

## MUSIC DEPARTMENT GUIDELINES FOR SCHOLARLY/ARTISTIC ACTIVITY

Scholarly/artistic activity in music consists of a spectrum in which "performance" is on one pole and "publication" is on the other. Activity on either side is considered equal. Therefore, evidence of professional activity in music may take a variety of forms and may also evolve according to professional skill and interest.

SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY/PUBLICATION: Scholarship includes research, writing, and publication. To this end, books (and/or chapters therein), music editions, articles, reviews in journals (both scholar- and performer-oriented), and authoring music computer programs fulfill this goal.

With regard to books and articles, blind peer-review, common in many fields, has only limited importance in music scholarship; the fields are small, anonymity almost impossible. Because the fields are so small *and* sub-specialized there are too many peer-reviewed journals to name here. That said, the most prestigious and competitive venues include the *American Musicological Society* for music history and the *Journal of Music Theory* (Yale/Duke) for that discipline. Other examples include *Strings* magazine or *The Strad* magazine (for string players); each family of instruments has similar prestigious publication venues. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion may want to discuss the prestige/nature of publication venues with departmental colleagues, and should clearly address this prestige/nature in the materials they submit to the Faculty Personnel Committee so as to be understood by colleagues who are outside the discipline of music. The first name in an author list is most commonly the first author of an article. Publishing houses vary in their review processes; most often two or three chapters from a book manuscript are sent to one or two outside reviewers, and the author sometimes suggests those reviewers.

With regard to music editions (that is, an author editing a composer's music), *first editions* or *first critical editions* are the most demanding, indicating that the author has brought music from a composer's manuscript(s) to an engraved, critical, playable edition for the first time; these are the equivalent of one *or more* peer-reviewed article(s), depending on the length of the composition; for example, editing a single song could be the equivalent of one peer-reviewed article whereas editing a four-movement string quartet could be the equivalent of four peer-reviewed articles. While publishing houses generally do not send these editions to outside readers, an in-house senior editor reviews them, so these are, in essence, in-house-peer-reviewed. *Modern editions* are the next most demanding because they require re-engraving and significant editing and are, again, in-house-peer-reviewed; these are the equivalent of one or two peer-reviewed articles, depending on the length of the composition. *Reprint editions* are the least demanding and should not be viewed as the equivalent of publishing a peer-reviewed article, but more at the level of chairing a

panel at a conference. The first name in the author list is most commonly the first author of the edition.

Public lectures and significant participation (papers given, offices held) in national/international societies are considered professional activity for a scholar/artist, but not enough in and of themselves for tenure or promotion. Projects such as consulting, peer review, musical transcription, etc. that support and advance the musical/academic growth of the scholar him/herself are also included, but not enough in and of themselves.

**PERFORMANCE/COMPOSITION:** Performance includes directing and/or coaching musical ensembles for public concerts; performing as a member of a professional ensemble; individual solo or chamber public performances (on campus, off campus, at festivals, at conventions), and commercial recordings. Music composition includes composing or arranging music, publication of said works, and/or public performance and/or recording of those works. It is unreasonable to expect a music critic to review all performances; if critical reviews are published, they should be provided to the Faculty Personnel Committee. If critical reviews are not published, the candidate should provide recordings of performances, *both on-campus and off-campus*, to an external reviewer of the candidate's choice who is a recognized expert in the candidate's field; that external reviewer should subsequently provide to the Faculty Personnel Committee a written review of those performances, which will then qualify those performances as peer-reviewed. In the materials the candidate submits to the Faculty Personnel Committee, the candidate should clearly explain the mechanics of each performance: when the performance took place; where; whether invited or self-promoted; whether reviewed by a music critic; whether reviewed by an external person.

**TO QUALIFY FOR TENURE AND FURTHER PROMOTION:** by the time of the tenure review, a performer/composer who opts for *performance-only* is expected to have presented several concerts on campus *and* regionally/nationally/internationally. Whitman-only performance is not in itself sufficient; nor is off-campus performance in itself sufficient. A blend of both is necessary by the time of tenure review and by the time of further promotion. Venues for performances will most often be other educational institutions or national conferences because the expense of renting even a small public hall is prohibitive for a solo or chamber performance. By the time of tenure review, non-performers must have published in peer-reviewed journals and/or have published a book/chapters/music editions. A blend of performance(s) and publication(s) is common as well; in this case, the candidate should follow the above protocols for each. For promotion to professor, a *consistent* record since the awarding of tenure of the types of professional activity described above should be evident.