Hugh Hodgson School of Music Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
(Approved by the faculty May 2015)
Approved by faculty 19 January 2024
Approved by the Director of HHSM 19 January 2024
Approved by the Dean of FCAS 22 January 2024
Approved by the Provost May 7, 2024

The Hugh Hodgson School of Music (HHSOM) continually strives to raise its standards of excellence in all its activities. The requirements for promotion and tenure are conceived as evolving over time, reflecting ever-greater levels of achievement by its faculty.

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, the Hugh Hodgson School of Music will carefully adhere to the University of Georgia *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Rank Faculty (effective August 1, 2023)*. The standards, criteria, and processes presented in this document are intended to supplement and/or extend the University's *Guidelines*. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this PTU document and the University *Guidelines*. If any inconsistency or discrepancy is found in this document, or if this PTU document does not address a certain issue, the University's *Guidelines* will supersede this document.

Advisement at the Time of Appointment

At the time of appointment, a new faculty member will be given a copy of this document and the UGA *Guidelines* and will be advised in writing about the HHSOM's requirements for promotion and tenure. The faculty member will sign a letter acknowledging receipt and understanding of these documents. For each assistant professor, the director of the school will appoint, in consultation with the assistant professor, a senior faculty mentor who will advise the individual on matters of teaching, research and creative activities, service, professional decorum, the HHSOM, and promotion and tenure. In the annual evaluation, the director will provide written advice to faculty members below the rank of professor on their progress towards promotion, with specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must do to improve in teaching, research and creative activity, and service for promotion to the next rank and/or tenure.

Third-Year Review Guidelines

The *Guidelines* require a review of assistant professors in their third year with respect to achievements and performance in teaching, research and creative activity, and service. The Final Report of the third-year review is included as a required part of the promotion and tenure dossier.

The purposes of the third-year review are to evaluate the faculty member in regard to progress toward promotion and tenure, and to provide appropriate recommendations and assistance. As such, it is the culmination of a process of faculty development that begins in the first year of appointment through the annual performance evaluations carried out by the director of the HHSOM.

Procedure

1. The director of the HHSOM in consultation with the faculty member to be reviewed appoints a Review Committee of three tenured faculty members by September 15 to review and evaluate the candidate's teaching, research and creative activity, and service. The Committee will consist of the candidate's area chair (if tenured, otherwise a tenured substitute is chosen by joint consent), one member appointed by the director, and one member requested by the candidate. At least one member of the committee shall hold the rank of full professor.

2. The Committee is charged by the director of the school, who provides information on the candidate's appointment, budgeted time, and specific assignments.

3. By October 15 the candidate submits a document equivalent to Section 4 of the Promotion and Tenure Dossier, as outlined in Appendix C of the *Guidelines*, which includes the following:
   a. A current vita. Candidates are encouraged to use the suggested format found in UGA *Guidelines* (found on the Provost's web site at https://provost.uga.edu/faculty-affairs/Guidelines_for_Appointment_Promotion_Tenure_of_Academic_Rank_Faculty_8-1-2023.pdf);
   b. A summary of results from the Student End-of-Course Experience Survey (this information should be created as part of the teaching portion of the CV; normally a numerical summary is supplied by the Music Office, and student comments are selected by the candidate)—this portion will normally be added to the CV in the January following the October deadline, to allow the fall semester data to be included;
   c. A two-page statement by the candidate that summarizes the most important achievements in teaching, research and creative activity, and service.

4. The candidate will also prepare and make available to the committee exhibits that document accomplishments in teaching and research/creativity activity. Such documentation should include a teaching portfolio comprising all course syllabi; innovative course materials; and special recognition or awards for teaching. Samples of student work, with names and other identifying information redacted, may be included if desired. Also available should be materials directly related to achievement in research and/or creative work, such as books; articles; CD recordings; reviews of publications, recordings, and performances; grants; and other materials that demonstrate achievement and peer review.

5. By October 15 the Committee schedules a meeting with the candidate to account for all materials needed for the review and to establish a schedule of class visits and a timetable for completion of the review. The committee should schedule one teaching observation as a group, with a second observation scheduled by committee members on an individual basis. Teaching observations of applied faculty should include a minimum of one applied lesson and one seminar or ensemble rehearsal.

6. Upon completion of its review, the Committee writes a preliminary report of its findings. For the third-year review dossier, this preliminary report comprises Section 5 ("Achievements"), as described in the *Guidelines* (see VI.C and Appendix C). This report (Section 5), the candidate's Section 4, and exhibits are then made available for review by the tenured faculty no later than April 1. The Committee report is also made available to the candidate, who may provide a written response. That written response will also be made

available at the faculty meeting at which the votes on the report and renewal of the candidate are taken.

7. A quorum of the tenured faculty meets to review the case prior to April 15 and at least one week after the dissemination of the materials described above. Members of the Review Committee discuss their review and recommendations with those present. The third-year review is separate and distinct from the renewal vote. The third-year review report provides feedback and advice to the faculty on progress towards promotion and tenure, while the renewal vote is a different matter. The voting faculty will conduct separate votes on the third-year review report and on renewal. The tenured faculty votes "yes" or "no" on these two questions:
    a. "[Candidate's name] has made sufficient progress towards promotion and/or tenure to Associate Professor."
    b. "[Candidate's name] should be renewed for the fourth year."

   Following the meeting, the Committee will create its final report, representing its own findings along with the views represented in the general faculty discussion and vote, and presents this report to the director within 7 days of the faculty meeting.

8. The candidate meets with the director to discuss the committee's final report and faculty vote. If the candidate has prepared a written reply to the report, that reply becomes an official part of the report itself (see UGA *Guidelines* for details related to the candidate's response and allowed timeline). The Guidelines also requires the PTU head acknowledge any reply within 5 days of receipt and this, too, will be part of the final report (see UGA *Guidelines* for complete details.). A cover letter to these materials is written by the director.

<u>Committee Report</u>

The Committee shall prepare preliminary and final reports, including any responses from the candidate and PTU (as noted above) as well as these elements: :

1. Teaching
    a. Names of classes, studio lessons, seminars, rehearsals, etc. observed and dates of observation;
    b. Evaluative comments on teaching observations that include information on the organization of the class; communication with students; quality of instruction (accuracy and depth of information), pacing of class; student involvement; overall strengths and weaknesses of instruction;
    c. Evaluative comments based on a review of the candidate's course syllabi, including whether or not the syllabi meet the minimum requirements of the HHSOM and the university;
    d. Evaluative comments regarding the candidate's instructional activity and accomplishments as described in the vita and documented in accordance with the *Guidelines* (innovative course materials, special recognitions, commendations, awards, etc.);
    e. A recommendation indicating whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress in meeting the standards required for promotion and tenure in the area of teaching, in the opinion of the Committee and the tenured faculty. If the candidate is not making satisfactory progress, specific corrective measures that could be taken are provided.

2. Research and Creative Activity
    a. Evaluative comments on the research and creative activity of the faculty member as described in the vita and documented in evidence provided in the exhibits. These comments should carefully consider the standards of achievement contained both in the *Guidelines* and in these HHSOM "Guidelines" below;
    b. A recommendation indicating whether or not the candidate is making satisfactory progress in meeting the standards required for promotion and tenure in the area of research and creative activity. If the candidate is not making satisfactory progress, include specific recommendations for improvement.

Preliminary Consideration for Promotion and Tenure

The HHSOM will follow all procedures for Preliminary Consideration presented in the *Guidelines.* In the spring of the appropriate year, by January 15, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion and/or tenure will communicate this wish in writing to the director. The candidate will then by February 15 present to the director a dossier consisting of the following:

a. A current vita (suggested but not required formatting as found in the UGA *Guidelines*);
b. A summary of results from the Student End-of-Course Experience Survey (this information should be summarized as part of the teaching portion of the CV; normally a numerical summary is supplied by the Music Office, and student comments are selected by the candidate);
c. A two-page statement by the candidate that summarizes the most important achievements in teaching, research and creative activity, and service;
d. A copy of the candidate's third-year review final report.

The evaluation of Preliminary Consideration for promotion and tenure is made by a committee consisting of all voting-eligible faculty members in the HHSOM. At least one week prior to a meeting of this committee, the candidate's dossier as described above will be made available for review. These faculty members shall then meet prior to April 15 and decide whether or not to proceed with the promotion and/or tenure process for those faculty members requesting preliminary consideration. At the discretion of the individual undergoing review, a spokesperson of his or her choice may speak in the meeting in their behalf, explaining important matters contained in the dossier and adding evaluative comments. This individual, however, does not represent the candidate *per se*; the eligible voting faculty considers each candidate's preparation and merit on the basis of the dossier as prepared. During the meeting, the eligible faculty will vote on the following two separate questions, as appropriate: "[Candidate's name] should be formally reviewed for promotion to the rank of [next rank]." "[Candidate's name] should be formally reviewed for tenure." The results will be conveyed by the director in writing to each candidate within three working days of the vote.

All procedures for the meeting of the faculty as described above must follow the *Guidelines*, including the definition of a quorum, absentee ballots, abstentions, recusal, etc. The binding authority of this vote of Preliminary Consideration is subject to the current exceptions as outlined in the *Guidelines*. If the resulting vote is positive, or if the *Guidelines* provide for the formal review to proceed regardless of the Preliminary Consideration vote, the director will proceed with the formal review process and seek external letters of support.

General Guidelines for the Formal Review for Promotion and Tenure

In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the HHSOM will follow the *Guidelines.* External letters of support will be gathered, following *Guidelines* criteria. Any materials to be sent to external reviewers for their evaluation must be made available to the director/PTU head by the candidate prior to May 15. The candidate will provide by August 1 the final version of Section 4 of the dossier (the updated CV and 2-page statement), and will have worked with the director/PTU head in the writing of Section 5 ("Achievements"), following the vote of Preliminary Consideration. The appropriate voting faculty members will consider a dossier for the candidate consisting of Section 3 (Unit Criteria), 4 (Vita), 5 (Achievements), 6 (Third-Year Review Report), and 7 (External Evaluations).

The candidate will also prepare and make available to the unit faculty exhibits that document accomplishments in teaching and research/creativity activity. Such documentation should include a teaching portfolio comprising all course syllabi; innovative course materials; and special recognition or awards for teaching. Samples of student work, with names and other identifying information redacted, may be included if desired. Also available should be materials directly related to achievement in research and/or creative work, such as books; articles; CD recordings; reviews of publications, recordings, and performances; grants; and other materials that demonstrate achievement and peer review.

The voting faculty will meet prior to September 1 to discuss the credentials and vote on its recommendation. At the discretion of each of the faculty members undergoing review, a spokesperson chosen from the eligible voting faculty may speak in the meeting on their behalf, explaining important matters contained in the dossier and adding evaluative comments. This individual, however, does not represent the candidate *per se*; the eligible voting faculty considers each candidate's preparation and merit on the basis of the dossier as prepared. Voting procedures are detailed in the *Guidelines.*

Criteria for Tenure and Promotion

For the purposes of review, faculty members in the HHSOM are assigned to one or more of the following six areas:

1. Music Theory
2. Music Education
3. Music Therapy
4. Musicology/Ethnomusicology
5. Music Performance
6. Music Composition
7. Conducting

The HHSOM utilizes the three university-wide promotion and tenure review criteria of teaching, research and creative activities, and service, while allowing for the unique natures of these disciplines, as addressed below. Candidates for promotion and or tenure must demonstrate excellence in their area(s) of assignment. In order for a faculty member to be recommended for tenure and/or promotion by the HHSOM, the appropriate eligible voting faculty must be satisfied that the faculty member has achieved or exceeded standards related to teaching, research and creative activities, and service, and has demonstrated in his or her own work the mission of the HHSOM.

In addition to the contents of Section IV of the *Guidelines,* requirements for ranks in music include the following as appropriate to the specific disciplines. At every level, evidence of excellence in teaching is required; however, teaching ability unsupported by professional growth as demonstrated by significant research and creative activities will not be adequate to justify promotion. Also service alone will not justify promotion to a higher rank.

Teaching

Student learning and improvements in the learning environment and curriculum are the core expectations of teaching effectiveness in the Hugh Hodgson School of Music and the core standards of UGA's *Guidelines* (III.A).

On the basis of student end of course experience surveys, peer reviews, awards, participation in school and/or college or university activities related to teaching, or other appropriate means, the candidate must show clear evidence of excellence in teaching. Candidates whose record reflects difficulties in teaching must demonstrate that problems have been addressed and improvement has occurred. Equal consideration is given to effective teaching for advancement both to associate professor and professor.

Teaching in music includes activities both within and beyond the traditional classroom setting, several of these outside the limits suggested in the *Guidelines* Section III. Examples of expected contributions to music teaching, as appropriate to specific sub-disciplines, may include (but are not limited to):

i. Specific classroom courses taught, with their enrollments.
ii. Graduate committees, including titles and dates of theses, documents, dissertations, and graduate degree recitals directed.
iii. Private studio or group instruction on instruments, voice, conducting, composition, improvisation, and other music skills and creative work.
iv. Leadership of music ensembles of all sizes and types, from marching band to string quartets to opera performances.
v. Workshops, master classes, adjudications, lectures, and the like, including evaluations of the candidate's presentations and materials as appropriate.
vi. Supervision of student teaching in music education.
vii. Mentoring and advising of students.
viii. Supervision of clinical experiences in music therapy through direct supervision of undergraduate and equivalency student or indirect supervision of graduate students and community Board-Certified Music Therapists (MT-BCs) servicing as direct supervisors.
ix. For performers, music education, music therapy, and conductors, effective undergraduate and graduate recruiting activities.
x. Developing and implementing new courses and curriculum or revising existing courses and curriculum.
xi. Teaching which reflects the instructor's research engagement, creative activities, and/or clinical expertise

General evidence for effective teaching is outlined in the UGA *Guidelines*, Section III.A. Additional forms of documentation for effective teaching within the sub-disciplines in music that are not cited in the *Guidelines* may include:

i. Peer evaluations of teaching based on class or lesson observations, student recital hearings and juries, student progress towards competence on standard assessments and/or clinical evaluations, or other performances or activities of students.
ii. Self-evaluation and reflection of teaching.
iii. The ability to attract, recruit, and retain qualified major students in the appropriate area.
iv. A high level of educational value and artistic quality in public performances of the various school ensembles.
v. A high level of educational value, artistic quality, and success of students who perform solo or chamber recitals, or who have significant solo roles in ensembles.
vi. For performers, evidence of creative and effective programming used as a pedagogical tool.
vii. The planning and administration of student ensemble tours and outreach activities, as well as special on-campus initiatives for school-aged musicians and their teachers.
viii. Student success in achieving professional placement (e.g., as a teacher, performer, composer in residence, music therapy internship, etc.).
ix. Awards, prizes, or other recognition for students' works.
x. The creation, maintenance, and distribution of pedagogical materials and workspaces, especially those with broad use and distribution. Where technology use is intensive, the updating and maintenance of equipment and software at cutting-edge levels is noteworthy.
xi. Noteworthy instructional activity outside UGA, including participation in festivals, camps, special academic or performance programs, workshops, or other settings throughout the year.

Research and Creative Activities

The UGA definition of research, scholarship, and other creative activities is stated clearly in the *Guidelines* (III.B). In addition to stressing published scholarship, this definition states:

> Creative activities include innovative work in the fine and performing arts; for example, the production of original paintings, sculptures, ceramics, musical compositions, novels, plays, poetry and films; the development of plans for projects in architecture and landscape design; and fresh interpretations in the performing arts of music, drama and dance. (III.B)

Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate the achievement of appropriate stature through such activities as performances or compositions, publication of scholarly works or instructional materials, meeting the discipline-specific requirements detailed in the HHSOM standards below. Note that each of the sub-disciplines in music carries unique, though sometimes interrelated requirements for promotion and tenure—these fields cannot be divided into such smaller categories as "academic" and "creative," but are highly differentiated in many ways.

UGA's general criteria for research and creative work to achieve academic rank are (*Guidelines*, IV):

> [For associate professor and for tenure,] candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of emerging stature as regional or national authorities.

> [For professor,] candidates must show clear and convincing evidence of high levels of attainment in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments and the missions of their units. Candidates should demonstrate national or international recognition in their fields and the likelihood of maintaining that stature.

As noted above, faculty members in the HHSOM are assigned to one or more sub-disciplines: Music Composition, Music Theory, Music Education and Music Therapy, Musicology/Ethnomusicology, Music Performance, and Conducting. The HHSOM recognizes the unique nature of these sub-disciplines. Candidates for promotion and/or tenure must demonstrate excellence in research and creative activity within their area(s) of assignment. We also recognize that the dissemination of creative work in the 21st century is rapidly evolving; equivalency of accomplishment in new or non-traditional ways will be established by the quantity and quality of peer review intrinsic to that dissemination.

The first four sub-disciplines in music are in general allied to traditional scholarship, though with important differences among them. Research evidence in these fields must demonstrate a *consistent* and *sustained* publication record in recognized venues as described for each field below. The expected quantity of published scholarship varies by discipline and research emphasis, as described. All areas require several substantive publications to have appeared in nationally recognized, peer-reviewed journals or online publications while at the rank of assistant professor, though other avenues of dissemination (such as film, an editorial role, or the like) can also be substantive or equivalent, depending on scope, audience, and peer review. See the descriptions below, addressing each discipline, for the relative value and required quantity of scholarly contributions.

Music Theory

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research and scholarship will include items from the list found in the UGA *Guidelines* (III.B). All categories can be significant in the promotion process; relative value is established on a case-by-case basis, reflecting a peer-reviewed record of strong accomplishment. Two or three articles in top-tier journals, as well as three or four additional articles in these and/or in second-tier publications (see description below) are required for promotion to associate professor, as well as beyond that rank to professor. A book is not expected for theory, though the equivalent level of peer-review should be evident in the quality and quantity of published scholarship. The candidate must also be actively presenting his or her research at significant conferences as defined below, at least annually. Exceptions to these requirements must be based on clear equivalence in material peer-review recognition.

Some additions and clarifications to the list of evidence in the *Guidelines* are:

a. Articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals and books, including pedagogical textbooks. Peer-reviewed articles are the norm in this field and should be weighted according to journal status:
    i. Top-tier general music theory journals are those with international audiences, including (but not limited to) the *Journal of Music Theory, Music Theory Spectrum, Music Theory Online.*
    ii. Top-tier subject-specific journals with national and international prominence include (but are not limited to) *Perspectives of New Music, Music Analysis, 19th-Century Music, Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy.*
    iii. Second-tier journals with more regional organization include (but are not limited to) *Intégral, Indiana Theory Review, In Theory Only, Theory & Practice, Mosaic.*

iv. Book-length monographs are extremely unusual in this field, but nonetheless represent significant achievement in line with the prestige of the academic press. The success of textbooks—which represent research excellence in the field of music theory pedagogy—is best judged by their rate of adoption.
v. Contributed chapters in edited and collected volumes published by recognized academic presses are roughly equivalent to articles placed in second-tier journals (see point iii above).
vi. Reviews, short essays, and other peer-reviewed writings smaller in scope than articles are valued, but carry only fractional weight compared with peer-reviewed articles.

b. Conference presentations at (inter)national conferences (such as the *Society for Music Theory*) are weighted more heavily than presentations at regional or local conferences.
c. Development of new technologies, software, and/or on-line materials that contribute to research and/or pedagogy.

Music Education

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research and scholarship in music education includes the items in the list found in the UGA *Guidelines* (III.B). All these categories can be significant in the promotion process; relative value is established on a case-by-case basis, reflecting a peer-reviewed record of strong accomplishment. The candidate's publications, presentations, papers and other research activities must show evidence of a clearly defined research program and direction, revealing appropriate areas of focus and scholarship in peer-reviewed nationally and internationally recognized forums.

Peer-reviewed articles, rather than books, are the norm in these fields and are an essential part of peer-reviewed accomplishment. Published articles should be weighted according to journal status. Top-tier, peer-reviewed journals in music education and therapy vary widely in field, focus, and audience and cannot all be named here; they can be identified by experts in each field. Publications in other journals will be found appropriate to the individual's area(s) of interest. Two or three articles in top-tier journals, as well as three or four additional articles in these and/or in second-tier publications are required for promotion to associate professor, as well as beyond that rank to professor. Also valued are parts of books, reviews, book reviews, bulletins, and the like. A monograph released by a major publisher of books in the individual's research area is unusual but highly valued, often the equivalent of several articles. Other forms of publication, including multimedia, web-based resources, and other research tools can also be significant, depending on the field. Exceptions to these requirements must be based on clear equivalence in material peer-review recognition.

The candidate must be actively presenting his or her research at significant professional meetings, at least annually, particularly at the national and international level, but also at regional, state, and local events. It is essential that the music education candidate be involved as a regular presenter, workshop leader, or in other ways with the local and state music education organizations, conferences, meetings, and similar events.

Music Therapy

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of research and scholarship in music therapy (MT) includes the items in the list found in the UGA *Guidelines* (III.B.). All these categories can be significant in the promotion process; relative value is established in a case-by-case basis, reflecting a per-reviewed record of strong accomplishment, with all categories being considered valid. Because scholarly work may be in

progress over a span of years before it is brought to completion, it is essential that faculty members show continuing, tangible progress in their projects. The candidate's publications, presentations, papers, and other research activities must show evidence of a clearly defined research program and direction, revealing appropriate areas of focus and scholarship in peer-reviewed nationally and internationally recognized forums. The suggested criteria for research expected for promotion and tenure are as follows. Exceptions to these requirements must be based on clear equivalence in material peer-review recognition.

a. Two or three major peer-reviewed articles published (or in-press) in top-tiered journals. These top-tiered journals include the *Journal of Music Therapy* and *Music Therapy Perspectives* as well as other population specific journals with national and international circulation (e.g., psychology, medical, developmental, music education, older adults, young children)
    i. Electronic journals, publications, and original electronic media shall be considered equivalent to printed ones as long as they meet the same peer review criteria, i.e., are refereed, are broadly circulated or available, and have a reputation for scholarly excellence.
    ii. Written acceptances for publication of any of the aforementioned items can be included but cannot ordinarily constitute the entire body of research submitted in support of a request for promotion.

b. There should be a supporting mix of 3 to 5 other activities depending on weight/impact of said activities. These may include (but are not limited to) activities such as:
    i. Additional articles published in top-tiered or second-tiered publications within music therapy, music education, or population specific journals.
    ii. Books or book chapters released by a published in print or e-book format.
    iii. Prefaces, reviews, or book reviews in peer-reviewed journals or released by a publisher.
    iv. Short articles or brief manuscripts in peer-reviewed journals
    v. Editorial board member, consultant, referee for journals or publications, and editing of journals or books
    vi. Other evidence of research and creative activities:
        1. Podcasts distributed on a mainstream platform on topics relevant to candidates defined research program and direction.
        2. Development of new communication partnerships that are essential to the execution of research projects in the candidate's area of expertise.
        3. Creative projects involving MT clients/participants in the candidate's area of music therapy practice.
        4. Interdisciplinary collaborations on projects related to the practice of music therapy
        5. Patents and new product development
        6. Outreach or other activities s in which there was significant use of candidate's expertise (e.g., speaker, service to government agencies, professional and industrial associations, local non-profits)

c. Actively presenting areas of expertise at the international, national, regional, and state level, including:
    i. Peer-review or invited papers/research presented verbally or as a poster.
    ii. Invited or peer-reviewed workshops, lectures, or panel discussions.
    iii. Appearance as a guest lecturer or featured speaker on other campuses.

d. Receipt of grants, and awards, while not required, shall be taken as indicators of recognition of currency and activity in research. These can include fellowships, state or federal grants, foundation grants, and university grants and shall be seen as very significant indicators of scholarly reputation.

e. Other forms of publication, including multimedia, web-based resources, and other research tools can also be significant, depending on the field. Exceptions to these requirements must be based on clear equivalence in material peer-review recognition.

Musicology/Ethnomusicology

Evidence of research and scholarship in the fields of musicology and ethnomusicology also closely parallel the categories outlined in the *Guidelines* (III.B). Documentation of achievement in these fields is best established by the following (in order of priority). Musicology and ethnomusicology encompass widely disparate fields; no single or narrow group of publishers represents this diversity. The prestige of each press is established most clearly by its level of peer review and the nationally recognized acceptance of scholarship standards for its discipline. It is expected that some scholarship contributions will appear in top-level publications by this definition.

A robust publication record and promise is required. The standard for promotion, both to associate professor and to professor, is a monograph and 2-3 other substantial peer-reviewed publications, from the list below, since the time the last rank was achieved. In some cases, other major scholarly and creative projects (such as scholarly editions or major multi-media or digital works or a number of substantial articles) may be accepted en lieu of the monograph, with justification as to the significance, scale, and impact of the work(s). In such cases, it should be clear as early as the 3rd year review that the non-monograph option is where the candidate's research trajectory lies. Note that journals, bulletins, proceedings, publishers, and related media may be discipline specific, as those found in musicology or ethnomusicology, or interdisciplinary. Publications of the highest merit include, in rough priority order of significance:

a. Fellowships, Grants, Residencies
    i. Books, particularly single author monographs accepted through peer review.
    ii. Scholarly editions of a musical work (value dependent upon scale and impact of the publication)
    iii. Translations of primary sources or scholarly works (value dependent upon scale and impact of the publication)
    iv. Major digital or multi-media works (film, recording, interactive media, etc.)
    v. Editor of a collected volume, peer-reviewed
    vi. Pedagogical books and materials (such as textbooks and related media) that are substantial in nature and original thought, often with broad acceptance.
    vii. Article in a premiere journal (such as *JAMS* or *Ethnomusicology*)
    viii. Article in a disciplinarily appropriate peer-reviewed journal
    ix. Book chapter in a fully peer-reviewed collection
    x. Other digital or multi-media contributions
    xi. Book chapter in volume-reviewed collection
    xii. Review essay
    xiii. Contributions to premiere reference collections (New Grove, Cambridge, Garland, etc. Higher value will be accorded to major entries, lesser values to sub-entries)
    xiv. Article in a non peer-reviewed published conference proceedings
    xv. Contributions to other reference collections
    xvi. Book review

The candidate must be actively presenting his or her research at significant conferences, at least 3-4 times since the last promotion review. Those conferences subject to peer-reviewed selection and those at the international and national levels are most significant. Other professional activities in scholarship, as described in the *Guidelines*, are likewise expected.

Music Performance

Faculty members in performance are required to participate in a variety of creative activities at a balance of different levels as part of their scholarship portfolio. The type, number, and venues for these activities is determined largely by the culture of the individual instrument and performance medium. In the process of promotion and tenure evaluation, the magnitude and prominence of specific events will be highlighted by both the candidate in the two-page statement and the director of the HHSOM in the Achievements section of the dossier. Note that some faculty members in performance areas may specialize in non-performance emphases, such as pedagogy. In such cases, scholarship and creative work may be defined across several faculty areas within the school, including traditional scholarship (see Music Theory or Musicology/ Ethnomusicology above for examples), music education (see the section on Music Education for guidance), and performance.

In music performance the candidate is expected to participate in a variety of activities, although he/she is not expected to have events in every category. For promotion to associate professor and/or tenure performers must engage in multiple performances each year, at least 3-4, though these may be in different genres and types, from solo recitals to chamber music to large ensembles. As the standard for promotion to associate professor includes evidence of emerging stature as a regional or national performing artist, and for professor, national or international recognition, this must be established either through touring or publication of some type (see below). Instrumentalists and vocalists must appear in multiple performances each year beyond the local level, some of which must arise through significant peer review (such as invitations to perform at national conferences, performing with nationally recognized ensembles, invited recitals, invited guest conducting, and the like). Typical for each promotion level is national recognition in one of many forms, such as the release of a CD on a known, peer-reviewed label typical for the field (or the equivalent release in other forms), performances with prominent professional ensembles, etc. Exceptions to these requirements must be based on clear equivalence in material peer-review recognition. We recognize that the dissemination of creative work in the 21st century is rapidly evolving; equivalency of accomplishment in new or non-traditional ways will be established by the quantity and quality of peer review intrinsic to that dissemination.

Public Performance. Performance events must occur at a variety of different levels: local, state, regional, national, and international.

a. Solo recitals, particularly in locations and/or in venues with national or regional reputations for excellence. Performances that are supported by some level of peer-review, as seen in the selection process or in a published review, are most significant.
b. Major solo works performed with orchestral, wind, or other ensembles in an established concert season or important venue.
c. Performances of solo repertoire in recital or chamber music at the local, state, and regional levels.
d. The premiere of a composer's original composition.
e. Orchestral, wind-band, or related concerts and tours as a member of the ensemble. The

nature and reputation of the ensemble, the peer-review required for hire, and position within the ensemble are all significant in establishing peer review.

f. Master classes, workshops, and clinics presented.
g. Presentations, papers, and other activities at professional gatherings and conferences.
h. Appointment to the faculties of festivals and other professional organizations where peer-review is evident.
i. The presentation of commissioned works that were written for the performer.

Publication.

a. Recordings (such as CDs, DVDs, digital downloads, and the like). Recordings on commercial labels or distributed as a result of a peer-reviewed process are weighted more heavily than self-published or self-produced recordings. The reputation of the label, reviews, distribution, and other evidence of peer review are also significant. These can include performances as soloist, as a chamber musician, or in large ensembles.
b. Public broadcasting or other similar dissemination of performances.
c. Traditional publications of books, parts of books, reviews, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals, research reports, accepted manuscripts, research notes and bulletins.
d. Publication or other dissemination of creative products such as compositions, editions of musical works, and the like.

Music Composition

Evidence to be considered in the evaluation of scholarship and creative activity in music composition may include items from the following list, but is not restricted to these categories only. While this list, as presented, suggests a particular priority order, it should be noted that all categories are significant in the promotion and tenure consideration process. Relative value is established on a case-by-case basis, reflecting active involvement in creating and distributing music of value; this cannot be established by counting the number of compositions or the like.

It remains, however, that the production of new musical works and their subsequent dissemination and performance is required. Critical is the evidence of emerging stature or recognition of original compositions through peer review found in any of the means mentioned below, such as performances, reviews, publications, commissions and so forth. We recognize that the dissemination of creative work in the 21st century is rapidly evolving; equivalency of accomplishment in new or non-traditional ways will be established by the quantity and quality of peer review intrinsic to that dissemination.

a. Performances of the faculty member's compositions (grouped by local, regional, national, and international venues). All public performances should be listed, to include multi-media installations. Invited and/or refereed performances will, however, receive higher consideration.
b. Selection of the faculty member's works for conferences and festivals. Works performed at national or international venues will normally receive higher consideration than regional or local performances.
c. Recordings of the faculty member's works. Recordings on commercial labels or distributed as a result of a peer-reviewed process are weighted more heavily than self-published or self-produced recordings. Broadcasts of recordings of compositions are generally evidence of positive peer review.

d. Completed commissions of original compositions. Commissions accepted, but not completed, should also be listed, with an appropriate indicator of the current status. The local, regional, national, or international status of commissioning individuals or organizations as well as the individuals' or organizations' reputation and the realized or potential impact on the field, should factor in the committee's evaluation.
e. Prizes, awards, or other recognition for works produced by the faculty member.
f. Grants, residencies, and fellowships. While all events should be listed, more consideration will be given to off-campus opportunities.
g. Publication of the faculty member's compositions by nationally recognized presses. The relative ease of self-publication renders commercial publication less common as a marker of peer review. Nonetheless, selection by publishers with large nationally and internationally distributed catalogues—such as Boosey and Hawkes, Schott, and Schirmer—and nationally prominent publishers specializing in new music—such as Peermusic Classical and the American Composers Alliance—represents exceptional achievement by the faculty member. Publishers with a more regional or other specialized focus—such as C. Alan Publications and Lauren Keiser Music Publishing—are also significant.
h. Development of new technologies and/or software that contributes to music performance or the music composition process.
i. Textbooks focusing on composition pedagogy. The success of textbooks—which represent research excellence in the field of music composition pedagogy—is best judged by their rate of adoption.
j. Service on program committees for festivals and conferences. Only service on program committees that includes responsibility for selecting participants, evaluating and selecting works to be performed, or determining specific program content should be listed in this category.

Conducting

The scholarship and creative work of the ensemble conductor is a diverse and specialized area containing many fields sharing some aspirations but also different in significant ways. Choral, orchestral, and wind conductors have significant differences among their fields, the latter existing almost exclusively in the academic world. At the core, conductors are performers and should be evaluated as such. The position of an academic conductor is distinctive in that it combines the normal musical duties with an important research and teaching focus. Academic conductors may carry out research on such topics as the work of other conductors and composers, musical score, technique, composition, and audience trends. An academic conductor also may couple this research with the preparation of articles presented at academic conferences or published in professional academic or music journals, though this is not required for success as a creative scholar.

The general standards for rank require an emerging stature as a conductor at the regional or national level for an associate professor and national or international recognition at the professor level. To fulfill this standard, the conductor must have both a clear reputation of superior performances with the assigned UGA ensembles and also must appear regularly (at least 2-3 times a year) in guest appearances elsewhere, as defined below. We recognize that the dissemination of creative work in the 21st century is rapidly evolving; equivalency of accomplishment in new or non-traditional ways will be established by the quantity and quality of peer review intrinsic to that dissemination.

In addition to those areas of scholarship outlined in the UGA *Guidelines* are the following:

Performances

a. Invited (juried) performances at state, regional, and national conferences of the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), the American Choral Directors Association (ACDA), the American Guild of Organists (AGO), the National Collegiate Choral Organization (NCCO), the American School Band Directors Association (ASBDA), the American String Teachers Association (ASTA), the College Band Directors National Association (CBDNA), and other similar organizations.
b. Invited and/or juried presentations (non-performance) at state, regional, and national conferences of organizations such as those cited in "a" above.
c. Invitations to conduct "honors" ensembles at national, regional, all-state, and local levels
d. Invitations to conduct established professional ensembles, or on an established, noteworthy concert series.
e. Noteworthy artistic activity/employment outside of UGA, participating as a conductor, performer, or producer of professional ensembles.
f. Leadership of and performances with non-UGA ensembles that might be classified as community or professional ensembles.
g. Awards from local, state, regional, national, and international festivals and competitions.
h. Appearances as guest instructor/master classes at other universities.
i. Individual and ensemble awards.
j. Invitations to serve as adjudicator/clinician/judge for local, state, regional, national, and international festivals and competitions.

Publications

a. Recordings (such as CDs, DVDs, digital downloads, and the like). The reputation of the label, reviews, distribution, and other evidence of peer review will determine significance.
b. Public broadcasting or other similar dissemination of performances.
c. Traditional publications of books, parts of books, reviews, book reviews, monographs, bulletins, articles and other scholarly works published in refereed journals, research reports, accepted manuscripts, research notes and bulletins.

A special case is the director of the marching band, who has little ability to alter or shape the performance season, generally set in conjunction with the needs of Athletics. Because there is a strong emphasis on public performances with the resident ensemble, scholarship and creative work for this position includes a large variety of responsibilities, including those listed below. They are not all required, but may be part of the job description, depending on the administrative arrangement in play.

a. Drill Design. Some directors may design the formations for the band shows.
b. Music Arranging. Some directors may custom arrange the music for their marching and pep bands.
c. Show Design. The director is often responsible for the overall creative aspect of field shows.
d. Music Composition. Some directors may write original music.
e. Performances. The actual performances are considered creative work.
f. Recordings. Production of CDs and DVDs may be considered.
g. Publicity Materials. Production of recruiting materials, web site design, and yearbooks may have the oversight of the director and may be considered in the review.

Service

Service contributions may refer to service to society, the university, and the profession. In general, documented service activity that advances the musical art, contributes to musical culture, and reflects well on the university and the individual is appropriate for all considerations of promotion and tenure. The general categories of service can be found in the *Guidelines* (III.C).

Successful candidates for promotion and/or for tenure are expected to attend school meetings, serve on student and school committees, and, if asked to serve, provide limited service on campus committees and governing bodies. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the school, the discipline, the university, and the community. Participation or leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

In addition to the types of service outlined in the *Guidelines,* service in music may also include such actions as:

i. Interaction with practicing music teachers in the state and region.
ii. Program notes, preconcert lectures and panels, and other service to the public.
iii. Contributions to auditions, competitions, other similar activities.
iv. Performances, presentations, publications, and reviews (including pre-publication reviews) that are related to professional or university service.

Amendment of these HHSOM Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Hugh Hodgson School of Music, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.