

UMKC CONSERVATORY

PROMOTION AND TENURE: ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS

I. REPORT & PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

II. ANNUAL REPORT TIMELINES

III. INFORMATION TRANSFER & FACULTY SUPPORT

I. REPORT AND PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES

Annual report submission expectations:

All full-time faculty (with appointments at .75 FTE or greater), whether tenured, tenure-track, or non-tenure-track **must** complete and submit a professional activity report each year. This includes visiting faculty, full-time adjunct faculty, faculty on leave, those in the process of preparing a dossier for promotion and/or tenure, or those waiting on the results of a tenure and/or promotion process.

Conservatory Professional Activity Report (CONS-PAR)

The CONS-PAR is the report submitted directly to the Division Chair using the MyVita system every January to provide a comprehensive account of teaching, research/creative activities and service for the preceding calendar year (January 1 – December 31). Faculty should list accomplishments from the previous calendar year *only*.

Importance of timely submission of the CONS-PAR:

- The Conservatory Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide notification of the due date for upcoming report submission at the end of the fall semester and again at the beginning of the new calendar year. *In cases of missing or late submissions, the Division Chair will not be able to complete a review and report to the Dean. Reports submitted after the due date will be forwarded directly to the Dean, and failure to submit a report will be interpreted as a waiver of opportunity for merit raise consideration. In addition, faculty who do not submit the report will not be eligible to be considered for a Kauffman Award.* It is strongly recommended that faculty work on their reports during the fall semester (or continually during the course of the year) to allow for timely submission of these reports.

Evaluation of the CONS-PAR:

- Each Division Chair studies each CONS-PAR submission for each faculty member. Strengths and any areas of concern are noted for each of three areas: Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service. The Division Chair looks for both quantity and quality of accomplishments in each of these areas. Typically, the three areas of activity are weighted in importance to reflect the standard expectation for most

faculty members' balance of activity. This results in relative emphasis and importance as: teaching=40%; research/creative activity=40%; and service=20%. For those who do not have the standard balance among the three areas (40/40/20 shown above) *it is imperative that a clear statement of their formally negotiated load arrangement* be provided in the form of a letter from the Dean of the Conservatory. This letter must outline the specific balance of expected professional activity for the evaluated year, and include special projects or other circumstances that are part of the non-standard arrangement.

- Since each faculty member has a somewhat distinctive and individualized activity profile, another issue may be relative expectations of activities *within* a given area (*teaching, research/creative activity, service*). For example, in the teaching area, some faculty will have dozens, even hundreds, of teaching evaluations, while others may have only a small number. For some, course evaluations may be an ideal mechanism for determining teaching excellence, while in others this vehicle may play a less prominent role in demonstrating quality of teaching. Some faculty will have extensive lists of current and former student accomplishments directly attributed to work with them, while others may have fewer. Similarly, some may find that specific examples of research or service activities are more closely matched to their professional profile than others. Publishing may be more central to some faculty profiles, and service to a particular element of the profession may be important to some more than others. Given this diversity among faculty individuals, it is important that each faculty member summarizes and annotates aspects of the annual report according to contractual expectations and *in a way that reflects unique circumstances of professional activity*.
- Quantity: it is important to provide a comprehensive and detailed report, indicating all activities within each area. Entries must be limited to activities occurring between January 1 and December 31 of the year of the review.
- Quality: It is helpful and important to annotate entries to indicate relative importance of various accomplishments. The Division Chair typically accepts that geographical scope of activity indicates different levels of merit (international more noteworthy than national, more important than regional, and so on). If a specific entry in your report seems to be an exception to this approach, it would be important to note this and explain why. Similarly, amounts of time spent in various committees can vary, so one should document the intensity of time and energy in service activities.
- Peer Review: One of the most important concepts in evaluating quality of faculty activities is peer review. This concept is at the heart of the promotion and tenure process, and is a key element in the judgment of quality in annual reviews. Positive peer review takes many forms, but essentially it is testimony from people who are in a position to make knowledgeable and respected judgments about the quality of instruction, research/creative activity or service. This "testimony" can be in the somewhat literal form of awards and letters of commendation, and can be implied by

prestigious invitations to perform, present and publish. This concept is central to expanding our individual and collective sphere of influence and visibility among various professional constituencies. *Therefore, documentation of positive peer review is considered to be the most important information in determining quality of faculty accomplishments.* In general, the more prestigious the institution or program or individual providing the positive peer review as described above, the more weight the accomplishment carries. For this reason, it is important to describe the relative level of each accomplishment in the CONS-PAR to insure this is understood by the Division Chair.

- Selected examples of peer review are shown below:

Teaching:

- Invitations to be a guest classroom lecturer at other institutions
- Course work and/or lessons provided to students at other institutions
- Evaluative statements from students other than standard evaluations
- Testimonials from workshop participants or hosts
- Use of texts and/or other course materials by students in other institutions
- Adoption of curricular methodologies by other institutions
- Awards, honors, or media recognition for teaching
- Ensemble performances at schools and other venues
- Internal peer review processes at the Conservatory and University

Research/Creative Activity:

- Invitations to be a guest lecturer, presenter, performer or adjudicator
- Invitations to be a master teacher at other schools or workshops (clinics, masterclasses, lessons)
- Critical reviews of professional performances, recordings, publications, etc.
- Conference presentations with peer-reviewed acceptance
- Articles in refereed journals
- Citations of published or publicly displayed work
- Prestige of performance or lecture venue; audience size
- Website usage or ‘hits’
- Other evidence of the use of intellectual property
- Patents, receipt of grants from foundations or government agencies
- Testimonial correspondence from participants or hosts
- Awards, honors, or media recognition for research/creative activity

Service

- Testimonials from committee or board leadership
- Testimonials from beneficiaries of service
- Use of written or web-based materials by other organizations
- Adoption of methodologies by other institutions
- Awards, honors, or media recognition for service

In summary, a performance, composition, publication, masterclass, or a community service project has some value in itself, but *the greater the impact/visibility of the accomplishment, the more weight it will generally carry in the evaluation process. The individual faculty member must provide evidence of the impact, and of the level of expertise of the peers reviewing the accomplishment.*

Procedural checklist for creating the CONS-PAR report:

1. Keep clear and complete records during the calendar year, sorting accomplishments into the areas of teaching, research/creative activity and service. Periodically during the year, enter research/creative activity accomplishments into the MyVita database.
2. Please do not include activities that happened before the calendar year of the report. If you refer to upcoming accomplishments – such as a forthcoming publication of materials produced during the report period – you should know that real credit for these accomplishments will be granted in the following evaluation cycle. It is appropriate to indicate works in progress or in review if you wish.
3. Create a method of highlighting the most significant accomplishments in each category (e.g. using **bold text**, or creating a separate list).
4. For most non-standard teaching accomplishments, as well as most service accomplishments, indicate an amount of time spent on the activity including hours as well as inclusive time frame (e.g. fall semester, 3 hours per week).
5. Be sure to include documentation on specific percentages of activity across the three areas that deviate from a standard 40-40-20 distribution. This should be a formal, written document signed by the Dean.
6. Include specific weighting information for your individual faculty activities, and relate your narrative or lists of accomplishments to these criteria.
7. While optional, the committee strongly suggests that you include a statement, perhaps for each area but especially for research/creative activity, that describes the nature of peer review for your sub-discipline, and/or for any specific activities where this may not be clear to a reviewer outside of your discipline.
8. Turn in the complete report on or before the announced deadline. Late documents will not be accepted or reviewed by the Committee, but will be forwarded directly to the Dean.

What constitutes teaching? How should this material be presented?

- Enter the specifics of teaching loads as requested in the MyVita system, and then adding additional material as needed to complete the teaching section. If the classes or lessons are not taught in the standard manner (different contact hours, extra time or less time, use of teaching assistants and so on), this should be indicated.
- Student course evaluations are automatically sent to the Division Chair and remain in the faculty files. One does not need to submit copies of these as part of the annual reports. *NOTE: Currently, there is no system-wide, UMKC-wide or Conservatory-wide mechanism in place for insuring student compliance with participating in the on-line evaluation process. Until such a mechanism is in place, faculty should make students aware of the importance of the evaluation process, and provide support, opportunity and encouragement to students as appropriate.*
- There are numerous additional teaching-related duties that should be added to the CONS-PAR information. In general, Division Chairs recommend that *any*

activities that involve assisting students be placed in the teaching section. Include approximate amount of time devoted to these efforts. Some selected examples:

- Dissertation and thesis committee service and supervision
- Comprehensive exam questions and grading (include numbers of students and hours)
- Current student and alumni accomplishments, including significant accomplishments by ensembles (limit these to the calendar year under review)
- Tutoring/mentoring sessions; other out-of-class teaching
- Guest teaching for UMKC classes and for classes at other institutions
- Recruiting activities, including auditions, portfolio review, etc.
- Recital grading and attendance (beyond that listed in the classes)
- Academic or career advising, or advising for student organizations
- Private teaching or teaching at other area programs
- New course development
- Development of textbooks, handouts, or web-based instructional materials
- Chamber music coordination
- Testimonial evidence of peer review beyond student evaluations (thank-you letters for classroom or applied teaching, workshops, etc.)
- Recommendation letters for current students and alumni

What constitutes research/creative activity? How should this material be presented?

- Each faculty member will have a unique set of accomplishments in this area. The best order of these listings could be the order of greatest to least number and/or significance of accomplishments, which will vary not only from faculty member to faculty member, but also from year to year for individual faculty members. Another format could be according to geographical scope (international, national, regional, state, local) with key accomplishments highlighted in some way. Where appropriate, include approximate amount of time devoted to these efforts.
- Selected examples of accomplishments in this area include:
 - Performances, and commissions or performances of choreographed or composed works
 - Commercial, non-profit, and other distributed recordings
 - Published media (journal articles & books, proceedings, compositions, etc.)
 - Guest lectures, guest artist invitations, guest conducting, masterclasses & presentations
 - Conference and other refereed performances/paper readings/presentations/poster sessions
 - Master teaching in nationally/internationally significant venues
 - Journal editorships and editorial board memberships
 - Honors/awards
 - Fellowships and residencies
 - Adjudication for competitions
 - Receipt of grants and/or foundation support for research/creative activity

What constitutes service? How should this material be presented?

- Each faculty member will have a unique set of accomplishments in this area. The best order of these listings could be the order of greatest to least number and/or significance of accomplishments, which will vary not only from faculty member to faculty member, but also from year to year for individual faculty members. Another format could be according to geographical scope (international, national, regional, state, local) with key accomplishments highlighted in some way. Finally, one could consider a format such as: Division, Conservatory, UMKC, UM system, Kansas City community, and Professional Organizations. Where appropriate, include approximate amount of time devoted to these efforts.
- Examples of accomplishments in this area include (some service may fall into more than one category):
 - Service to the University
 - Conservatory, campus, and system committee service (standing, special or ad hoc committees)
 - Task force service, or other efforts on specific projects
 - Administrative leadership for a division or coordination of an academic area
 - Coordination of an important aspect of academic life, such as a concert or series, auditions or adjudications, etc. (coordination of instructional activities should go in the teaching area)
 - Service to the Profession
 - Membership or leadership of professional organizations
 - Board membership for discipline-related organizations
 - Evaluation of tenure and promotion files for other schools
 - Consulting
 - Recommendation letters for peers
 - Service to the Community
 - Community board leadership or membership
 - Public service to an organization or cause
 - Organization of Conservatory/University activities that benefit the community or an organization
 - Liaison work with regional arts, educational or other community organizations

When some information seems difficult to place in one category, how should one decide?

- * Activities such as academic advising, career advising, advising of student organizations, recruiting and audition activities, attendance at student recitals (in other than a grading capacity), and many others are both teaching-related and service-related. In general, the Division Chairs recommend placing all activities that support students in the teaching area. However, some faculty members who provide extensive

- service to students and who may not have significant committee assignments may elect to place some of these activities under service.
- * Division Chairs suggest that recommendation letters created for students and alumni should go in the teaching area, while those for peers should go in the service-to-the-profession area.
 - * Faculty who are asked to serve as external reviewers for promotion and tenure applicants at other universities should place these activities in service (to the profession).
 - * Faculty with other activities that do not seem to fall clearly in one area and for which there are no guidelines should feel free to develop appropriate headings/categories and include them in the report as they see fit.
 - The committee recommends identifying the number of hours spent on these kinds of accomplishments as an indication of quantity. This could be total hours, or average hours per week, month or semester.

II. ANNUAL REPORT TIMELINES

October: Committee provides initial notice to faculty with deadline dates

November: Committee sends a reminder notice

December: Committee sends the FINAL REMINDER

February – first week: Deadline for submission of CONS-PAR.

February – March: Division Chairs review all submitted CONS-PARs

April 1st: Division Chairs send their reports to the Dean, including a list of commendable faculty candidates to be considered for Kauffman Awards in Teaching, Research/Creative Activity, and Service.

April 15th: Kauffman Award winners are chosen by the Dean's appointed ad hoc Committee in accordance with established guidelines.

Commencement: Kauffman Award winners are publicly announced

First Monday in May: Dean sends letters to each faculty member indicating her/his evaluation for the year reviewed (does not include the Dean's merit raise decision).

Mid-late summer: Dean sends letters to each faculty member indicating her/his merit raise decision and salary recommendation for the coming academic year.

III. INFORMATION TRANSFER AND FACULTY SUPPORT

What information is provided to faculty members and to the P & T Committee by the Dean?

- The Dean will provide a letter to each faculty member, by the first Monday in May, that outlines successes and areas that need improvement, based on the evaluation of the CONS-PAR by Division Chair and by the Dean's own assessment of these materials and reviews. Upon request, this information will also be provided via email, in order to accommodate faculty who are traveling. A copy of the Dean's letter will be sent to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to be placed in an archive file for each faculty member. *Upon receipt of this review letter, the faculty member may submit a formal written response to the Dean if the faculty member feels that s/he has been unfairly or inaccurately evaluated.*
- In the summer, the Dean will provide a second letter with the recommended salary for the following academic year. If there is any portion of the increase that is based on market issues, the Dean will provide information on this element of the increase.
- The Dean will consult annually with individual faculty members and their respective Division Chairs to produce a formal document outlining load expectations for each full-time faculty member.
- This proposed load expectation document would include the following:
 - Name, Date of hire, initial rank and current rank
 - Tenured, Tenure Track, Non-Tenure Track, non-regular or other
 - Date Tenure Portfolio must be or was submitted (if applicable)
 - Teaching Load (current, plus each of the previous two semesters)
 - Research/Creative Activities Expectations
 - Service Expectations
 - Special arrangements with the Chair or Dean that alter the standard balance (40,40,20) for teaching, research and service
- This information can be used to understand overloads and underloads, to fairly compare portfolios with agreed-upon expectations, and (for tenured faculty) to track yearly reports and evaluations as part of a post-tenure review.

What support mechanisms are available to faculty members who wish to improve their annual evaluations in one or more areas?

- Faculty should feel free to share their evaluative information with mentors and with trusted peers.
- For several years the selection of Kauffman Award winners has been based in part on the evaluations by the Division Chairs. If they are willing, past award winners in each category serve as excellent role models for faculty wishing to enhance their success in a specific area.
- Though neither the Dean nor the Division Chairs can provide specific comparative rankings, s/he might provide a general list of faculty who excel in specific areas (with permission of the faculty involved). If these faculty members are willing, they could provide good information, both on the kinds of accomplishments they document, and on the methods they use to organize and describe these accomplishments, to helping the faculty in a workshop setting.
- Suggestions for additional support mechanisms are welcome and encouraged. Proposals may be sent to the Division Chairs at any time.

