee reviews, updates, and votes on all proposals pertaining to curriculum and academic policy.

**Process**

Curriculum proposals can be initiated by School of Music faculty, areas or the CAP Committee. All curriculum matters of the School of Music shall be considered in this order:

- All proposals must be submitted electronically to the CAP co-chairs on the College of Arts and Sciences curriculum change form.
- The Director for Undergraduate Studies sends any new curricular change forms out to the entire faculty at least five business days in advance of a CAP meeting in which it is introduced/discussed. Exceptions to this timeline must be approved by the co-chairs.
- Area members provide feedback to their CAP representative.
- Curricular proposals or amendments that are discussed in the CAP Committee are returned to the impacted area(s) for further discussion. Any changes to the proposals subsequently made by the impacted areas will then return to the CAP Committee for approval before moving forward to the School of Music faculty.
If approved by the CAP Committee, proposals are shared electronically with the entire faculty at least five business days in advance of a faculty meeting for consideration.

If a proposal passed by the CAP committee fails to pass at the faculty level, the proposal should return to the area/committee where it originated. Revisions must follow the protocol above.

c. RECRUITMENT COMMITTEE

Membership & Meetings

- Recruitment Committee consists of one member of every area. Although all areas have a seat on the committee, they may willingly vacate their seat in any given year. Members are elected by the area faculty for a three-year term.
- The Director will appoint 3-5 students to serve in an advisory role to this committee.
- The School of Music First Year Studies Coordinator shall be an ex-officio member of this committee.
- The Communication Coordinator shall attend meetings as needed.
- It is recommended that the Recruitment Committee meets three times per semester.

Charge

- The committee discusses trends and philosophical ideas and cultivates strategies regarding recruitment for the School as a whole.
- The committee analyzes recruitment data to determine the effectiveness of our efforts and makes recommendations to the faculty and Director.
- The committee manages audition day logistics, and is proactive and innovative in engaging potential students.
- The committee organizes school-wide recruiting events.

d. INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Membership & Meetings

- The Innovation and Technology Committee consists of one member of every area. Although all areas have a seat on the committee, they may willingly vacate their seat in any given year.
- The SOM Technology Specialist shall be an ex-officio member of this
committee.

- It is recommended that the Innovation and Technology Committee meets three times per semester.

**Charge**

1. Innovation and Technology Committee is a visionary committee directed to give our students and faculty the most relevant and contemporary educational experiences possible.
2. Innovation and Technology Committee ensures that our current ideology and practices reflect contemporary methodologies, priorities, and technologies, drawing on our unique qualities to differentiate ourselves where possible.
3. Innovation and Technology Committee will make recommendations to the faculty and/or Director as appropriate.

**e. DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE**

**Membership & Meetings**

1. DEI Committee consists of one member in every area. Although all areas have a seat on the committee, they may willingly vacate their seat in any given year.
2. The Director will appoint 3-5 students to serve in an advisory role to this committee.
3. It is recommended that the DEI Committee meets three times per semester.

**Charge**

1. The committee is responsible for leading diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts and initiatives in the School of Music, ensuring that we are engaging and educating our School in order to create a climate of empowerment and celebration of all people.
   The DEI Committee will make recommendations to the faculty and/or Director as appropriate.

**5. AD HOC COMMITTEES**

**a. BYLAWS COMMITTEE**

**Membership & Meetings**

2. Members are appointed by the Director of the School of Music.
3. The committee chair(s) shall be appointed by the Director of the School of Music.
4. The bylaws committee will meet at least biennially to consider changes to the
bylaws. The committee will also meet if there are changes suggested to the bylaws.

**Charge**

1. The committee recommends bylaws revisions to the faculty. Revisions may be needed due to changes made at the college or university levels. Faculty may also recommend changes to the bylaws.
2. The committee ensures that a copy of the current bylaws is available on the School of Music website.

**Process**

A. Proposed amendments should be submitted to the Bylaws Committee, who will review the proposal. If approved by the Bylaws Committee, the updated bylaws text will be brought to the voting faculty for consideration.

B. Voting on an amendment:

   1. Proposed amendments must be circulated via email by the chair of the Bylaws Committee to all voting faculty at least five business days before the vote.
   2. Voting follows the guidelines laid out in “Procedural Rules for Any SOM Meeting.” Minor clerical changes in language could be voted on by voice or show of hands, however any faculty member can request a vote by electronic means rather than by hand count.

C. The School of Music will keep a record of all bylaw revisions.

**II. FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

A. UNIVERSITY-WIDE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PERSONNEL ACTIONS

   General criteria and procedures for faculty rights and responsibilities are set forth in Chapter 2 of the *University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook*. Additional criteria of the School of Music are outlined below.

B. ACTIVITIES TO CARRY OUT THE MISSION OF THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC

   The activities of the faculty that are necessary to carry out the mission of the School of Music fall into three categories: teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service. In addition, faculty should behave with integrity and civility in performing their School responsibilities.

   To qualify for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and/or to receive annual
performance evaluations of “meets expectations” or better, a faculty member must demonstrate successful contributions in all areas.

For more information on the Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Retention, Promotion and Tenure Consideration in the School of Music, see Appendix A.

C. FACULTY WORKLOADS

The primary objective of the workload policy is to spread as equitably as possible across the faculty those professional activities that are necessary to meet the mission of the School of Music. The university requires that each member of the faculty perform a reasonable and equitable amount of work each year.

The assigned workload for full-time faculty consists of a combination of teaching, advising, research / scholarship / creative activity, and institutional and/or public service.

The assigned teaching workload is determined annually by the Area Coordinator in consultation with each faculty member, with review and approval of the Director.

The normal maximum teaching responsibility of a full-time faculty member engaged only in classroom teaching is 12 credit hours each semester. The normal maximum teaching responsibility of a full-time faculty member engaged only in studio teaching is 15 clock hours of private teaching per week each semester.

For studio teaching, a minimum of twelve 50-minute lessons per student taking 2-3 hours of credit is expected per semester. For students taking 1 credit hour, a minimum of twelve 25-minute lessons is expected per semester.

Teaching loads may be reduced by the Director for other justifiable reasons including recruitment, active involvement in research and/or creative activities (with publications or other suitable forms of recognition), administrative duties, and institutional and/or public service.

Additional information concerning workloads is available in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook (3.7).

D. COURSE SYLLABI

Note: For official College of Arts & Sciences guidelines for syllabi, see Appendix B or the College of Arts and Sciences Syllabus Guidelines.

A current course syllabus must be on file in the main office for each course offered
by the School of Music and should be kept for a period of at least 3 years.

E. ABSENCE FROM CAMPUS

Faculty members are expected to be present to teach their classes and lessons, as well as for final examination periods and area juries, and auditions and interviews.

Faculty members are encouraged to perform, attend and present at professional meetings, give guest clinics and lectures, and provide service to the university through recruiting trips and adjudication.

When the faculty member is absent from campus on university business, the proper travel forms (must be submitted 2 weeks prior to a domestic trip or 4 weeks prior to an international trip according to University guidelines. (See http://treasurer.tennessee.edu/travel/ and http://cie.utk.edu/travel/ for more information.)

When absent from campus the faculty member must provide for the teaching of classes and/or lessons missed or provide make-up instruction periods. Notification of extended absences (5 consecutive class days or more) and plans for coverage of lessons or classes should be given to the Area Coordinator and Director prior to accepting the off campus activity, outside of an emergency situation.

F. SCHOOL OF MUSIC MENTORING COMMITTEES

Mentoring is a crucial means by which the School’s expectations are articulated to faculty. Every faculty member below the rank of full professor will select (in consultation with the Director) a faculty mentor, who will serve as a source of information about department and university policies and expectations, as well as a guide to the profession in general. The mentor should have knowledge of the field in which the faculty member is working. In cases where the faculty person has a wide range of interests, two mentors may be appointed.

For new faculty hires, the mentor is assigned at the time of the hire by the Director. If the working relationship between mentor and mentee is not satisfactory from either point of view, the faculty member will be assigned a new mentor.

If a mentoring committee is assigned to a faculty member, the members:

- Provide guidance to the faculty member regarding teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service.
- Observe teaching as frequently as appropriate to the rank of the faculty member (see sections on Peer Review of Teaching and Promotion and Tenure procedures).
- Meet with the faculty member as appropriate.
- Assist in the completion and review the workload form each year.
- Provide evaluation reports as needed.
- Assist in the compilation and editing of the dossier for tenure and/or
Specific duties of the mentoring committees for each faculty rank are noted below.

MENTORING COMMITTEES FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A mentoring committee will be assigned to each tenure-track faculty member by the end of the faculty member’s first semester on campus. The mentoring committee will consist of three faculty above the rank of the mentee: the mentor, who serves as chair, and two other faculty.

The committee acts as primary liaison between the tenure-track faculty member and the School. The committee will provide guidance to the tenure-track faculty as they progress through the tenure process. The committee should meet with the mentee at least once per semester, but will meet with the mentee at least once per year. Members of the committee should be available for additional meetings as requested by the mentee.

The mentoring committee shall review the faculty member each year. This review will assess the faculty member’s teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service. In year two and four, a peer-review of teaching will be conducted. (See section II.G for more information.) For the annual review of teaching, each member of the mentoring committee should attend and comment on at least two lessons or classes each year and attend student performances. For research/creative activity, it is expected that the committee will attend some of the faculty member’s performances, attend presentations (if possible), or read publications among other activities.

The mentoring committee will present a short report which evaluates the progress of the tenure-track faculty member towards tenure in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service to the faculty at the annual retention/promotion/tenure faculty meeting. The report will contain factual information on the accomplishments for the previous year and prospects for the coming year, as well as an assessment of areas in need of improvement. The mentoring committee’s report is meant to be an objective view of the tenure-track faculty’s professional progress and should not contain an explicit recommendation for or against retention, promotion, or tenure and should not be based on rumor, speculation or personal feelings.

MENTORING COMMITTEES FOR TENURED FACULTY

Once a faculty member has reached the rank of Associate Professor, they may choose a mentor at the rank of professor from the faculty in the School of Music or a faculty member from outside the School. If and when the Associate Professor decides to apply for promotion to full professor, the mentor will act in an advisory role to the faculty member in the promotion process.
Once every three years, a peer-review of teaching (see section II.G) of the Associate Professor will be conducted by a faculty committee of two full professors, preferably the mentor and one other faculty member in the person’s area. The peer-review of teaching committee will be assigned by the Director in consultation with the faculty member. Each member of this review committee should observe at least two lessons and/or classes. The committee will submit a written report of their observations to the faculty member and the Director. The mentoring committee’s report is meant to be an objective view of the faculty member’s teaching and should not be based on rumor, speculation or personal feelings.

MENTORING COMMITTEES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (75%+ appointments)

A mentoring committee will be assigned to each non-tenure-track faculty member at the beginning of the first semester of appointment. The mentoring committee will consist of two faculty at or above the rank of assistant professor: the mentor, who serves as chair, and one other faculty member. Whenever possible, the evaluators will be from the faculty's area of teaching.

The committee should provide guidance to the non-tenure-track faculty as they progress through the promotion process (i.e., from lecturer to senior lecturer to distinguished lecturer). The committee should meet with the non-tenure-track faculty at least once per year. Members of the committee should be available for additional meetings as requested by the faculty member.

Non-tenure-track faculty will be assessed only on their teaching. For the annual review, each member of the mentoring committee should attend and comment on at least one lesson or class each year. It is expected that the committee will also attend some of their students’ performances or juries if the lecturer is teaching applied lessons. The report should not be based on rumor, speculation or personal feelings. A report of the non-tenure-track faculty member’s evaluation will be submitted to the Director and shared with the faculty member.

For lecturers preparing for promotion to senior lecturer, a peer-review of teaching (see section II.G) will be conducted by the mentoring committee at least twice within five years of the promotion process. Senior lecturers preparing for promotion to distinguished lecturer will have a peer-review of teaching one year prior to the year the promotion material is to be submitted.

Even though non-tenure-track faculty may conduct research/creative activity and participate in service activities, only teaching will be included in the yearly or promotional review.
MENTORING COMMITTEES FOR NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY (less than 75% appointments)

Non-tenure-track faculty appointed at less than a 75% appointment will not be assigned a mentoring committee. These faculty can ask for advice from other faculty members or the Director.

In the first year and at least every three years after that, the Director will ask two faculty at the level of Assistant Professor or higher to assess the teaching of the faculty member (i.e., the review committee). The review committee should attend and comment on at least one lesson or class. It is expected that the review committee will also attend some of their students’ performances or juries if the lecturer is teaching applied lessons. The review committee will write a report on the faculty’s teaching. The report should be based on the committee’s findings, not on rumor, speculation or personal feelings. The report will be submitted to the Director and shared with the faculty member.

Even though non-tenure-track faculty may conduct research/creative activity and participate in service activities, only teaching will be included in their reviews.

G. PEER-REVIEW OF TEACHING

The information below is based on the College Guidelines for peer-review of teaching. (See College of Arts & Sciences Peer-review of Teaching Policy or Appendix D.)

As faculty, our primary job is to teach our students. Periodic review of teaching is a means of providing assessments of this most important task and formative and summative evaluation of faculty.

Peer-reviews of teaching will be conducted, in most cases, by the faculty member’s mentoring committee.

The committee’s review will include:

- One or more classroom observations completed prior to the last month of classes.
- Review of additional course and teaching information including, but not restricted to:
  - end of course student evaluations
  - course syllabi
  - course materials (e.g., handbooks, handouts, tests)
  - teaching philosophy
  - interviews with current and former students
  - grade distributions
Note: If the review includes courses commonly taught by multiple faculty, the review could include a comparison of grades on final exams and grade distributions.

A peer-review of teaching can occur for the purpose of promotion and tenure, as a result of an annual review, and on request.

For promotion and tenure purposes, peer-reviews of teaching will regularly occur on the following schedule:

- Tenure-track faculty will be reviewed at least twice: (1) In year two for review in year three, and (2) in year four for review in year five.
- Associate Professors preparing for promotion to Full Professor will be reviewed every third year.
- Lecturers in preparation for promotion to senior lecturer: at least twice in the five years prior to the promotion process.
- Senior lecturer preparing for promotion to distinguished lecturer: one year prior to the year promotion materials are sent.

Should the annual review of a full professor indicate he or she falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank in teaching, a peer-review of teaching should be conducted no later than the following term in which the person teaches. The Director will appoint a committee of three faculty at the rank of full professor to conduct the peer-review. The results of this initial review may be used as a base against which expected improvements will be compared both from student survey and subsequent peer-review(s) of teaching.

A faculty member can request a peer-review of their teaching at any time.

Once a review is concluded, the review committee will write and submit a single report summarizing their findings.

III. APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REVIEW FOR ALL TENURE-TRACK AND TENURED FACULTY

The following guidelines for appointment, performance evaluation, and promotion for tenured and tenure-track faculty are specific to the School of Music. They are designed to supplement the criteria and procedures for formal evaluations in the Faculty Handbook (http://provost.utk.edu/faculty-handbook/) and in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation (http://provost.utk.edu/faculty-evaluation-manual/). These guidelines should inform and be reflected in:

- annual reviews by the Director of individual faculty members
- reviews by the tenured faculty and the Director when a faculty member is undergoing an enhanced retention review or being considered for the granting of tenure and/or promotion.
- A vote to initiate termination proceedings for a tenured faculty member. (See Faculty Handbook, 3.12)

Appointment, evaluation, and promotion/tenure represent a continuous and transparent process. Expectations must be clearly documented and articulated to individual faculty members at every stage of this process. Discussions concerning evaluation, promotion, and tenure are based on performance in three areas – teaching; research and/or creative activity; and service. Judgments must be based on documented professional evidence made available before and during deliberations and not speculation, rumor or personal feelings.

At the time of a faculty member’s appointment the Director will create two documents:

1. The **Letter of Appointment** which specifies the terms of the appointment. This letter will remain a permanent part of the faculty member’s file as the faculty member moves through retention and any subsequent promotions.
2. The **Statement of Responsibilities** outlines the expectations of the faculty member in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service. This statement may be revised throughout the term of the faculty member’s association with the University and will be included in the annual evaluation of each faculty member.

A. APPOINTMENT PROCEDURES

1. All faculty positions must be filled in accordance with the guidelines “Steps for Conducting a Standard Search” on the Office of Equity and Diversity website [http://oed.utk.edu/searches/steps/](http://oed.utk.edu/searches/steps/).

2. No search may be initiated without formal approval of the Director of the School of Music and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. To initiate a search for a Director of the School of Music, only approval by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences is required. Any search must be conducted according to procedure as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 3, sections 3.1 and 3.2.

3. For each full-time tenure-track faculty opening, a committee of at least five voting faculty will be appointed by the Director. The Chair should be a faculty member in the area where the vacancy exists. All committees must include at least one faculty member from an applied area and one from an academic area. Retiring faculty members will not serve on any search committees within one
year of their retirement.

For each non-tenure track position at a 50% time or higher, a committee of at least three voting faculty will be appointed by the Director. The Chair should be a faculty member in the area where the vacancy exists.

For lecturer positions under 50% time, the Director and Area Coordinator will consult and mutually agree on area hires.

All search committees for tenured or tenure-track positions must be approved by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.

4. For a Director of the School of Music search, the guidelines in the Faculty Handbook Chapter 1.6.4 must be followed. The dean appoints the chair of the search committee from outside the department. The search committee will consist of 12 people and will include the chair, one voting faculty member from each area in the School of Music, and either or both the Undergraduate and Graduate director. As per the Faculty Handbook, School of Music tenure-track and tenured faculty members collectively recommend a slate of departmental faculty for the search committee, from which the dean selects all departmental representatives on the search committee. While all departmental constituencies (including students, staff, non-tenure track faculty) have input into the discussion, only the voting faculty will participate in the vote which will take place by anonymous ballot.

5. The Director, in consultation with the search committee, shall define the duties and qualifications listed for any faculty position. The expected degree qualifications for tenure or promotion will be established in writing at the time of a hire and will not be changed during any subsequent retention or promotion considerations.

6. The search committee:
   ● recruits for the position,
   ● reviews all files submitted by applicants,
   ● constructs a list of candidates,
   ● conducts phone or video interview with selected candidates,
   ● checks references, then
   ● recommends to the Director those it wishes to interview on campus,
   ● meets with the candidates while they are on campus,
   ● considers all faculty and student comments from candidate visits, and
   ● makes a recommendation to the faculty.

7. Other faculty are encouraged to be involved in the search process in recruitment of applicants, participation in on-campus interviews during open meetings, and in providing feedback to the search committee.
Students are encouraged to attend appropriate sessions in the on-campus interviews and must be given the opportunity to provide written feedback to the search committee.

Faculty and student written feedback must be distributed to the search committee and conveyed to the faculty. Original copies of these comments must be kept in the search file.

8. The Director will call a special meeting of the tenured and tenure-track faculty for the purpose of reviewing the findings of the committee. The Director is also present at the meeting, but only to moderate and answer questions about procedure. The committee will present its findings and recommendation via email to the faculty at least 24 hours prior to the meeting and will also present its findings and recommendation verbally at the meeting and invite discussion. The voting faculty will then vote on the acceptability of each of the finalists individually and the ranked order of preference of the acceptable candidates. Faculty who are not at the meeting can submit their vote via email to the chair of the search committee before the meeting is held. Minutes will be taken at this meeting and will include discussion points and voting results.

Note: It is strongly recommended that videos of teaching/masterclasses and research presentation/performance of the candidates are recorded and made available to the faculty for review prior to the vote.

9. The search committee submits its recommendations and the results of the faculty vote to the Director. The minutes of the meeting are also submitted to the Director. If in agreement with the faculty, the Director submits the recommendation to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. If in disagreement, the Director submits his recommendation along with the search committee’s recommendation, the faculty vote, and the minutes of the faculty discussion to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The Director must also explain his or her reasons in detail to the faculty, who have the right to meet with the Dean and chief academic officer about the recommendation.

B. PRINCIPLES OF EVALUATION

The activities of the faculty that are necessary to carry out the mission of the School of Music fall into three categories: teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service. To qualify for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and/or to receive annual performance evaluations of “meets expectations,” a faculty member must demonstrate successful contributions in all areas. Along with the criteria in the University Faculty Handbook, the School of Music criteria must be met, as outlined in Appendix A: Criteria for annual evaluation, retention, promotion
and tenure consideration in the School of Music.

C. PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

A tenure-track faculty member must serve a probationary period prior to being considered for tenure. The appointment letter shall state the length of the faculty member’s probationary period and the academic year in which he or she will be considered for tenure.

D. ANNUAL RETENTION REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

Every tenure-track faculty member will undergo an annual retention review each Fall Semester of his or her probationary period. The annual retention review process is designed to ensure that a tenure-track faculty member receives clear and timely feedback from the tenured faculty and Director about his or her progress as measured by the standards and criteria for rank as defined in Appendix A: Criteria for annual evaluation, retention, promotion and tenure consideration in the School of Music, the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

Each annual retention review will contain a review of the faculty member’s teaching. In addition, a more thorough peer-review of teaching will be conducted in year two and four. (See section II.G for more information.)

Each tenure-track faculty member with a probationary period of four or more years shall undergo an enhanced retention review in the academic year following the midpoint in his or her probationary period (typically, the faculty member’s fourth year of employment). A tenure-track faculty member with a probationary period of less than four years may request that the tenured faculty provide him or her with an enhanced retention review in any one year of the probationary period up to (but not including) the faculty member’s year of tenure consideration. For a detailed outline of the procedure surrounding this evaluation please refer to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part I, Section B, 1, a.

For the Enhanced Review, the file shall be prepared by the faculty member as a preliminary draft of the faculty member’s file in support of a tenure dossier. The file shall conform to the guidelines for a tenure dossier both in format and content. (See Arts & Sciences Dossier Guidelines and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Appendix B.)
E. PROCEDURE FOR RETENTION REVIEW

1. Each fall, the Director will request from each tenure-track faculty member a workload form listing his or her accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service for the previous three academic years.

The information provided will include the workload form and a current CV. The Director will specify what additional information and materials, if any, should be included with the documents submitted for review.

The Director makes this summary available to the tenured faculty at least two weeks prior to the retention meeting. The report of the mentoring committee, including the peer-review of teaching in appropriate years, must be available to faculty at least one week prior to the annual retention meeting.

2. The Director will schedule an annual retention meeting(s), in which the Director and the tenured faculty will hear a brief summary of the report from the faculty member’s mentoring committee. The tenured faculty will then discuss the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and tenure with respect to his or her appointment and departmental bylaws. The Director will appoint a faculty member to write a summary of the discussion, which becomes part of the dossier.

In keeping with the university policy, while the Director may attend the discussion of a tenure and/or promotion candidate, he or she shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.

3. The tenured faculty will take a formal retention vote.

In the years before any enhanced retention review, this vote shall focus primarily (but not exclusively) on the tenure-track faculty member’s ability to sustain a level of teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service that comports with the faculty member’s current rank.

Beginning in the year of the enhanced retention review, the tenured faculty’s vote on retention shall focus primarily (and increasingly, in succeeding years) on the tenure-track faculty member’s ability to meet the requirements for tenure in the department and college.

The vote will be counted by one faculty member and either the Undergraduate or Graduate Director. The results of the vote should be announced to those present unless there are absentee ballots to be cast.
Faculty who cannot attend the faculty meeting must express their intention to vote by absentee ballot in writing to the Director before the meeting begins. Those who wish to submit an absentee ballot will have 4 business days to review the summary of the discussion and submit their vote via email to the Undergraduate or Graduate Director. The final vote count will then be shared with the tenured faculty by the Undergraduate or Graduate Director.

The vote and any written comments, attached to the Retention Review Form, will be shared electronically with the faculty member and the Director. The vote, along with any dissenting statements, becomes part of the dossier.

4. The Director conducts an independent retention review based upon the faculty member’s written summary, the written narrative of the mentoring committee, the written comments of the tenured faculty, the vote of the tenured faculty, and a scheduled meeting with the faculty member.

5. The Director submits his recommendation on the Retention Review Form. The Director’s report includes a written recommendation to the Dean as to retention or non-retention. The report will include an evaluation of performance that uses the ratings for annual performance and planning reviews.

6. The faculty member reviews and electronically signs the Retention Review Form and the attached narrative report(s). The faculty member’s signature indicates that she or he has read the entire evaluation, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with its findings.

7. The faculty member under review may submit a written response to the vote and narrative of the tenured faculty, to the report and recommendation of the Director, and/or to any dissenting statements. The faculty member shall be allowed two calendar weeks from the date of receipt of the finalized Retention Review Form and its complete set of attachments to submit any written response. If no response is received by the end of two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

8. The Director will forward to the Dean the finalized Retention Review Form, together with the Director’s report and recommendation, the retention vote and the narrative of the mentoring committee, the written comments of the tenured faculty, and all dissenting statements and responses.
F. ANNUAL EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY

1. Each fall, the Director will request from each tenured faculty member a workload form of his or her accomplishments in teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service for the previous three academic years (i.e., the evaluation period).

The information provided will include the workload form and a current CV. The Director will specify what additional information and materials, if any, should be included with the documents submitted for review.

As described under Mentoring Committees (section II.F), once every three years, a peer-review of teaching (see section II.G) will be conducted. A copy of the committee’s report will be given to the Director and included in the documents for review.

2. The Director will evaluate the faculty member’s activities by the standards and criteria for rank as defined in Appendix A: Criteria for annual evaluation, retention, promotion and tenure consideration in the School of Music, the Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

The Director schedules an annual review conference with the faculty member. At this meeting, the Director will share his evaluation with the faculty member. In addition, the faculty member and Director will discuss the faculty member’s goals from the previous year, accomplishments during the Evaluation Period, and review the faculty member’s goals for the coming year.

3. The Director submits his/her recommendation on the Annual Review Form.

At least every three years, the Director writes a Progress and Performance Narrative which includes:

- A description and discussion of the faculty member’s progress on his or her goals in the Evaluation Period.
- An evaluation of the faculty member’s accomplishments in the areas of teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service
- outlines the faculty member’s goals for the coming year.
- include evidence, if any, of international and intercultural expertise or experience.

The Director’s review and the Progress and Performance Narrative shall only be based on information available to the Director at the time of the review and shall not be based on rumor, speculation, or personal feelings.
4. The faculty member reviews and electronically signs the Annual Review Form and the attached narrative report(s). The faculty member’s signature indicates that she or he has read the entire evaluation and met with the Director, but the signature does not necessarily imply agreement with its findings.

5. The faculty member is allowed two calendar weeks from the date of receipt of the Annual Review Form and any attachments to submit a written response. If no response is received by the end of two weeks of the date of receipt, the faculty member relinquishes the right to respond.

6. The Director will forward to the Dean the finalized Annual Review Form, together with the Director’s report and recommendation and any faculty response.

For a detailed outline of the procedure surrounding the Annual Performance Review please refer to the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part II, Section B.

G. TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION REVIEW

1. As defined by the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, tenure is a principle that entitles a faculty member to continue his or her annual appointment until relinquishment or forfeiture of tenure or until termination of tenure for adequate causes, financial exigency, or academic program discontinuance.

Tenure is granted on the basis of a demonstrated record of achievement and the expectation of continued excellence.

Although reviews are conducted at the School, college, and university levels, tenure at the University of Tennessee is acquired only by positive action of the Board of Trustees. Procedures for tenure and promotion review are the same.

2. Generally, assistant professors will be considered for promotion to the rank of associate professor at the same time as they are considered for tenure.

While an associate professor may petition for promotion to full professor at any time subsequent to the receiving of tenure at the rank of associate professor, generally, associate professors must serve at least five years in rank before promotion to full professor.

3. A candidate for tenure and/or promotion review will prepare their dossier in accordance with College of Arts & Sciences Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Appendix A of this document.
4. In the case of a tenure vote, the departmental review committee is comprised of all tenured faculty members. In the case of a vote for promotion, the School review committee is comprised of all voting faculty members of a rank higher than the candidate.

5. **School of Music procedures for tenure and/or promotion review:**

   a. No later than two weeks before the meeting at which a tenure and/or promotion case will be discussed, the Director will make available to the review committee members all materials submitted for tenure and/or promotion review. **The report of the mentoring committee must be available to faculty at least one week prior to the promotion/tenure meeting.**

   b. The Director will schedule a meeting for a vote, in which eligible voting faculty will hear a brief summary of the report from the faculty member’s mentoring committee. The eligible voting faculty will then discuss the faculty member’s progress toward promotion and/or tenure with respect to his or her appointment and departmental bylaws. The Director will appoint a faculty member to write a summary of the discussion, which becomes part of the dossier.

   c. In keeping with the university policy, while the Director may attend the discussion of a tenure and/or promotion candidate, he or she shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.

   d. The voting faculty will take a formal promotion and/or tenure vote.

   **NOTE:** In order to be eligible to vote faculty members must review the candidate’s dossier and sign a register attesting to such.

   The vote will be counted by one faculty member and either the Undergraduate or Graduate Director. The results of the vote should be announced to those present unless there are absentee ballots to be cast.

   Faculty who cannot attend the faculty meeting must express their intention to vote by absentee ballot in writing to the Director before the meeting begins. Those who wish to submit an absentee ballot will have 4 business days to review the summary of the discussion (sent by either the Undergraduate or Graduate Director to the faculty) and submit their vote via email to the Undergraduate or Graduate Director who counted the votes. The final vote count will then be shared electronically with the tenured faculty by the Undergraduate or Graduate Director.
e. The vote and any written comments, attached to the Annual Review Form, will be shared with the faculty member and the Director. The vote, along with any dissenting statements, becomes part of the dossier.

See the Manual for Faculty Evaluation for the subsequent steps for review of the dossier in Part III: Tenure and Promotion Review, section C: Review Procedures.

H. PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO FULL PROFESSOR

1. At the time of application for promotion to Full Professor, a Promotion Review Committee will be appointed by the Director of the School of Music. The Promotion Review Committee (unique to each candidate) is made up of three full professors. This committee should consist of the faculty member’s mentor (if they have one), and faculty who have observed their teaching in the past.

The committee should, when possible, be representative of the area(s) in which the candidate teaches. If a candidate has a split appointment in more than one area of teaching, each area should be represented on the committee.

2. A candidate for promotion review will prepare a dossier, curriculum vitae, and supporting materials as evidence of his or her activities in teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service. Reports of at least two peer-reviews of teaching (see section II.G) are to be included in the supporting materials. A detailed description of what should be included in the dossier can be found in the Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Appendix A of this document.

3. Promotion Review Committee responsibilities:

a. Evaluate teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service using the criteria outlined in Appendix A of this document.

b. Meet with the candidate to review the candidate’s dossier and provide guidance on organization and content as they feel necessary.

c. Prepare a written report without recommendation and present it at a special meeting called for the purpose of discussion and consideration of promotion.

4. Review by the Faculty: No later than two weeks before the meeting at which a promotion case will be discussed, the Director will make available all materials submitted by the candidate for promotion review as well as all letters from external reviewers to the full professors. The report of the Promotion Review Committee must be available to the full professors at least one week prior to the promotion meeting.
5. The Director will schedule a meeting for a vote, in which full professors will hear a brief summary of the report from the faculty member’s Promotion Review Committee. The full professors will then discuss the faculty member’s progress toward promotion with respect to his or her appointment and departmental bylaws. The Director will appoint a faculty member to write a summary of the discussion, which becomes part of the dossier.

In keeping with the university policy, while the Director may attend the discussion of a promotion candidate, he or she shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.

6. The full professors will take a formal promotion vote.

In order to be eligible to vote, faculty members must review the candidate’s dossier and sign a register attesting to such.

The vote will be counted by two full professors. The results of the vote should be announced to those present unless there are absentee ballots to be cast.

Faculty who cannot attend the meeting must express their intention to vote by absentee ballot in writing to the Director before the meeting begins. Those who wish to submit an absentee ballot will have 4 business days to review the summary of the discussion and submit their vote via email to the Director. The final vote count will then be shared with the full professors by the Director.

7. Upon evaluation by the faculty as a whole, the Director will render an independent recommendation to include in the candidate's file. Procedures for review by the Director are covered in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation.

IV. APPOINTMENT, EVALUATION, AND APPEALS FOR ALL NON-TENURE-TRACK FACULTY

The following guidelines for appointment, performance evaluation, and promotion for non-tenure-track faculty are specific to the School of Music. They are designed to supplement the criteria found in The University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook. These guidelines should inform and be reflected in:

- annual reviews by the Director of individual faculty members
- reviews by the faculty at or above the rank of Assistant Professor
- and the Director when a non-tenure-track faculty member is being considered for promotion to senior or distinguished lecturer
Appointment, evaluation, and promotion represent a continuous and transparent process. Expectations must be clearly documented and articulated to individual faculty members at every stage of this process. Discussions concerning evaluation and promotion for non-tenure-track faculty are based on teaching only. Judgments must be based on documented professional evidence made available before and during deliberations and not speculation, rumor or personal feelings.

A. APPOINTMENT AND REAPPOINTMENT

1. The employment of non-tenure-track faculty is governed by the applicable provisions of *The University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook* (see Chapter 4) and University policies and procedures.

   All non-tenure-track faculty positions must be filled in accordance with the guidelines “Positions with Modified (Limited or Exempted) Search Requirements” on the Office of Equity and Diversity website (https://oed.utk.edu/searches/limited/).

2. Any search must be approved by the College of Arts and Sciences and initiated through the Director’s Office once permission is granted. At the time of the search, the Director will meet with the committee and outline the appropriate steps in the search process.

3. For each non-tenure track position at a 75% time or higher, a committee of at least three voting faculty will be appointed by the Director. The Chair should be a faculty member in the area where the vacancy exists.

   For lecturer positions under 75% time, the Director and Area Coordinator will consult and mutually agree on area hires.

4. The Director will then recommend appointments to the dean, who will in turn recommend appointments to the chief academic officer. The non-tenure-track faculty will receive a Notification of Appointment by letter from the chief academic officer. This appointment letter specifies (a) rank, (b) salary and related financial conditions, (c) general duties and expectations, and (d) duration. This letter will remain a permanent part of the faculty member’s file as the faculty member moves through retention and any subsequent promotions.

5. Typically, initial non-tenure-track teaching appointments will be made at the rank of lecturer for a definite term of one year or less.

6. A non-tenure-track appointment (whatever its duration) may be renewed for a new term through the normal application and appointment process. Renewal decisions will include consideration of available funding and the
faculty member’s performance. If a non-tenure-track appointment is not renewed in writing, it automatically expires at the end of the stated term. A non-tenure-track appointment may be, by its nature, funding-limited and may automatically expire when funding lapses. Whenever feasible, however, subject to available funding, the Director should give the faculty member at least one month’s written notice of termination of the faculty member’s employment.

B. DUTIES

1. Lecturer duties are assigned at the time of hire and are outlined in the Notification of Appointment letter.

2. Non-tenure-track faculty are not expected to conduct research and/or creative activity or perform public or disciplinary service as a condition of their employment.

3. Non-tenure-track faculty over 75% effort are encouraged, but not required, to attend faculty meetings and, as appropriate, to participate in School governance.

C. ANNUAL EVALUATION

For more information, see sections 4.3: Evaluation and 4.4: Promotion of Lecturers in the Faculty Handbook.

The non-tenure-track faculty evaluation is done in the fall semester (unless otherwise indicated below) for the previous academic year. If there are any teaching issues prior to or between evaluations, the concern(s) should be recorded and shared with the director for discussion as they arise as soon as possible.

1. Annual Evaluation for 75% or greater non-tenure-track faculty

   a. Each year, the non-tenure-track faculty’s mentoring committee (see section II.G) will evaluate the lecturer. Lecturers are evaluated on the previous academic year (Aug-May).

   b. Prior to the evaluation, the lecturer will upload the following materials to the faculty portal by October 1 for those with service of 2 or more years and by January 15 for those in their first year:

      - A report from the teaching section of Elements (also see the teaching section of Appendix A)
All course evaluations and scores related to the student evaluation process
All recruitment activities as related to their position and/or as specified in their job description.

Note: Lecturers are evaluated on their teaching ability and effectiveness. However, other elements of pedagogical influence can also be considered, including:

Evidence of Excellence in Contributing to the University’s Instructional Mission:
- Administrative responsibilities within the program or unit
- Program or course-coordination across multiple sections
- Support for extracurricular student organization and activities
- Participation in the unit’s governance activities and committees
- Professional outreach activities in the campus, community, or discipline
- Other evidence of professional excellence

A list of other scholarly/creative activity/research activities and service is optional and can put in Elements. However, teaching is the only category that will be evaluated in the review process.

c. The evaluators will attend at least one class (prior to the last month of classes) each and the visits should encompass the breadth of the lecturer’s teaching responsibility whenever possible.

For lecturers preparing for promotion to senior lecturer, a peer-review of teaching (see section II.G) will be conducted by the mentoring committee twice within five years prior to the start of the promotion process. Senior lecturers preparing for promotion to distinguished lecturer will have a peer-review of teaching one year prior to the year the promotion material is to be submitted.

Lecturers who intend to apply for promotion must email the director of their intent by April 1 of the previous academic year.

d. The mentoring committee members will create a single narrative document that will evaluate only on the lecturer’s teaching. The report must be on letterhead and signed by all committee members. Committee reports are due by December 1 for lecturers in their second year or more of teaching, and by February 15 for first year lecturers.

The report should include:

- Comments on the lecturer’s teaching strengths
● Comments on areas in which the lecturer should improve their teaching
● Additional comments (if necessary)
● A recommendation to the Director to retain, put on probation, or not retain the lecturer.

If a lecturer receives a “put on probation” recommendation from the committee, the candidate and committee must create a Plan of Improvement with measurable outcomes to be addressed within a specified timeframe. The Director will be consulted during this process.

e. The Director will meet with each lecturer to discuss the evaluation and any actions that need to be taken.

f. The Lecturer annual review process (including the visit with the Director) must be completed prior to March 1 for first-year lecturers and December 15 for those in their second year and after.

2. Annual Evaluation for Other non-tenure track faculty (74% or less)

The performance of non-tenure track faculty members will be evaluated annually by a faculty member appointed by the Director with a written record of the evaluation maintained in the School of Music and Human Resource files. The evaluation of non-tenure track faculty is based upon the indicators of performance in the area of teaching criteria as contained in Appendix A.

3. Appeals

Non-tenure track faculty may exercise the appeals procedures outlined in Chapter 5 of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook, except those applicable to the termination of tenured or tenure-track faculty appointments.

D. PROMOTION REVIEW

For more information, see the Faculty Handbook, Section 4.4: Promotion of Lecturers, and the Manual for Faculty Evaluation, Part VI: Promotion of Non-tenure-track teaching faculty, A. Lecturer Promotion Process.

a. Lecturers can be considered for promotion to senior lecturer during their fifth year of regular (full-time) service at the rank of lecturer.

A senior lecturer is eligible for promotion to distinguished lecturer typically after three to five years of regular (full-time) service at the rank of senior lecturer.
b. A candidate for promotion review will prepare their dossier in accordance with College of Arts & Sciences Lecturer Promotion Guidelines, Manual for Faculty Evaluation and Appendix A of this document.

c. In the case of a vote for promotion, the School review committee is comprised of all voting faculty members of a rank higher than the candidate.

d. **School of Music procedures for promotion review:**

   1. No later than two weeks before the meeting at which a promotion case will be discussed, the Director will make available to the review committee members all materials submitted for promotion review. The report of the mentoring committee must be available to faculty **at least one week prior** to the promotion meeting.

   2. The Director will schedule a meeting for a vote, in which eligible voting faculty will hear a **brief summary** of the report from the faculty member’s mentoring committee. The eligible voting faculty will then discuss the faculty member’s progress toward promotion with respect to his or her appointment and departmental bylaws. The Director will appoint a faculty member to write a summary of the discussion, which becomes part of the dossier.

   3. In keeping with the university policy, while the Director may attend the discussion of a promotion candidate, he or she shall not participate in the discussion except to clarify issues and assure that proper procedure is followed.

   4. The voting faculty will take a formal promotion vote.

   **NOTE:** In order to be eligible to vote faculty members must review the candidate’s dossier and sign a register attesting to such.

   The vote will be counted by one faculty member and either the Undergraduate or Graduate Director. The results of the vote should be announced to those present unless there are absentee ballots to be cast.

   Faculty who cannot attend the faculty meeting must express their intention to vote by absentee ballot in writing to the Director before the meeting begins. Those who wish to submit an absentee ballot will have 4 business days to review the summary of the discussion (sent by the Undergraduate or Graduate Director to the faculty) and
submit their vote via email to the Undergraduate or Graduate Director who counted the votes. The final vote count will then be shared electronically with the tenured faculty by the Undergraduate or Graduate Director.

5. The vote and any written comments, attached to the Annual Review Form, will be shared with the faculty member and the Director. The vote, along with any dissenting statements, becomes part of the dossier.

6. See the Manual for Faculty Evaluation for the subsequent steps for review of the dossier in Part VI: Promotion of Non-tenure-track teaching faculty, A. Lecturer Promotion Process.

V. FACULTY RIGHTS OF APPEAL

Faculty have the right to pursue a grievance through the general appeals procedures as outlined in The University of Tennessee, Knoxville-Faculty Handbook, Chapter 5.

VI. BENEFITS AND LEAVES OF ABSENCE

The University of Tennessee provides a comprehensive program of benefits for faculty members and full-time non-tenure track (75% or higher) faculty members as set forth in the University of Tennessee Faculty Handbook, Chapter 6.
VII. COMPENSATED OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES

Faculty members on regular full-time appointments are often asked to provide consulting services to other organizations. This activity is encouraged by the University as long as it does not interfere with regular duties of the faculty member. When requested by the university, faculty must report any compensated outside activity and/or conflicts of interest in keeping with university policies.

University policies concerning compensated outside services are outlined in Chapter 7 of the University of Tennessee Faculty Handbook.
APPENDIX A: Criteria for Annual Evaluation, Retention, Promotion and Tenure Consideration in the School of Music

Along with the criteria in the University Faculty Handbook, the following School of Music criteria must be met.

The activities of the faculty that are necessary to carry out the mission of the School of Music fall into three categories: teaching, research and/or creative accomplishment, and service. To qualify for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and/or to receive annual performance evaluations of “meets expectations,” a faculty member must demonstrate successful contributions in all areas. (See below.)

The following is not a checklist.

All faculty are expected to:

1. be accomplished teachers.

   The teaching load of the faculty member is appropriate to the needs of the area and School, and the expertise of the faculty member.

   Within the sub-categories below, the following lists are not in any particular order based on importance or weighting.

   Teaching load includes:

   • courses (including lessons/recitals, ensembles, independent study, thesis supervision, undergraduate or graduate student research or senior/honors theses)
   • student teaching/internship supervision
   • academic advising as assigned
   • successful recruiting

   A faculty member’s recruiting is evaluated based upon results, not the activities that lead to these results. At a minimal level, successful recruiting results in filling an academic area/studio/ensemble with predominantly music majors. More successful recruiting activity is reflected in larger numbers of higher quality music major auditionees/interviewees, on average, over the course of years, resulting in a more competitive admission process and higher quality of matriculating students.

   Evidence of quality teaching includes:

   • peer evaluation of teaching
   • student evaluation reports, including student comments
statements from administrators which attest to the candidate's teaching and advising effectiveness
- competitively awarded honors, fellowships, prizes, festivals or apprenticeships received by students (e.g., regional, national, or international level)
- college, university, or external (at the regional, national, or international level) honors and awards received for teaching/advising
- membership on graduate committees
- evidence of expertise or experience in international or intercultural activities
- mentoring of students in successfully meeting the requirements of their degree program, demonstrating a positive record of student retention and graduation
- placement of students in graduate programs at premier institutions
- mentoring students in presenting and/or publishing research or music in a professionally recognized forum
- evidence of course or curricular development
- evidence of pedagogical innovation
- an account of supervision of undergraduate research
- a description of mentoring or coordinating GTAs for large-enrolling, multi-section classes
- a description of participation in teaching workshops and pedagogical training
- evidence of producing students who become active professionals in music
- mentoring students to achieve the standard of excellence in performance and academic studies established by the School of Music

2. establish and sustain a record of research and/or creative accomplishment.

Within the sub-categories below, the following lists are in order of importance/weighting from highest to lowest. Inclusion of primarily lower ranked activities will not be sufficient for promotion and tenure.

The weight of each of the following is based on the significance of the venue/journal/label, the intent of the activity, whether it is invited/peer-reviewed/refereed, the venue of the activity (regional/national), the quality of program, and where faculty member is in trajectory and rank. Weighting is determined by an assessment of informed faculty.

a. Research/scholarly publications

Notes:
- Include an opening statement to this subsection that explains norms for authorship in the field. This may include an explanation of author order
or the importance of single vs. multiple author publications. Also, if needed, include in this opening section an explanation of what descriptors such as “in press” or “to appear” connote in the given field of research.

- For publications with multiple authors, indicate the candidate’s contribution (e.g., corresponding author, principal author, supervisor of principal author, etc.). Indicate graduate student or undergraduate authors under supervision of the candidate.
- Include beginning and ending page numbers or total number of pages for each publication, where appropriate.

1. Books, compositions, recordings or computer programs in which you are the primary author, composer, or performer.
2. Books, compositions, recordings, or computer programs in which you are a contributing author, composer, performer, or editor.
3. Articles published in refereed print or online journals.
4. Invited or peer-reviewed presentations at national or international professional meetings as a sole or co-presenter.
5. Serves as editor of a professional and/or scholarly journal.
6. Invited or peer-reviewed presentations at regional professional meetings as a sole or co-presenter.
7. Invited or peer-reviewed poster/panel session at a significant professional meeting.
8. Invited or peer-reviewed video research presentation published by a significant professional organization.
9. Invited presentation at peer or aspirational institutions or significant programs in the given field.
11. Substantial review article published in a scholarly print or online source.
12. Extended abstracts published in a journal or conference proceedings (refereed on the basis of abstract).
13. Articles published in popular press or non-refereed journals.
14. Invited or peer-reviewed presentations at state/local professional meetings as a sole or co-presenter.
15. Manuscripts submitted for publication (include where and when submitted and status of submission).

b. Creative Activity

1. Invited or competitively awarded performances, conducting engagements, or seminars/workshops in nationally or internationally recognized venues or conferences.
2. Invited or competitively awarded performances, conducting engagements, or or seminars/workshops in regionally recognized venues/conferences.
3. Performer or conductor at nationally or internationally recognized venues or with honor ensembles.
4. Performer or conductor at regionally recognized venues or with honor ensembles.
5. Exchange performances at peer or aspirational institutions or significant programs in the given field.
6. Master classes at peer or aspirational institutions or significant programs in the given field.
7. Faculty or local recital.
8. Secondary role in faculty or local recital.
9. Playing as a member of or conducting a local large ensemble.

c. Grants or fellowships.

Provide date, title, agency, amount, and status (completed, funded and in progress, under review, submitted but not funded).

1. Funded by nationally or internationally recognized source.
2. Funded by a regional source.
3. Funded by a state source.
4. Funded by the university.
5. Funded by a local source.

d. Honors, awards or prizes for research and/or creative accomplishment.

List by level:
1. National or international
2. University-level or regional
3. College or state
4. School of Music or local

3. contribute to the School, College, University, profession and the community.

a. Institutional Service

1. committee work at university, college, and School level. Serving as:
   ● Chair of governance bodies and related activities
   ● Member of governance bodies and related activities
2. Administrative service to the School of Music
3. Invited special event performances/presentations at the university, college, or School level. These performances could include performances by students (solo or ensemble) that the faculty arrange.
4. Record of contributions to the University’s programs, at home and abroad, to enhance equal opportunity and cultural diversity (e.g., Ready for the World events).
5. Contributions to university, college or School publications
6. Recognition through awards from the University or community for service
7. Hosting and/or organizing symposia, clinics, workshops, guest artist appearances
8. Working with Development to raise funds for the university, college or School.

b. Disciplinary Service

1. membership and active participation in professional and learned societies related to candidate’s academic discipline, including
   ● offices held in professional societies
   ● service on professional society committees
2. evaluation of peer research / scholarship / creative activity
   ● service as peer referee for professional journals and publishers
   ● service as reviewer of proposals for granting agencies
   ● service as external evaluator for promotion and/or tenure
   ● published book/CD/software reviews
3. honors or awards for service activity within your academic discipline
4. commissioning a composition
5. performing artist for or professional endorsement by a music vendor related to the discipline

C. Professional Service

1. Service to public and private organizations or institutions in which the candidate uses his/her professional expertise.
2. Service to governmental agencies at the international, federal, state and local levels.
3. Service to industry, e.g., training, workshops, consulting
4. Participation in community affairs as a University representative
5. Adjudication at competitions or on audition panels (other than School of Music auditions).
6. Recital or ensemble performance in public or private schools

4. Behaves with integrity and civility in performing their School responsibilities.

EXPECTATIONS BY RANK

A Professor is expected to:

1. hold a doctorate in music or an allied field, or possess outstanding professional experience appropriate to the position.
2. have an established and sustained national or international reputation through a record of research and/or creative accomplishment.
3. be an excellent teacher.
4. have contributed and continue to contribute significantly to the institution, discipline, and profession though service.
5. serve as mentor to junior colleagues.
6. have normally served as associate professor for at least 5 years.

An Associate Professor is expected to:

1. hold a doctorate in music or an allied field or possess outstanding professional experience appropriate to the position.
2. have a growing national or international reputation through a record of research and/or creative accomplishment.
3. be an accomplished and increasingly excellent teacher.
4. have achieved and maintained a record of service to the institution, discipline, and profession.
5. have normally served as assistant professor for at least 5 years.
6. serve as mentor to junior faculty.

An Assistant Professor is expected to:

1. hold a doctorate in music or an allied field or possess outstanding professional experience appropriate to the position.
2. have a growing national or international reputation through a record of research and/or creative accomplishment.
3. be an effective and increasingly accomplished teacher.
4. have a developing record of service to the institution, discipline, and profession.

A Lecturer/senior lecturer/distinguished lecturer is expected to:

1. hold a doctorate in music or an allied field or possess a record of professional experience appropriate to the position.
2. be an effective teacher.
3. Senior or distinguished lecturers carry commensurately higher expectations as outlined in the faculty handbook.
APPENDIX B: College of Arts & Sciences Syllabus Guidelines (July 2013)

1. Purpose of this document

This document summarizes College guidelines regarding course syllabi and instructors’ office hours. It is intended (1) to help the College and its academic programs prepare for activities associated with SACS re-accreditation and (2) to help faculty design course syllabi that clearly present course requirements. As the College prepares for SACS re-accreditation, we aim for our academic programs, and our courses, to have clearly-stated learning objectives that can provide a basis for assessment of student learning. Clearly written syllabi can also reduce the number of grade appeals that instructors and departments must deal with.

2. Recommendations regarding syllabus distribution and retention

Ideally, a draft version of the course syllabus, or a representative syllabus from a previous semester’s offering of the course, should be made available to prospective and enrolled students before the first day of the semester. (This could be accomplished by posting such a document on the instructor’s web page or on a department/school website, or by making such a document available in the department/school office for students to consult.)

Ideally, the syllabus for a course should be made available to all enrolled students, and posted on the course’s Canvas site, at the beginning of the semester.

Ideally, copies of course syllabi should be retained by the offering department or school for a period of three years.

3. Recommendations regarding instructors’ office hours

The instructor of record for each course should ideally hold at least one regularly scheduled, on-campus, hour-long office hour per week for any course that is not delivered entirely online. Instructors teaching three or more courses in a term need only hold two regularly scheduled, on-campus, hour-long office hours per week. (For on-campus Mini-Term courses, the instructor of record will ideally hold at least two one-hour office hour blocks per week; they should be on two different days of the week.)

4. Key elements of the course syllabus

The following items are key elements of a course syllabus:

A. Semester and year of the course (e.g. Fall 2013).
B. Course subject and number (e.g. Chemistry 120). If several sections of the course,
taught by multiple instructors of record, are offered in a single semester, include the section number or CRN as well.

C. Course title (for variable-title courses, give the current semester’s title).

D. Name, office location, contact information (office or department telephone, e-mail address) and office hours for instructor of record.

E. Names, offices, contact information, and office hours for any teaching assistants, if this information is available before the first day of class. If this information is not available before the first day of class, the syllabus should explain how and when this information will be provided.

F. Required textbooks and/or course packets.

G. Required instructional technology (e.g. calculator, clicker, access code for online homework system).

H. Brief description of the course.

I. Central learning objectives for the course (for SACS purposes).

J. Degree-level learning objectives that the course supports (for SACS purposes). Degree-level learning objectives are typically listed in an academic unit’s SACS assessment plan. Not every course offered by a unit will necessarily support the unit’s degree-level learning objectives; courses that primarily serve the University’s General Education program, for instance, may not support a unit’s degree-level learning objectives.

K. Outline of the semester, including an approximate calendar that lists major topics and assignments. The semester outline might also include a schedule of reading assignments. If a single in-class activity (exam, presentation, etc.) or an out-of-class assignment (term paper, etc.) constitutes 10% or more of the final course grade, indicate the week during which the activity or assignment is likely to occur. (Replace “week” with “day” for Mini-Term courses.)

L. List of any required events that take place outside of the course’s normal weekly meeting times (such as evening exams, field trips, etc.) — note that the online timetable should also state that events outside of the course’s normal weekly meeting times may be required of students. The online timetable might also indicate the general nature of these events (e.g. “two day-long Saturday field trips” or “three Wednesday evening exams”).

M. List of all categories of activities and assignments that will contribute to a student’s final course grade. If category weights are used to determine a student’s final grade, list the approximate weights for each assignment category (e.g. homework is worth 15%, three mid-term exams are worth 15% each, end-of-semester paper is worth 10%, final exam is worth 30%).

N. Course grading policy. This might take the form of either a table converting percentile or numerical grades to letter grades; equally acceptable is a statement that final course letter grades will be computed using an instructor-specified scale that will be
determined at the end of the course. What is important is that students understand the procedure by which the instructor will assign end-of-semester letter grades. (Note that instructors have no obligation to use all of the grades listed in the Catalog.)

O. If attendance contributes to a student’s final course grade, an explanation of how absences will reduce a student’s attendance grade.

P. If participation contributes to a student’s final course grade, an explanation of what type of in-class participation is expected.

Q. Instructor’s policy regarding make-ups for in-class activities (exams, etc.).

R. Instructor’s policy regarding acceptance of late out-of-class assignments (term papers, etc.) along with a statement of any penalty assessed on late assignments.

S. Date and time of final exam (if any), with a reference to the final exam policy listed in the catalog.

T. Reference to academic honesty statement and disability statement (attaching the Campus Syllabus provided by the Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center will accomplish this).

**Additional information to be included in School of Music Syllabi:**

A. Degree level learning objectives for the School of Music can be found in Appendix C.

B. Health and wellness policy statement must be added to the syllabus as follows:

   “As an Institutional Member of the National Association of Schools of Music, the University of Tennessee School of Music supports the Association’s commitment to student health and wellness. The following web address provides links to information for resources related to physical and mental well-being, as well as assisting in offering preventative measures that students can take to avoid serious and/or chronic conditions:  [http://www.music.utk.edu/about/health.html](http://www.music.utk.edu/about/health.html)”

5. **Other suggested syllabus content**

It may be useful to include this information in a course syllabus as well:

A. A statement that any electronic announcements will be (1) sent via email to students’ official UTK email addresses and (2) posted on Canvas, with a reminder that students are responsible for monitoring their UTK email account and the course Canvas site.

B. Instructions to students regarding e-mail communication with instructor of record (e.g. “Please put CHEM 120 in the subject line of any e-mail message that you send me”). A statement regarding the instructor’s expectations for civil behavior in class.

C. The instructor’s recommendations for student success.
D. For writing-emphasis courses, a statement that the course is writing-emphasis and an explanation of the writing assignments that qualify the course as writing-emphasis.

E. For service-learning courses, an explanation of the service-learning component, including a statement whether the service-learning component is required or optional.

F. A statement explaining how minor revisions to the syllabus will be announced to students (e.g. instructor will send an e-mail message announcing that a revised syllabus has been posted to Canvas).

6. History of this document

The first draft of this document was sent to department heads and school directors in December 2012, with a request for heads and directors to solicit comments from faculty members and return those comments to the College office in January 2013. In February 2013, a compilation of the comments received by the College office was sent to department heads and school directors, along with copies of the syllabus policies in force at the Universities of Arizona, Florida, Georgia, and Minnesota. A revised version of this document was sent to department heads and school directors in April 2013 for further review. The proposed guidelines were also sent to the Dean’s Student Advisory Council, the College Curriculum Committee, and the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council for review and comment.

The current document incorporates several suggestions made by faculty (through department heads and school directors), by members of the College Curriculum Committee, and by members of the Dean’s Faculty Advisory Council.
APPENDIX C: School of Music Degree Learning Objectives

Bachelor of Music/Bachelor of Arts Learning Objectives

1. Create an effective music presentation by integrating comprehensive capabilities, and by demonstrating general knowledge of literature and/or key concepts, in the concentration.
2. Demonstrate a general working knowledge, as appropriate to their concentration, of aural and visual analysis and knowledge of musicology and repertoire.
3. Demonstrate the ability to communicate clearly and effectively about the art of music.

Master of Music Learning Objectives

1. Create an effective music presentation at a high level by integrating comprehensive capabilities, and by demonstrating advanced, comprehensive knowledge of literature and/or key concepts at an advanced level, in the concentration.
2. Demonstrate a thorough working knowledge, as appropriate to their concentration, of aural and visual analysis and knowledge of musicology and repertoire.
3. Demonstrate the ability to communicate clearly and effectively about the art of music for a professional audience.

Graduate Artist Certificate Learning Objectives

1. Create an effective music presentation by integrating comprehensive capabilities, and by demonstrating general knowledge of literature and/or key concepts, in the concentration at a professional level.
2. Demonstrate an advanced working knowledge, as appropriate to their concentration, of literature for their instrument.
3. Demonstrate the ability to communicate clearly and effectively about the art of music at a professional level.

Certificate in Music Theory Pedagogy Learning Objectives

1. Demonstrate a thorough knowledge of music theory, analytical methods and technology appropriate to the teaching of music theory and aural skills.
2. Compare, contrast, and evaluate different pedagogical methods for the teaching of music theory and aural skills.
3. Demonstrate the ability to communicate music theory and aural skills clearly and effectively.
Appendix D: College of Arts and Sciences Peer-Review of Teaching Policy

Departments are expected to develop peer-review of teaching procedures that are consistent with the college policy and recommendations from the Tennessee Teaching and Learning Center. In most units the procedures will include:

- Peer-review by a small committee of faculty members.
- One or more classroom observations for each course reviewed.
- Additional review of various course and teaching information, typically including, but not restricted to end of course evaluations, syllabi and other course materials, grade distributions, teaching philosophy, and interviews with current and former students. If the review includes courses commonly taught by multiple faculty, the review could include a comparison of grades on final exams and grade distributions.

Peer-reviews occur in at least 3 circumstances:

- Tenure and Promotion Cases: For tenure cases, at least two peer-review reports required. The Manual for Faculty Evaluation makes the following recommendation: “Normally, a peer evaluation will be conducted within a year of the faculty member’s initial appointment and repeated after a period of several years but prior to review for tenure and/or promotion according to departmental bylaws.” At least one peer-review is needed for promotion-only cases.
  - If desired, statements may be included from other colleagues who have visited the classroom or who are in a good position to evaluate fairly and effectively clinical or field assignments or advising. Any such statements or letters should clearly indicate that they are not official peer review reports.
  - Recommend that one of the two pre-tenure reviews occur prior to the enhanced retention review and the second in the year prior to dossier review.
  - Additional reviews may be desired to show improvement.

Results of Annual Review: Should the annual review of a full professor indicate he or she falls short or falls far short of meeting expectations for rank in teaching, a peer-review of teaching should be conducted no later that the following term in which the person teaches. The results of the initial review may be used as a base against which expected improvements will be compared both from student survey and subsequent peer-review(s) of teaching.

A faculty member may request a peer-review of their teaching.