

**BENCHMARKING THE ARTISTIC WORK
OF MUSIC FACULTIES**

**Developed from College Music Society Summit
“Shaping Institutional Expectations for National Benchmarking
of Faculty and Music Unit Accomplishments”
January 16-17, 2016
Dallas, Texas**

Steering Committee

**James C. Scott, University of North Texas, Chair & Summit Director
C. Tayloe Harding, Jr., University of South Carolina
David Myers, University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
Betty Anne Younker, University of Western Ontario
Robert Walzel, University of Kansas**

**BENCHMARKING THE ARTISTIC WORK
OF MUSIC FACULTIES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	FOREWORD	3
II.	PREAMBLE	4
III.	REPORT	4
IV.	APPENDICES	
	A. Significant National and International Awards	9
	B. Consideration of External Professional Performance as Related to Fulltime Faculty Research/Creative Activity	12
	C. Boston University School of Music Faculty Expectations	15

BENCHMARKING THE ARTISTIC WORK OF MUSIC FACULTIES

FOREWORD

It has become evident over the last decade that a significant part of the national scrutiny of higher education involves various attempts at measuring the scholarly work, research, and creative accomplishments of faculty members as tools for evaluating departments and programs, alongside other metrics that are more easily obtainable.

While sources such as Higher Education Arts Data Services (HEADS), National Research Council (NRC), and Academic Analytics provide reports that can be used for various aspects of program evaluation, none address the quality, importance, or even the scope of the artistic work of music faculties central to their positions. In fact, there is no national, inter-institutional gathering of evidence in any form. Perhaps the most developed such effort is in the United Kingdom (UK) under their Research Effectiveness Framework. (Information available at www.fer.ac.uk and in many related articles.) Their system is instructive for future planning in the United States (US), but its failings are apparent and openly documented.

The College Music Society (CMS) held a Summit in January, 2016, to discuss the problems surrounding the evaluation and national benchmarking of artistic work and to develop responsible and principled means for responding to institutional demands for measurable outcomes. The document presented here is intended as a compendium of measures and techniques based on what can be done with resources currently available. The larger goal of the CMS project is the consideration of developing a national database accessible to institutions based on the values we all share.

It must be emphasized that this effort represents only a part of faculty or program evaluation. No effort is made herein to address teaching, professional or institutional service, or the specifically scholarly output of faculty members (with the exception of including scholarly awards in the appendices). These other areas are currently addressed in the domain of institutions' own assessments or through currently available national benchmarking. Even so, it should be noted that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the data used in assessing scholarly accomplishments in the field of music and also well beyond. The "Trends Report: 2016" insert in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* of March 4, 2016 (p.18-19B) presents the larger issues very well. Further, sources such as *Scopus* do and will likely continue to fail to capture important publications in their database. The appendices of this document are obviously incomplete also, but may serve as a starting point from which evaluators at local levels can work to identify and justify other organizations, venues, etc. No such listing should ever be used as if it contained all awards, venues and organizations of importance.

PREAMBLE

The national benchmarking of artistic accomplishments can take the form of a nationally embraced statement of values regarding faculty work applied to a combination of both locally and nationally acquired evidence. Intrinsic quality of work is a value that cannot be converted to objective data in a meaningful way, and a number of aspects of excellence should remain the province of institutional evaluation. For those institutions seeking to demonstrate accomplishments of national importance for their faculties, there are some key indicators provided in this document. Also provided are examples of critically important artistic work of faculty members that can contribute to the well-being of the institution and its region. The importance of this latter kind of work relative to work demonstrating national recognition will vary among institutions and music programs. These variations represent the health of the entire higher education enterprise and are not to be viewed as hierarchical. It is essential that any evaluation of artistic work be based on its purpose, its quality, and its impact.

PURPOSES

It should be well understood that the purposes of most performance and compositional activities have to do with the creation and presentation of music as an intrinsically justified artistic experience shared with a wide variety of audience types.

Nevertheless, there are additional purposes that should be considered alongside the artistic nature of work in determining its value to the institution and/or the profession. Such purposes include but are not limited to the following:

- I. Enhancement of an event primarily religious or community centered
- II. Adding character and excitement to institutional events such as created by bands for athletics
- III. Recruiting for an institution or its music program
- IV. Providing education in and about music outside the curriculum and/or its campus

The Dallas Summit, January 16-17, 2016

Fifty-five leaders from 37 institutions across the U.S. and Canada gathered for two days to discuss issues and strategies related to the challenges of national benchmarking. A wide variety of institutions participated, confirming the need for differences of approach based on the nature of geographical settings, research aspirations of institutions, aspects of community engagement, and other institutional needs. The ongoing work of the Summit Steering Committee will be the development of advisories regarding short-term possibilities and the planning for the development of new databases. There appears to be a clear need both for using data collected at the local level vetted against commonly accepted indications of importance, and also for local use of data and other benchmarks provided through a central entity.

At the present time, only the former can be provided, but planning can begin for developing such a nationally based entity.

Research Parity

The parity of artistic work with research has been acknowledged in most institutions for many years. Occasionally, the acknowledgement has led to less than appropriate forced equivalencies of unlike activities. It is critically important in accepting parity to understand the nature and purposes of various kinds of artistic work. To this end, the following definitions, descriptions, and explanations are provided.

Artistic Work of Music Faculties and Its Impact

I. Performance

Roles: Soloist in recital, concert, or opera; conductor; chamber ensemble member; member of a conducted ensemble.

Performance Impact Classifications

- i) National Impact (including high-level impact in other nations as an alternative to impact in the United States).

Activities will take the form of roles listed above, and relationships to entities such as those listed in the appendices can be demonstrated for either performers or composers. Collection of accomplishments at this time must take place at the local level. If there were a national entity for evaluating such accomplishments, at least some form of centralized vetting for this kind of activity could exist.

- ii) Local or regional Impact based on content that is in some way original and important for definable constituencies.

Performances of new work, new productions in special institutional programming, or festivals and conferences of regional stature would be recognized in this category. Accompanying narrative explanation of significance would be required in most cases and would need to be collected at the local level.

- iii) Local or regional impact and significance based on demonstration of quality and/or overall performance ability.

For this category, narrative review by peers or recognized professionals would be necessary as evidence. A recital or chamber music performance on a locally, institutionally, or regionally recognized series would be an example of work fitting this category. Again, accompanying narrative explanation of significance would be required in most cases and would need to be collected at the local level.

- iv) Performance or composition that is significant for its engagement with a defined community.

In this category, institutions will need to embrace the importance of certain communities defined in ways that might be ethnic, religious, age-based, etc. Again, accompanying narrative explanation of significance would be required in most cases and would need to be collected at the local level.

- v) Performance that is significant for institutional purposes such as recruitment, or major public events not defined as concerts or specifically musical productions.

This very large and important category includes on or off campus performances with a specific purpose of recruitment of students, providing music for major public occasions (inaugurations, e.g.), athletic events (including the work of marching band directors as applied to their own institution, etc. (If the creative work of marching band directors goes beyond its own campus through publications, it would add categories 1 or 2 as appropriate.)

II. Recordings

- i) Self-produced without contract, relying on some form of self-managed distribution (YouTube, social media).
- ii) Contracted recordings for labels of varying stature.

III. Composition and Other Original Work of an Artistic Nature

- i) National, regional, or local impact determined as appropriate by the descriptions above.
- ii) Assessments relating to the auspices presented in the appendices.

PRESENTING THE CASE

As institutions grapple with the issues surrounding a “report card” for music units, they must first work with their music units in agreeing upon purposes for the unit and acknowledge alignment or non-alignment with scope and qualitative ambitions for other similar units of the institution. If an institution in other disciplines expects membership in the national academies, Pulitzer prizes, large amounts of federal research money, and publication in the most revered journals, the music unit must be able to define parity with such accomplishments and recognition on its own terms, or else accept not being on a par with other campus units. Category 1 above and association with organizations comparable to those in the appendices will likely be required. However, an institution whose priority lies in serving a defined geographic or faith-based community may define its expectations for faculty work outside the classroom in terms of values more consistent with its mission, and the other categories may demonstrate greater relevance. This kind of internal parity assessment should take place before undertaking comparisons of music units in different institutions.

Defining peer institutions with music units of comparable aspirations is a next step. Urban, suburban, and rural settings have perhaps as much bearing as size, undergraduate/graduate balance, and budgetary scope in making such decisions. Although making data-based comparisons among such carefully defined peer groups remains an effort for the future, useful information about other members of these comparatively small groups can often be obtained informally but reliably. Forthright discussions about “bragging rights” vs. demonstrable excellence in terms of a music unit’s nature, goals, and needs are essential. For example, is a music department that is primarily undergraduate in a thinly populated area that seeks to improve the cultural life of its area as it trains teachers really made better because one of its faculty members is given a role by a major opera company?

Once these discussions have led to understandings about the nature of work in the profession and about the kinds of work to be valued in a particular setting, the impact definitions above can be used with locally collected faculty record information to demonstrate levels of activity and recognitions.

In evaluating a music unit as a whole, consideration might be given in large units for providing data for only the top third or fourth of the faculty in order to attract adequate attention to the most important accomplishments. This would represent considerably better data than the random number of submissions in the UK system, which allows institution-based decisions on what to submit for evaluation.

Beyond considering this information that represents locally developed data through something of a nationally accepted lens, music units can also make use of certain external mechanisms of reporting:

- I. The Strategic National Arts Alumni Project (SNAAP) provides excellent information on the outcomes of programs and presents that information in percentile ratings relative to participating institutions. Alumni responses can give meaningful insights into what of value was provided by the faculty. Naturally, this is very indirect, since there is no demonstrable relationship between the artistic accomplishments of individual faculty members and either the attitudes or successes of alumni. Further, the connection between artistic

- accomplishments of faculty members and their impact on long-term student achievement is elusive at best.
- II. A compilation of meaningful statements from external reviewers of candidates for promotion and tenure can be very helpful, especially if the solicitation specifically asks for information on such things as the candidates' artistic impact or whether the promotion or tenure would be granted at the writer's own institution, which is normally in the "peer or better" category.
 - III. Accreditation visitor reports and specially commissioned program reviews also bring outside voices to the argument.
 - IV. National ratings of symphonies, opera companies, etc., can provide evidence when faculty members have performed with or been commissioned by such entities in those institutions that expect such work from their faculty. (The appendices are provided in part for this purpose.)
 - V. Although not organized in meaningful ways in the profession, discographical information about faculty members and, very importantly, colleagues with whom they have performed or recorded, can be a powerful demonstration. For instance, if a string quartet with 25 recordings on major labels invites an institution's clarinet professor to perform or record the Brahms *Clarinet Quintet* with them, the mere invitation becomes a measure of national artistic stature. Of course, if the clarinetist is the brother of the quartet's violist, this may not be the case!
 - VI. In the case of awards, nothing should be implied by the absence of awards, but when present, their categorization can provide meaningful evidence. A lifetime achievement award from a nationally recognized organization is probably a more important achievement than a Grammy nomination. MacArthur and Pulitzer awards, certain competition recognitions such as the Grawemeyer, and grants such as Fulbright or Council of Learned Societies have generally understood hierarchical values, and certainly contribute to profiles being developed.

In order to provide for some kind of basis for considering impact or stature at the national level, the appendices to this document provide a list of nationally important awards, top symphony orchestras, top opera companies, recognized auspices for new music, and recently recognized top-level music programs as reported through *Musical America* and the National Research Council. These lists are neither exhaustive nor infallible. However, they provide a basis of recognition in public sources that avoids numerical rankings in favor of cohorts of excellence. Cases can certainly be made with local arguments for equivalency to cited institutions and accomplishments.

It should also be emphasized that "second-hand" recognition is to be respected. As stated earlier, artistic work undertaken alongside artists who have achieved the levels defined by these lists receives a validation of its own, regardless of the stature of a particular event or venue. Performing with a MacArthur fellow or a concerto soloist with the New York Philharmonic or a jazz hall-of-fame member achieves value based on the invitation from such individuals.

Appendix A.

SIGNIFICANT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL AWARDS

A compilation of awards deemed significant or highly significant at the national or international level for faculty members in the field of music. Scholarly awards as well as artistic awards are included. The list cannot be exhaustive, but criteria for other awards can be compared to these at local levels.

GRANTING ORGANIZATION	AWARD NAME
American Academy in Rome	Rome Prize
American Academy in Rome	Residency at the American Academy in Rome
American Academy of Arts and Letters	Goddard Lieberston Fellowships
American Academy of Arts and Letters	Marc Blitzstein Award
American Academy of Arts and Letters	The Charles Ives Awards
American Academy of Arts and Letters	Walter Hinrichsen Award
American Academy of Arts and Sciences	American Academy of Arts and Sciences Membership
American Association for University Women	Achievement Award
American Council of Learned Societies	ACLS Fellowships
American Council of Learned Societies	ACLS Mellon Fellowships
American Musicology Society	Alfred Einstein Award for outstanding article in musicology
American Musicology Society	Otto Kinkeldey Award for outstanding work of musicological scholarship
American Musicology Society	Lewis Lockwood Award for outstanding work of musicological scholarship
American Musicology Society	Claude V. Palisca Award for outstanding Edition or Translation
American Musicology Society	H. Colin Slim Award for outstanding article in musicology
American Musicology Society	Robert M. Stevenson Award for outstanding scholarship in Iberian music

American Musicology Society	Philip Brett Award for outstanding work in gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender/transsexual studies "
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation	Distinguished Achievement Award
Council for International Exchange of Scholars	Fulbright Grant
Gramophone Magazine	Gramophone Classical Music Awards
Grawemeyer Foundation	Grawemeyer Award for Music Composition
John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation	Guggenheim Fellow
Jury of Editors of Major International Music Publications	International Classical Music Awards
MacArthur Foundation	MacArthur Fellows
National Endowment for the Humanities	National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowship
National Endowment for the Humanities	National Endowment for the Humanities Faculty Research Award
Newberry Library	American Society for Eighteenth Century Studies Fellowship
Newberry Library	Arthur Winberg Fellow
Opera Awards Foundation	International Opera Awards
Society for American Music	Irving Lowens Award for Best Book
Society for American Music	Irving Lowens Award for Best Article
Society for American Music	Earle Johnson Bequest for Book Publication Subvention
Society for Ethnomusicology	Jaap Kunst Prize for the most significant article in ethnomusicology written by a member of the Society
Society for Ethnomusicology	Alan Merriam Prize
Society for Ethnomusicology	Robert M. Stevenson Prize

Society for Ethnomusicology	Klaus P. Wachsmann Prize for Advanced and Critical Essays in Organology
Society for Music Theory	The Wallace Berry Award for a distinguished book
The Pulitzer Board	Pulitzer Prize
The Recording Academy	GRAMMY Awards
The Rhodes Trust	Rhodes Scholar
The Rockefeller Foundation	Bellagio Center Residence
The Rockefeller Foundation	Rockefeller Foundation Fellowship

In addition to these specific awards, there are at least three more general categories for which the above classification cannot work. Nevertheless, these awards are clearly highly significant.

- Distinguished Alumni awards from top-tier institutions
- Laureates from leading competitions including Cliburn, Tchaikovsky, Menuhin, Indianapolis Violin, Gilmore, Leeds, Richard Tucker, Queen Elizabeth, Long-Thibaud-Crespin, Geneva, Rubenstein, Clara Haskil, Cleveland International, Busoni, Bachauer, Chopin (Poland), Naumburg, and Young Concert Artists
- Lifetime Achievement, Honorary Membership, and other awards from nationally and internationally prominent professional music, music education, and music therapy societies/associations

Appendix B.

Consideration of External Professional Performance As Related to Fulltime Faculty Research/Creative Activity

Fulltime symphony orchestras require a time commitment from their regular members that is seldom consonant with fulltime faculty responsibilities/appointments. Performance as an extra/substitute musician with a fulltime professional orchestra should be considered as a validating accomplishment with regard to faculty creative activity. Likewise, performance with a part-time professional orchestra, particularly if the ensemble is a primary cultural entity for a major city or geographic region, should also be acknowledged. Of course, a solo performance with a professional orchestra should be considered as being more significant than performing as an extra/substitute musician. Concerto/solo performance with a top professional orchestra should be considered very substantial.

Similar to orchestral performance for instrumentalists, performance with professional opera and/or musical theatre companies is an important creative activity for singers. Generally speaking, major roles deserve more credit than do smaller ones. With regard to creative activity for fulltime faculty, performance as a member of an opera or symphony chorus is not typically considered significant.

Other types of performance not uncommon for fulltime faculty include professional engagements with ensembles and festivals such as: jazz, chamber music, new music, and other accompanying ensembles (musical theatre, ballet orchestra, modern dance collaborative musician, etc.). Although most performance in this category is typically contracted through professional engagement, purely artistic (non-compensated) endeavor is not uncommon.

Just as there are no agreed upon metrics for comparing or ranking music schools and conservatories, there is no purely objective method for determining qualitative rankings of professional music ensembles and companies. Notwithstanding the lack of any formal structure, symphony orchestras and opera companies may be generally classified into tiered groupings according to fulltime status or total annual budget.

Symphony Orchestras

Most top-level orchestras in the USA and Canada have collective bargaining agreements with the music union covering salary, health benefits, retirement, and working conditions. An exception is the Seattle Symphony, whose players voted in 1988 to disassociate with the American Federation of Musicians (AFofM). Fifty-two full-time professional orchestras with collective bargaining agreement are member orchestras of the International Council of Symphony and Opera Musicians (ICSOM).

The "International" name reference for ICSOM is a relic from a previous time when Canadian professional orchestras were included in the association. The twenty Canadian professional orchestras now have their own national association – Organization of Canadian Symphony Musicians (OCSM).

The Regional Orchestra Players Association (ROPA) includes some eighty-four-member organizations including symphony, opera, and ballet orchestras. ROPA orchestras, while fully professional, are not considered fulltime. Member groups range from leading opera and ballet companies in major metropolitan areas to communities with populations smaller than 100,000.

Professional orchestras without union collective bargaining agreements must also be considered. In addition to the Seattle Symphony, other highly respected organizations, such as the Orpheus Chamber Orchestra and the Los Angeles Chamber Orchestra, do hold membership in ICSOM or ROPA. Although it is not always apparent where the designations for “professional orchestra” and “community orchestra” begin and end, an organization that 1) has fulltime administrative management, 2) holds its musicians to professional performance standards and pays them a per service or weekly salary, and 3) is a leading cultural resource for a major geographic population, should be considered to be a professional orchestra.

Although less frequent in their engagement of fulltime university faculty, a number of professional orchestras outside of the USA and Canada will occasionally employ such individuals as soloist or substitute musicians. Of course, engagement by renowned orchestras is a strong indicator of excellence with regard to creative accomplishment for university faculty members. Not to be discounted are solo performances with less renowned groups that serve national and/or regional populations as major sources for classical music. No objective ranking system exists for orchestras outside of the USA and Canada.

Another source that can assist in classifying levels of prestige for symphony orchestras is the League of Symphony Orchestras (previously known as the America Symphony Orchestra League). The League has a formal tiered structure in which orchestras with the largest annual budgets hold “Tier 1” status. The classification structure includes member ensembles grouped according to annual expenditures, descending in rank order to include non-compensated community orchestras. To be ranked in one of the eight tiers, an organization must be a member of the League and pay annual membership dues. The amount of dues required is determined, in part, by the tier in which the orchestra is classified. There are recent instances where orchestras have chosen to drop their membership because of disputes of their tier classification. Others have chosen not to become League members. Although the League’s tiered rankings may be helpful to some extent, relying exclusively on a “pay to play” organization as the sole source determinant for rankings of quality/prestige is not practical.

More information on these organizations can be found on their websites:

<http://www.icsom.org>

<http://ocsm-omosc.org>

<http://ropaweb.org>

<http://www.americanorchestras.org>

Opera Companies

Like orchestras, there is no agreed upon ranking system for professional opera companies. The most comprehensive list available is made by Opera America, which, like League of Symphony Orchestras, places its member companies in tiers according to total annual expenditures. Opera America also does not include companies that are not paying member organizations. Because many orchestras of opera companies are ICSOM, OCSM, and ROPA members, relative merits of opera companies should be applied relative to the work of fulltime faculty members who are singers, and not orchestral musicians. Opera America lists fourteen Tier 1, twenty-six Tier 2, twenty Tier 3, and seventy-three Tier 4 professional opera companies in the United States. No Canadian companies are included. It appears that Opera America only uses total annual budget, without regard for total number of productions or performances, in determining their tiered rankings. [<https://www.operaamerica.org>]

There are no objective rank listings for opera companies outside of the USA. Rich historic traditions include multiple cities in most European countries. There are high-quality companies existing on six continents. North American singers employed as fulltime faculty members may on occasion sing with leading international opera companies. Such situations should be considered as major accomplishments.

Other Genres

As with symphony orchestras and opera companies, other non-pop music genres lack a formal or informal rank order for prestige or prominence. Whereas the professional status of an organization must be considered, so should the quality of the musicians it engages and the reputation of the composers it features. Because of the subjective nature of making such assessments, developing rankings or tier groupings is prohibitive if not impossible.

Application

Developing qualitative comparisons for fulltime faculty performance activity, both at micro level of comparison between small groups of individuals with the same performance specialization and at a macro level of institutional comparison, is impacted by complex variables not easily ascertained through purely objectives means. Considerations such as geographic proximity to professional performance opportunities, the amount of time an institution allows its faculty to be away from campus for external professional work, and what (if any) restrictions an institution puts on income earned over and above a faculty member's annual salary all must be considered. Numbers of fulltime faculty in applied (studio) specializations must also be considered when comparing the productivity of one institution with another. Ultimately, music units must find ways to document and contextualize the individual and collective achievements of their performance faculties. In doing so, Music (as an academic discipline) can be better prepared to satisfy both internal institutional demands for documenting quality contributions to the field, as well as edifying external entities looking collect data to derive their own determinations of qualitative comparison between institutions.

Appendix C.

Boston University School of Music Faculty Expectations for Evaluation, Reappointment, and Promotion

Below is an excerpt from the "Faculty Expectations" document of the Boston University School of Music. Permission for use of the document here was granted by the Director *ad interim* of the School of Music, Sheila Kibbe. Most institutions have such statements, but this one is included here because of its forthrightness in addressing some of the false directions frequently undertaken in assessing faculty output. It may be useful to other institutions.

Performance and Teaching Careers: Across the disciplines and specialties they represent, our faculty members follow varied career trajectories. For instance, instrumentalists may follow careers as orchestral players, chamber musicians, or soloists, and individual instrumentalists may have vastly differing career profiles (piano or violin as opposed to trombone or percussion).

Vocalists cannot always sustain lengthy performance careers, however their teaching may have significant professional impact. In a professional faculty such diversity is highly valued and necessary. Evaluation must therefore be on a case-by-case basis, and consider the individual contribution of each to the whole.

Peer Review: The evaluation of the research and creative work of music faculty should emphasize its quality as assessed by qualified experts in the field. Appreciation by general audiences is not an acceptable indication of quality, nor is commercial success or its lack. Creative work of the music faculty is expected to have reach and impact and to merit regard by experts in the field. It is not deemed appropriate to rely on assessment by amateur astronomers when evaluating the work of astrophysicists, and field-relevant expertise from peers is the primary source for evaluators. Likewise, scholars and practitioners who have professional qualifications in music should be relied on to assess the work of faculty members under review.

Quality and Impact: The venues in which artistic work is presented are often understood to be a general indication of the standing of an artist. However, marketplace acceptance does not necessarily correlate with quality. The framework of "local, regional, national, and international" must be tempered when an artist is working in a city such as Boston, a world-destination city for music in particular. In many cases our "local" stage is in fact a "world" stage. In addition, economic exigencies and cultural shifts are limiting music publication, broadcasting, concert, and recording opportunities. Traditional metrics no longer supply a complete picture of a work's impact or quality. For the purposes of the instructional program, worthiness of recognition, as assessed by experts, is as important as recognition itself.

Productivity and Quantity: Quantity should be taken only as a general measure of that sustained productivity that marks a committed professional. Like novelists, composers and musical scholars regularly undertake works requiring years of effort to complete. Recording, publication, concert performances, commissions, and invitations to perform or present scholarship are general indications of reach and impact. However, quantity is not the equivalent of quality, which is the *sine qua non*.

Range of Research: A research university encourages the full range of research and creative activity, not only the traditional, but also the unusual and the innovative. Creative artists, composers, and musicians, like other researchers, must remain free to take risks. Their research may find slow acceptance in conventional journals; their artistic products may not

function in traditional venues nor find ready acceptance in the marketplace, particularly if these involve new forms. They may in fact make a valuable contribution to the intellectual and critical conversation, and therein is their quality.

Research and Creative Activity:

- A. Creative activity, including performance, is considered to be equivalent to scholarly research. There is a mutually supportive, synergistic relationship among the creative spheres of composition and performance, and the creativity that characterizes research in musicology, music theory, and music education. A new idea or concept needs to be shared, tested, critiqued, whether a fresh interpretation of an acknowledged masterpiece, a new approach to analysis, a new composition, a new understanding of music's history, or a new strategy of teaching and learning. In all cases we expect that the research and creative work of our faculty will have impact, reach, quality, and significance, and that it will constitute a coherent body of work.

The characteristics of excellence in research and creative activity should be assessed appropriately for each discipline and specialty. For scholars this will entail the quantity and quality of publications and books, and writings published in significant peer-reviewed journals. Performances should give evidence of high artistic value, and occur in professionally significant venues. Scholars, composers, and performers aspiring to tenure and Associate Professor should show evidence of national standing. Those aspiring to the rank of Professor should show demonstrable national and/or international standing.

In today's classical music climate, it is not always possible to identify in advance explicitly the publications in which a candidate would need to publish. Judgments must be made on a case-by-case basis, with the Director making the case for or against the candidate's qualifications.

- B. Evidence of Research and Creative Activity may include items such as:
- Published and in-press journal articles, published books, book chapters, conference proceedings, manuscripts in draft, and substantial review essays
 - Music published in scholarly editions
 - Presentations, invited or peer reviewed, at regional, national, or international meetings, conferences, professional societies
 - Compositions, performed or published
 - Recitals including solo performances, performances with orchestras, chamber ensembles, or other groups
 - Performances related to scholarship, such as lecture recitals
 - Invited lectures and presentations
 - Clinics and guest conducting appearances
 - Recordings and recording contracts
 - Development of new technologies, including software
 - Authoring reviews of books, articles, compositions, performances, and other creative activity
 - Critical evaluation of creative activity or research in journals, e-journals, press, and media
 - Grants, contracts, and commissions for research or creative activity
 - Awards and honors for research or creative activity