

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting # 83 on November 16, 1998:

MOTION PASSED
=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to approve the Unit Criteria for Music.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

 Upon Chancellor Approval

RATIONALE: The committee assessed the unit criteria submitted by the Music Department. With some minor changes, agreed upon by the department representative, David Stech, the unit criteria were found to be consistent with UAF guidelines.

UNIT CRITERIA

for Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure

Department of Music
University of Alaska Fairbanks

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.

These unit criteria are to supplement the University of Alaska Fairbanks Policies and Regulations for the Evaluation of Faculty for Promotion and Tenure (hereafter referred to as the "University Policies and Regulations") and to clarify their application to faculty of the UAF Department of Music. These unit criteria are subordinate to the University Policies and Regulations.

INTRODUCTION.

These criteria define for the University Promotion/Tenure Review Committee the kinds of music performance and conducting events that are most appropriately assigned to the categories of Teaching, Research and Service.

With respect to performance or conducting activities done under the category of research, the professional prestige of any performance or conducting event is determined by the visibility of the performance forum and the likelihood that a printed review could result. Also affecting visibility of the event is the level of sophistication of the audience, and the reputation of the forum in the eyes of the music professionals in the same performance discipline.

A review can be a significant part of a performer's professional record; however, the lack of a printed review for any one concert should not be construed as a negative assessment of the work of the artist. The artist has no control whether a reviewer is present or whether a review is ultimately printed.

Each live performance is itself a separate creative act where the professional risk is not reduced by the fact that the same program may have been done previously in another location.

Performers are evaluated and chosen for professional management sponsorship after a screening process that parallels the review process used for printed forums. Vitae and recordings of prior concerts are carefully evaluated by sponsors before contractual terms are agreed upon.

The value of university and public school service in music is fully recognized. In many aspects of music performance, service represents a major part of the professional time commitment, even for faculty with heavy teaching loads. Music faculty participation in such events brings favorable notice to the institution as a whole.

Finally, public performance or exhibition activity was described as the appropriate research product for the discipline. Chancellor Patrick O'Rourke wrote, in a memorandum to the Executive Council in 1985:

"Each faculty member must be involved in some effort to make a valid contribution to the body of knowledge in his/her own discipline. This contribution can be made in a variety of ways: research and publication in learned journals, monograph publications, papers at professional meetings, sculpting, painting, music composition, and other performance media which may be appropriate to the discipline. The medium is not near as important as the effort to make a contribution."

SUGGESTIONS FOR DEPARTMENTAL USE OF THE UNIT CRITERIA

It is recommended the faculty member including music performance or conducting activities as part of their promotion and tenure files classify their creative activities according to the categories defined below. The candidate should describe explicitly which events were refereed, juried, or otherwise screened, and precisely how this process was accomplished.

The Departmental Peer Review Committee and Department Chair should offer its collective opinion as to whether the events listed by the candidate appear in the appropriate categories.

The Unit Criteria document defines how the following professional activities apply to the discipline of music:

- I. TEACHING
- II. RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY
- III. UNIVERSITY/PUBLIC SERVICE

for the three levels of professional forum:

- a. local and surrounding community
- b. statewide; mostly outside the local community
- c. national or international; mostly outside the state.

MUSIC PERFORMANCE activities defined as part of TEACHING

DEFINITIONS: Performance done as an adjunct to formal course instruction, principally to provide role models for students in the classroom environment.

LOCAL: Local solo and ensemble events done as part of studio teaching, master classes, student recitals, or non-solo participation with credit-producing university music ensembles.

Method for Evaluation: This activity should be evaluated by use of the Learning Assessment System (LAS).

STATEWIDE: Similar activities done as part of formal course instruction delivered at other units of the University.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

NATIONAL: Similar activities done as part of formal teaching done at institutions beyond the state or done at institutions outside the U.S.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

Statewide and national teaching activities should not be confused with workshop-type performance activities described in Public and University Service.

MUSIC PERFORMANCE
activities defined as part of RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY
ACTIVITY

DEFINITION: Formal concerts given clearly independently of formal instruction or service activities. Shall include performance of music created through electronic music synthesis.

LOCAL: Faculty solo recitals, chamber music, and solo concerto events where the visibility of the event is limited to the local community.

Method for Evaluation: Based upon opinions expressed by music faculty, or by members of the Performing/Fine Arts/ JB Promotion & Tenure Review Committee.

STATEWIDE: Similar events where the visibility of the events extends beyond the community but appears limited to the confines of the state

Method for Evaluation: Faculty who do much performing should be expected to have received some printed press reviews for some of the concerts. Unsolicited written comments may also be used to substantiate the impact and success of the performance.

NATIONAL: Similar events given mostly at nationally or internationally recognized forums. A forum located in the state such as the Fairbanks Summer Arts Festival, the Anchorage Festival, or the Sitka Festival may be included in this category if the professional visibility of the individual is judged to go beyond the State. Also includes faculty participation at an internationally-known music ensemble or at a nationally-visible professional forum. Includes sound recordings commercially and distributed beyond the State.

Method for Evaluation: Faculty engaged in such activities Are expected to have accumulated reviews for some of the events, if they appeared as a soloist. For evaluation of nationally-released sound recordings, the existence of printed reviews would reflect significance of the product in the professional world.

In the absence of published reviews, the Department Chair or the Department Peer Review Committee could (at their discretion) solicit opinions from knowledgeable persons who attended out-of-town performances. Faculty members desiring to engage local peers should discuss specifics with the Department Head well in advance of the concert event.

The principal determinant for measuring the impact placement of an event is the scope of professional visibility achieved.

Special recognition will be given to those performances which

- 1) expose the performer to critical public evaluation by professional peers, or
- 2) major statewide events in which the performer was selected from a national or international pool of performers, or
- 3) where the performer placed well in a formal competition, or in a similar juried evaluation process.

MUSIC PERFORMING

activities defined as part of PUBLIC AND UNIVERSITY SERVICE

DEFINITION: defined as that done in a non-solo capacity to support departmental ensembles, or done as part of University public relations events. Performance done to benefit an extra-university host or sponsor, especially where the host or sponsor is principally involved with activities other than sponsorship of the performance arts.

LOCAL: Performances given at a municipal event, given to benefit of a host or sponsor such as service organization, church, public school or private business. Also includes performances with municipal non-profit performance groups (e.g. municipal band, light opera theatre, youth orchestra) or other activities done as part of public relations events held locally.

Method for Evaluation: Since such activities are done to benefit the sponsor or host directly, no printed review should be expected. Evaluation can be based upon the opinion of faculty peers who attended the event. There is no

formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

STATEWIDE: Similar performances given out of town. Also includes performances with departmental-sponsored music ensembles on tour in the state; performing at music clinics at state regional music festivals by invitation, or performing done at public schools, for purposes of recruitment. Local events may be included in this category if the event drew an audience which is statewide.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host. There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar events done outside of the state. A local or statewide event may be included in this category if the event drew an audience which was national or international in scope.

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself. The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host.

MUSIC CONDUCTING activities defined as part of TEACHING

DEFINITION: Conducting done by the instructor as part of required day-to-day preparation of credit-bearing music ensemble courses.

LOCAL: Conducting activities as defined above, including department-sponsored performance.

Method for Evaluation: Through use of the Learning Assessment System (LAS).

STATEWIDE: Similar activities done as part of formal credit-bearing course instruction delivered University wide.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar activities done as part of formal credit-bearing course instruction done at institutions beyond the state or done internationally.

Method for Evaluation: Opinion of professional peers on site, if such opinions are available. Also measured by whatever evaluation tool might be in place at that event.

MUSIC CONDUCTING

activities defined as part of RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY
ACTIVITY

DEFINITION: Formal concerts given independently of formal instruction and independent of service activities, except where noted below.

LOCAL: Conducting of non-credit producing department-sponsored music ensembles given locally. Conducting of faculty chamber recitals given locally would be considered part of this category.

Method for Evaluation: Based primarily upon opinions by music unit faculty who attended the performance. Printed reviews would not normally be expected. The provision to allow occasional credit-producing events into the category is NOT to be misunderstood to mean that any successful course-related performance may be automatically included in this category. The assertion by the candidate that the "exceptionally favorable" test was met would need to be supported by Departmental Peer Review and Chair evaluations.

STATEWIDE: Similar events where the visibility extends beyond the community (e.g., if televised to the general public, or if noted in out-of-town press).

Method for Evaluation: Faculty do much conducting would be expected to have received some printed reviews for some of the concerts. Letters of appreciation, or other unsolicited written comments recognizing the merit of the performances, could also be used to substantiate the impact and success of the performance.

NATIONAL: Similar events given mostly at nationally or internationally recognized forums. May include local performance if visibility is judged to extend to beyond the state. Also includes faculty conducting appearances with a national, or internationally, known music ensemble or at nationally, or internationally, visible concert forums. Sound recordings commercially marketed and distributed beyond the State would also be included in this category.

Method for Evaluation: The significance of such participation would derive from the visibility or prestige of the ensemble. For evaluation of nationally-released sound recordings, the existence of printed reviews, would reflect the significance of the product in the professional world.

In the absence of published reviews, the Department Chair or the Departmental Peer Review Committee could (at their discretion), solicit opinions from knowledgeable persons who attended out-of-town performances. Such evaluations, if available, can supplement the candidate's professional file. Faculty members desiring to implement this evaluation tool should suggest the possibility of the music executive well in advance of the concert advance. The lack of external peer evaluations should not reflect negatively on the record of the faculty candidate

The principal determinant for categorizing conducting events described above is the scope of the professional visibility achieved by the performance, and to a lesser degree, where the performance actually took place.

Special recognition should be given to those performances which

- 1) exposed the conductor to critical public evaluation by professional peers,
- 2) major statewide events in which the conductor was elected from a national or international pool of conductors, or
- 3) where the conductor placed well in a formal competition or in a similar juried evaluation process.

MUSIC CONDUCTING

activities defined as part of UNIVERSITY AND PUBLIC SERVICE

DEFINITION: to benefit an extra-university host or sponsor, especially where the host or sponsor is principally involved with activities other than sponsorship of the performing arts.

LOCAL: Performances given at a municipal event sponsored by a service organization, church, public school, or private business. Also includes conducting municipal band, light opera theater, youth orchestra, conducting of departmental ensembles for public school music ensembles (including those out-of-town groups which were hosted locally).

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

STATEWIDE FORUM: Similar performances given out-of-town. Also includes conducting of department-sponsored music ensemble on tour of the state. Also includes conducting of music clinics at state region festivals by invitation and other clinics done around the state.

Method for Evaluation: There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

NATIONAL or INTERNATIONAL: Similar events done where professional visibility of the conductor extends beyond the confines of the state or local region. May include being a clinician at a nationally-recognized event held locally, if sponsors of the event have a previously established record of selecting clinicians from a national pool.

Method for Evaluation: The importance of the event could be assessed according to the professional prestige of the sponsor or the host. There is no formalized tool to measure quality for such events. The invitation to participate should be judged as significant in and of itself.

PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE EXPECTATION DOCUMENT SUMMARY OF UNIT CRITERIA DESIGNATIONS AND PROFESSIONAL EXPECTATIONS

I. Teaching

A. Local and surrounding community

II. Research

B. Statewide; mostly outside the

local community

III. University and Public Service

C. National or International,
mostly outside of the state.

PROFESSIONAL VISIBILITY EXPECTED FOR PROMOTION TO DIFFERENT ACADEMIC RANKS

Lecturer (non-tenure)	IA
Instructor (non-tenure)	IA
Instructor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIIA
Assistant Professor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIIA
Associate Professor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB
Professor (tenure)	IA, IIA, IIB, IIC, IIIA, IIIB

Criteria for tenure are assumed to be the same as those used for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

Candidates for promotion are expected to have a record of recent professional activities beyond the professional record used to achieve promotion to previous rank.

The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting # 83 on November 16, 1998:

MOTION PASSED (unanimous)

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to recommend that the proposed Regents' Policy 09.03.00--Student Dispute Resolution as submitted by the Board of Regents to the Faculty Alliance be accepted.

EFFECTIVE: Immediately

RATIONALE: The Curricular Affairs Committee discussed the revised draft policies on Student Dispute Resolution, forwarded to the Faculty Senate for review and moves to forward them to the full Senate, with its recommendation that they be accepted.

Date: 12 October, 1998

To: Pat Ivey, Executive Officer, for distribution to Systemwide Governance Organizations

From: 'Nanne Myers, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, for the Policy Revision Work Group

Subj: Re-draft of Regents' Policy/University Regulation
09.03.01--Student Dispute Resolution

Last spring, as a result of the dissatisfaction expressed in this policy and regulation by the Faculty Alliance and the Coalition of Student Leaders, the drafting team met with representatives of the Faculty Alliance. It was agreed that the team would revise the policy and regulation to reflect the AAUP guidelines for review of assignment of final grades. The resulting drafts are herewith forwarded for your consideration, with apologies that they were not available at the beginning of the semester. Editing reflects changes from the first draft forwarded for review by governance.

The changes to the policy are summarized below.

09.03.02.A The word "generally" is inserted to indicate that an informal resolution is not a necessary first step in the initiation of a review.

09.03.02.B.2 This section has been substantively changed to make a policy statement that only faculty may authorize a change in grade.

09.03.02.B.3 This paragraph is rewritten but not substantively changed

The regulation has been revised to address reviews of final grade assignments as distinct from all other reviews of academic decisions, and reflect student concerns regarding eligibility for services while a review is in progress.

The review of final grade assignment results in a process by which a faculty committee may change a grade given by an instructor. It is important to note, as the AAUP guidelines point out, that institutions receiving federal funds are legally obligated to provide procedures by which students might successfully challenge grades that they believe may have been tainted by race or sex discrimination. A copy of the AAUP statement is attached.

On the advice of the Systemwide Academic Council, procedures for resolving other academic disputes are left to definition by MAU rules and procedures. The chancellor or designee is specified as the person to make the final decision, since in some cases, e.g., for decisions regarding graduate studies at UAS, the chief academic officer may make the decision which is subsequently challenged.

Section 09.03.02.E has been revised in response to a recommendation from the Coalition of Students Governments that eligibility for services not be affected while a dispute is in progress. Unfortunately, this is not always possible or desirable.

The drafting team requests the Faculty Alliance and the Coalition of Student Leaders to consider completing final recommendations on the policy in time for its presentation to the board in November. Because the regulation is approved not by the board, but by the president, more time could, and probably should, be taken for consideration of final recommendations regarding the regulation.

This request is made out of respect for Academic and Student Affairs Chair Sharon Gagnon, who was primarily instrumental in calling for and expediting the sorely needed revisions to policy regarding academic matters and student affairs. Regent Gagnon's term is coming to an end, and the November meeting is most likely to be her last. It would be fitting to accomplish as much revision as possible before she leaves.

(The following policy draft is the equivalent of the hard copy with the footer "For Governance Review, second reading; Disp Res Pol 10.13gov.doc)

DRAFT

POLICY 09.03.00

PART IX

STUDENT AFFAIRS

CHAPTER III

Student Dispute Resolution

General Statement: Student Dispute Resolution P09.03.01

The University of Alaska will provide fair, consistent, and expeditious procedures for students to contest actions or decisions which adversely affect them. These procedures will be published in student catalogs or handbooks. Students may direct a complaint to the MAU senior student services officer, the chief academic officer, the chief administrative services officer, or designee. This official will initiate action to resolve the complaint or will inform the student of the appropriate procedure, if any, for review of the action or decision in dispute.

Actions or decisions of the Board of Regents or the substance of Regents Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures are not subject to review pursuant to the provisions of this policy.

General Procedures For Dispute Resolution P09.03.02

A. Informal Resolution Procedures

Unless specified to the contrary, the first step for a student to challenge a university action or decision will [[GENERALLY]] be to seek an informal resolution with the person responsible for the decision or action, or with the person's immediate supervisor.

B. Formal Review Procedures

If the matter [is not] CAN NOT BE resolved informally, a student may submit a written statement to initiate one of the following formal review procedures. A request for formal dispute resolution may not be filed under more than one procedure, or more than once on an issue. Each procedure will include at least one level of review prior to the final decision, and will provide due process appropriate to the issue.

1. Review of student employment decisions or actions

Issues related to student employment will be reviewed in accordance with the grievance procedure specified in Regents' Policy on human resources, except as specifically modified by Regents' Policy on employment of students.

2. Review of academic decisions or actions

Challenges to academic decisions or actions of the faculty or academic administration will be reviewed in accordance with the procedures set forth in the accompanying regulation and in MAU rules and procedures. [Review of the assignment of grades will start with the faculty member assigning the grade, unless this person is unavailable within the review schedule provided in the regulation.] Appropriate issues for this procedure include such things as alleged arbitrary or capricious dismissal from or denial of admission to an academic program based upon academic considerations, or assignment of final grades. ONLY THE COURSE INSTRUCTOR OR A REVIEW BODY COMPOSED OF FACULTY MAY AUTHORIZE A CHANGE IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF A FINAL GRADE.

3. Review of university judicial decisions or disciplinary SANCTIONS [actions]

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING TWO PARAGRAPHS ARE NEW WORDING

Procedures by which students may challenge decisions resulting from university judicial procedures and/or the imposition of sanctions for violation of the Student Code of Conduct are set forth in University Regulation 09.02.04 - Student Rights and Responsibilities, sections G - K.

The Code, examples of violations of the Code (which include cheating, plagiarism, and disruption of the living or learning environment), university judicial procedures, and disciplinary sanctions are set forth in Regents' Policy and University Regulation 09.02.00 - Student Rights and Responsibilities, and MAU rules and procedures.

NOTE: THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH WAS PROPOSED FOR DELETION

[Challenges of university judicial decisions or disciplinary sanctions related to behavioral or academic misconduct will be reviewed in accordance with procedures set forth in University Regulation on student rights and responsibilities and in MAU rules and procedures. Appropriate issues for this procedure include such things as allegations of cheating, plagiarism, disruption of the living or learning environment, or other violations of the Student Code of Conduct.

4. Review of administrative decisions or actions

Chancellors will be responsible for providing and promulgating MAU rules and procedures which provide a mechanism for students to challenge certain administrative decisions or actions not otherwise covered in this policy. Not all administrative decisions and actions will be subject to challenge.

C. Final decision

At the end of the review proceedings the university will issue a written decision, identified as the "final decision," after which

point the matter under dispute will not be reviewed further by the university. Notification of the final decision will be made in accordance with Regents' Policy on student rights and responsibilities regarding seeking further redress in the court system to university decisions and actions. (See also Regents' Policy 09.02.08 - Student Rights and Responsibilities: Final University Decision.)

Confidentiality

P09.03.03

Access to files pertaining to student disputes will be governed by state and federal laws and regulations, Regents' Policy, University Regulation, and MAU rules and procedures and may vary with the issue under review and the review process.

The university cannot guarantee confidentiality but will make a reasonable effort to preserve the legitimate privacy interests of the persons involved. In order to preserve the legitimate privacy interests of the persons involved, all participants in the proceedings will be expected to maintain confidentiality.

The person in charge of the review procedure may release information if appropriate permission from the parties is provided or if other applicable legal requirements are met.

Access to Formal Review Proceedings

P09.03.04

Student dispute resolution proceedings will normally be closed. Requests for an open proceeding must be made by a party prior to the start of the proceeding. Such requests will be granted to the extent allowed by law unless the person in charge of the proceeding determines that all or part of a proceeding should be closed based upon considerations of fairness, justice, and other relevant factors. A party may choose an advisor to be present at all times during the proceedings.

The person in charge of the proceeding may direct that witnesses, but not the parties or their advisors, be excluded from the proceedings except during their testimony. The deliberations of the hearing panel or officer will be closed to the public and the parties.