SJSU SAN JOSÉ STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Magdalena L. Barrera
Vice Provost for Faculty Success
Office of the Provost

San José State University
One Washington Square
San José, CA 95192-0020

408.924.2405
magdalena.barrera@sjsu.edu
www.sjsu.edu/provost/faculty-success

TO: Fred Cohen, Director, School of Music and Dance

FROM: Magdalena Barrera, Vice Provost for Faculty Success

DATE: 22 September 2022

SUBJECT: Approved School of Music and Dance RTP Guidelines

On behalf of Provost Vincent Del Casino, I am pleased to report that the School of Music and Dance RTP guidelines have been approved. Per University Policy S15-7, these guidelines have been reviewed by the Professional Standards Committee of the Academic Senate, the College of Science RTP Committee, and the Office of the Provost. The implementation date for these approved guidelines is August 17, 2022 and will come up for review in five years.

A copy of the appropriate guidelines (creative, scholarly, or combined) must be included in the dossier of all RTP candidates from the School of Music and Dance.

C: Shannon Miller, Dean, Humanities and the Arts
Jason Aleksander, Associate Dean for Faculty Success and Research, Humanities and the Arts
Alison McKee, Chair, Academic Senate
James Lee, Senior Director, UP-Faculty Services

Faculty Services:
Adopted Fall 22
Renewal or Revision Due Fall 27
This is a set of guidelines. Each candidate may include the portion of the set (Scholarly, Artistic, or Hybrid) that best applies to their work when it is under review.

RTP Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines
School of Music and Dance
Scholarly Activities

By a secret vote of _12_ for, _0__ against, _1__ abstain, _0_ absent, the FT faculty of the School of Music and Dance approves these guidelines; September _21_, 2021

INTRODUCTION

The School of Music and Dance (SMD) has developed Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines to assist committees and administrators outside the School at all levels of review to understand standards appropriate to the applicant's profession (S15-7 - 4.1.5.), and to ensure fair and equitable application of these standards to the broader procedures and criteria of University policies.

The SMD has determined that the standard criteria for Teaching and Service serve the needs of our School, but that the great diversity and range of artistic, creative, and scholarly achievements in the fields of music and dance warrant an explanation of School-specific guidelines.

The SMD regards scholarly work, artistic creation, and performance as equivalent. Our guidelines explain a candidate's merit in light of their work's originality, breadth, richness, productivity, and depth of creative expression and scholarly achievement.

We have defined RSCA achievement on the basis of three levels: baseline, good, and excellent. These levels of achievement outline the process whereby candidates narrate their creative/artistic/scholarly productivity in the context of S15-8.

ARTISTIC/CREATIVE AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

The SMD faculty is comprised of dance and musical performers, dance and musical directors, choreographers, composers, conductors, educators, music historians and music theorists. The RSCA activities of SMD faculty can be understood, generally, to fall into two distinct categories: artistic/creative and scholarly. Each music and dance discipline provides its own avenues for creative output and the transmission of knowledge. Faculty may be engaged in artistic/creative or scholarly work, or their work may include *both* categories. The SMD faculty recognizes that scholarly and creative activities can be represented by a wide variety of artistic expression appropriate and acceptable for RTP candidates in the disciplines of music and dance.

RTP RSCA GUIDELINES

The SMD's RTP RSCA standards are guided by the belief that faculty are expected to carry out work that has made substantial contributions to their respective artistic or scholarly fields, the mission of San José

State University, and the mission of the SMD. Faculty contributions shall be available in ways that permit informed response, including peer review.

S15-8 states that "Levels of achievement shall be awarded appropriately not only in the individual category but also for the level of synergism that could not have been achieved without the overlap." (S15-8, 2.0). Accordingly, a candidate's dossier may span both creative and scholarly accomplishments. Candidates should clearly communicate how their work meets the following guidelines, identifying their contributions to different categories as appropriate.

Candidates will identify which aspect of their RSCA projects are to be evaluated as creative accomplishments, and which aspects are to be evaluated as scholarly accomplishments. Each entry shall be evaluated according to the respective criteria described in the list of hypothetical examples (see below), keeping in mind that this list is not exhaustive, but rather a sample of the types of activities that candidates in the School may produce. In accordance with S15-8, if a single project or entry in the dossier spans both artistic and scholarly achievements, these aspects will be assessed by their respective criteria (artistic or scholarly). Further, these may be assessed at different levels of achievement. For example, the artistic aspect of a specific project may qualify as Excellent while the scholarly aspect may qualify as Baseline, rendering a total combined ranking of "Good" for the project.

VENUES BEYOND CONVENTIONAL PERFORMANCES, RECITALS, AND PUBLICATIONS

As appropriate, candidates should request outside reviews of their activities, so that these contributions are documented and reviewed, and not merely enumerated.

PEER REVIEW IN OUR DISCIPLINES AND THE NEED FOR DOCUMENTATION

For many artistic/creative/scholarly activities, peer review is documented, and expressed either in traditional academic or non-traditional formats. Peer review of scholarly articles in music and dance is no different from that in similar fields within the humanities. Peer review of experiential creative work, however, sometimes finds expression in formats outside the norms of traditional academic discourse.

For example, peer review of a performance may be documented by published reviews and/or evaluations in printed or on-line media, sometimes including responses in the same artistic expression as the work itself (e.g., a dance review that is itself a dance).
Another example: Peer review may be expressed and evaluated by consideration of invitations to perform, conduct, or choreograph highly regarded ensembles and companies, in concert series, summer workshops, or festivals; or via invitations to speak at concerts, conferences, and colloquia. In many cases, the *invitation* to create, perform, or present may be evaluated as a peer review, acknowledging that the invitation is based on the prestige the musician/dancer acquired over many past performances. Indeed, the reputation of a faculty member through their artistic/creative/scholarly activities is one of the most important forms of peer review in the field of music and dance. For composers or choreographers, distinction is also demonstrated through repeated performances of works that further enhance the artist's stature.

Candidates are expected to provide evidence of the works and activities cited in their RTP files in the form of concert programs, invitation correspondences, performance contracts, evaluation letters by the candidate's peers or other individuals possessing the background to provide substantial critical commentary, and other similar types of documentation.

Evidence for a peer-reviewed article would satisfy the university policy "acceptance of scholarly or artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes and evaluation of that work" (S15-8, 2.3.1.3) since "published or otherwise completed works that are peer-reviewed or juried will normally receive the greatest weight." (S15-8, 2.3.1.4) Journals and books published through academic presses are typically peer reviewed. We embrace the policy's requirement that peer-reviewed or juried published work will normally receive the greatest weight. We believe, however, that many other forms of artistic achievement and scholarship that are not *conventionally* peer reviewed are, nevertheless, valuable and highly appropriate. Consequently, we encourage SMD faculty to pursue all forms of artistic creation, performance, and scholarship, but require that candidates "request that disciplinary experts provide evaluations of any of their work to be included in the dossier," especially of work that is not conventionally peer reviewed. (See *School of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*, below.)

Whether reviewing artistic, scholarly or professional achievement, "external reviewers must be objective, and any relationships that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the evaluation." (S15-8, 2.3.1.3) For example, a candidate with extensive performance activities or numerous non-reviewed or community concerts and events, should seek a review from one or more independent experts from within their discipline to determine the quality, extent, and impact of their contributions.

Given the unfamiliarity that many University's committees will have with the diverse range of artistic and creative achievement appropriate to our multifaceted disciplines, candidates are advised to document whether and how each achievement is peer-reviewed, and sensibly explain all non-traditional reviews of their work.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

The following three levels—baseline, good, and excellent—offer examples of scholarly/creative activities within our disciplines that demonstrate quality and quantity of work to satisfy the requirements for tenure and promotion.

EXAMPLES of LEVELS of ACHIEVEMENT

S15-7 (4.2.1) requires that guidelines provide hypothetical examples of profiles that would warrant a given level of achievement. The School of Music and Dance provides these sample profiles, remaining acutely aware that they should be "inclusive and not exclusive in nature." If a candidate from the SMD has achievements that are roughly parallel with the kinds and levels of achievement outlined below, these hypothetical profiles serve as a fair scale to assist in the evaluation and level of achievement attained by a candidate. We anticipate, however, that some candidates will have types and combinations of achievements not anticipated in these guidelines. Such achievements should be assessed using the more general language of the policy on Criteria and Standards (S15-8).

Given the School of Music and Dance's mission to cultivate and grow ties in the Bay Area and California, within our home community as well as reaching out to other locations globally, to provide educational leadership in our artistic communities, and to provide leadership in the dynamic and innovative nature of media for artistic/creative and scholarly work, we view:

- our faculty's artistic/creative and scholarly activities in local performance venues, places of worship, K-12 schools, and community colleges as important and critical to each faculty members' individual mission within the University;
- the application of artistic/creative and scholarly activities through the training of music and dance teachers and advisory services to local school districts and non-profits as having high social impact;
- the publication within open access journals and media as valid, provided they meet the same standards for peer review and ethics as traditional journals.

Unsatisfactory: Any candidate not meeting the standards of "Baseline" will be evaluated as "Unsatisfactory." The candidate has not created scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level.

The following hypothetical examples describe profiles that warrant a given level of achievement in their respective scholarly/artistic/creative categories including hybrid accomplishments that may overlap RSCA and teaching.

Scholarly "Baseline":

Baseline 1. At least two single or co-authored articles in scholarly journals, or book chapters in collections from academic or educational presses, especially as part of a promising pattern of accomplishments.

Baseline 2. A consistent series of articles or local/regional conference presentations presented to music/dance audiences, and/or academic or disciplinary professionals, provided these presentations/articles are linked to the faculty member's areas of disciplinary expertise or contribute to better teaching. Such documents should receive positive independent reviews. (See *School Of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*, below.)

Baseline 3. Occasionally, items from the above may overlap with elements of creative activities such as presentations at scholarly conferences, musical or dance workshops, clinics, concert, and/or master-classes at regional, national, and/or international venues. In such cases, the candidate shall demonstrate that these activities are linked to the faculty member's disciplinary areas of expertise, and shall present these activities to independent review (see *School Of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*.)

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "BASELINE STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities that meet the level of Baseline. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a music historian may meet the baseline standard with three published articles, or might meet the baseline standard with a combination that includes

a) one single authored article, and
b) one book chapter editorially reviewed.

Scholarly "Good":

Good 1. An academic book, edited volume or scholarly music or dance edition of a pre-existing work.

Good 2. A publication of a series of articles or chapters, whether single-authored or not, appearing in reputable academic journals or chapters in book anthologies.

Good 3. A series of peer-reviewed publications, joined with media interviews and/or editorials. These activities must be independently reviewed and found to have a benefit to the public and also linked to the faculty member's areas of disciplinary expertise.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "GOOD STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities listed above that meet the level of Good. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a scholar may meet the "Good" standard with a single edited edition of a pre-existing dance or music artifact/score and a more than one scholarly publication in a reputable academic journal.

Scholarly "Excellent":

Excellent 1. At least four publications, several of which appear in professional (e.g., peer-reviewed) academic or educational journals.

Excellent 2. An academic book or edition published by a reputable (e.g., peer-reviewed) academic or educational publisher.

Excellent 3. A portfolio of regular peer-reviewed publications such as that described above (Scholarly Good 3) may qualify as "excellent" if accompanied by a series of reports, extensive conference presentations, and/or academic lectures. Such documents/activities shall be independently reviewed and linked to faculty member's areas of disciplinary expertise, and/or found or contribute to better teaching.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "EXCELLENT STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities listed above that meet the level of Excellent. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, two peer-reviewed publications and more than two peer-reviewed publications accompanied by a similar or larger number of related professional conference presentations.

SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DANCE
OPTIONAL EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS

Achievements in the areas of research, scholarship, creative activities, and professional accomplishments will undergo review as part of the RTP process in the School of Music and Dance. The School RTP Committee may review the work and indicate the extent of its quality and significance. Work accepted by an editorial or review board or jury in of itself constitutes an evaluation of that work (S15-8, 2.3.1.3). For work that has not been accepted by an editorial or review board or jury, candidates for tenure or promotion may choose to include external reviews of their RSCA activities (S15-8). Faculty in the School of Music and Dance may elect to submit their entire RSCA portfolio for external review.

If a candidate elects to have external reviews, and in keeping with the Collective Bargaining Agreement Contract (2014-2020), the recommended process in the School of Music and Dance is described below. These recommendations encompass research, scholarly and artistic and professional activities and are based on precedent from the School of Music and Dance RTP review process, current academic literature on the subject of external reviews and follow university policy (S15-8) and the SMD RTP Guidelines.

PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. At the beginning of the RTP review process and being advised by the Director and the School RTP committee, candidates will select material to be included in the dossier (documentation of RSCA activity) to be sent to external reviewers. The Director will be in charge of making these materials available to reviewers in timely manner while safeguarding confidentiality of the review process.

2. Only material that is in the dossier can be sent out for external review.

3. For the selection of reviewers the candidate will submit two names, and the SMD RTP Committee and Director will submit two names. Out of these four names, two will be selected to constitute the candidate's external reviewers, one from the candidate's list and one from the RTP Committee's list.

4. Candidates must write a statement identifying their relationship to external reviewers, if any, including any potential conflict of interest. (S15-8, 2.3.1.3).

5. The candidate will be notified of the Committee's choice of reviewers. Candidates may identify any suggested reviewer from the Committee's list that they perceive as holding a negative bias towards the candidate. The name may still be included in the final list of external reviewers, but the RTP Committee shall note the potential negative bias of the reviewer.

6. In the case where a reviewer requested by the candidate is the same as one requested by the Committee, the choice will be identified as mutual. The Director and the RTP committees can ensure that no more than one duplicate name is on the final 2-name list. If all the names are the same, two reviewers will be selected, regardless.

7. Reviews should be from experts in the candidate's (sub)field (in academic or professional organizations related to the candidate's field of work) but not that candidate's collaborators, friends or individuals invested in the candidate's success.

8. External reviewers will be asked to comment on the quality and/or significance of the candidate's work according to the norms in the field and expectations set in the SMD guidelines. Only RSCA work *included in the dossier* may be reviewed.

9. Materials made available to reviewers:
   - Statements from the candidate on her/his RSCA activities.
   - Link to an online portfolio (Optional).
   - Examples of materials:
     - Scholarly work, creative works, audio recordings, performances (video and/or audio recordings [online portfolios], programs), scores, any material that documents the activity in as much detail as possible.

10. External reviewers are informed that, per SJSU RTP policy, their review letters will be included in the candidate's dossier and will be available to the candidate during the RTP process.

11. Reviewers will be asked to summarize their current position or job title, expertise, and in what capacity they know the candidate; disclose any potential conflict of interest. (S17-8, 2.3.1.4)

12. Review letters are to be sent to the SMD RTP Committee for inclusion in the dossier.

RTP Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines
School of Music and Dance
Artistic Activities

By a secret vote of _12_ for, _0__ against, _1__ abstain, _0_ absent, the FT faculty of the School of Music and Dance approves these guidelines; September _21_, 2021

INTRODUCTION

The School of Music and Dance (SMD) has developed Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines to assist committees and administrators outside the School at all levels of review to understand standards appropriate to the applicant's profession (S15-7 - 4.1.5.), and to ensure fair and equitable application of these standards to the broader procedures and criteria of University policies.

The SMD has determined that the standard criteria for Teaching and Service serve the needs of our School, but that the great diversity and range of artistic, creative, and scholarly achievements in the fields of music and dance warrant an explanation of School-specific guidelines.

The SMD regards scholarly work, artistic creation, and performance as equivalent. Our guidelines explain a candidate's merit in light of their work's originality, breadth, richness, productivity, and depth of creative expression and scholarly achievement.

We have defined RSCA achievement on the basis of three levels: baseline, good, and excellent. These levels of achievement outline the process whereby candidates narrate their creative/artistic/scholarly productivity in the context of S15-8.

ARTISTIC/CREATIVE AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

The SMD faculty is comprised of dance and musical performers, dance and musical directors, choreographers, composers, conductors, educators, music historians and music theorists. The RSCA activities of SMD faculty can be understood, generally, to fall into two distinct categories: artistic/creative and scholarly. Each music and dance discipline provides its own avenues for creative output and the transmission of knowledge. Faculty may be engaged in artistic/creative or scholarly work, or their work may include *both* categories. The SMD faculty recognizes that scholarly and creative activities can be represented by a wide variety of artistic expression appropriate and acceptable for RTP candidates in the disciplines of music and dance.

RTP RSCA GUIDELINES

The SMD's RTP RSCA standards are guided by the belief that faculty are expected to carry out work that has made substantial contributions to their respective artistic or scholarly fields, the mission of San José

State University, and the mission of the SMD. Faculty contributions shall be available in ways that permit informed response, including peer review.

S15-8 states that "Levels of achievement shall be awarded appropriately not only in the individual category but also for the level of synergism that could not have been achieved without the overlap." (S15-8, 2.0). Accordingly, a candidate's dossier may span both creative and scholarly accomplishments. Candidates should clearly communicate how their work meets the following guidelines, identifying their contributions to different categories as appropriate.

Candidates will identify which aspect of their RSCA projects are to be evaluated as creative accomplishments, and which aspects are to be evaluated as scholarly accomplishments. Each entry shall be evaluated according to the respective criteria described in the list of hypothetical examples (see below), keeping in mind that this list is not exhaustive, but rather a sample of the types of activities that candidates in the School may produce. In accordance with S15-8, if a single project or entry in the dossier spans both artistic and scholarly achievements, these aspects will be assessed by their respective criteria (artistic or scholarly). Further, these may be assessed at different levels of achievement. For example, the artistic aspect of a specific project may qualify as Excellent while the scholarly aspect may qualify as Baseline, rendering a total combined ranking of "Good" for the project.

VENUES BEYOND CONVENTIONAL PERFORMANCES, RECITALS, AND PUBLICATIONS

As appropriate, candidates should request outside reviews of their activities, so that these contributions are documented and reviewed, and not merely enumerated.

PEER REVIEW IN OUR DISCIPLINES AND THE NEED FOR DOCUMENTATION

For many artistic/creative/scholarly activities, peer review is documented, and expressed either in traditional academic or non-traditional formats. Peer review of scholarly articles in music and dance is no different from that in similar fields within the humanities. Peer review of experiential creative work, however, sometimes finds expression in formats outside the norms of traditional academic discourse.

For example, peer review of a performance may be documented by published reviews and/or evaluations in printed or on-line media, sometimes including responses in the same artistic expression as the work itself (e.g., a dance review that is itself a dance).
Another example: Peer review may be expressed and evaluated by consideration of invitations to perform, conduct, or choreograph highly regarded ensembles and companies, in concert series, summer workshops, or festivals; or via invitations to speak at concerts, conferences, and colloquia. In many cases, the *invitation* to create, perform, or present may be evaluated as a peer review, acknowledging that the invitation is based on the prestige the musician/dancer acquired over many past performances. Indeed, the reputation of a faculty member through their artistic/creative/scholarly activities is one of the most important forms of peer review in the field of music and dance. For composers or choreographers, distinction is also demonstrated through repeated performances of works that further enhance the artist's stature.

Candidates are expected to provide evidence of the works and activities cited in their RTP files in the form of concert programs, invitation correspondences, performance contracts, evaluation letters by the candidate's peers or other individuals possessing the background to provide substantial critical commentary, and other similar types of documentation.

Evidence for a peer-reviewed article would satisfy the university policy "acceptance of scholarly or artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes and evaluation of that work" (S15-8, 2.3.1.3) since "published or otherwise completed works that are peer-reviewed or juried will normally receive the greatest weight." (S15-8, 2.3.1.4) Journals and books published through academic presses are typically peer reviewed. We embrace the policy's requirement that peer-reviewed or juried published work will normally receive the greatest weight. We believe, however, that many other forms of artistic achievement and scholarship that are not *conventionally* peer reviewed are, nevertheless, valuable and highly appropriate. Consequently, we encourage SMD faculty to pursue all forms of artistic creation, performance, and scholarship, but require that candidates "request that disciplinary experts provide evaluations of any of their work to be included in the dossier," especially of work that is not conventionally peer reviewed. (See *School of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*, below.)

Whether reviewing artistic, scholarly or professional achievement, "external reviewers must be objective, and any relationships that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the evaluation." (S15-8, 2.3.1.3) For example, a candidate with extensive performance activities or numerous non-reviewed or community concerts and events, should seek a review from one or more independent experts from within their discipline to determine the quality, extent, and impact of their contributions.

Given the unfamiliarity that many University's committees will have with the diverse range of artistic and creative achievement appropriate to our multifaceted disciplines, candidates are advised to document whether and how each achievement is peer-reviewed, and sensibly explain all non-traditional reviews of their work.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

The following three levels—baseline, good, and excellent—offer examples of scholarly/creative activities within our disciplines that demonstrate quality and quantity of work to satisfy the requirements for tenure and promotion.

EXAMPLES of LEVELS of ACHIEVEMENT

S15-7 (4.2.1) requires that guidelines provide hypothetical examples of profiles that would warrant a given level of achievement. The School of Music and Dance provides these sample profiles, remaining acutely aware that they should be "inclusive and not exclusive in nature." If a candidate from the SMD has achievements that are roughly parallel with the kinds and levels of achievement outlined below, these hypothetical profiles serve as a fair scale to assist in the evaluation and level of achievement attained by a candidate. We anticipate, however, that some candidates will have types and combinations of achievements not anticipated in these guidelines. Such achievements should be assessed using the more general language of the policy on Criteria and Standards (S15-8).

Given the School of Music and Dance's mission to cultivate and grow ties in the Bay Area and California, within our home community as well as reaching out to other locations globally, to provide educational leadership in our artistic communities, and to provide leadership in the dynamic and innovative nature of media for artistic/creative work, we view:

- our faculty's artistic/creative activities in local performance venues, places of worship, K-12 schools, and community colleges as important and critical to each faculty members' individual mission within the University;
- the application of artistic/creative activities through the training of music and dance teachers and advisory services to local school districts and non-profits as having high social impact;
- the publication within open access journals and media as valid, provided they meet the same standards for peer review and ethics as traditional journals.

Unsatisfactory: Any candidate not meeting the standards of "Baseline" will be evaluated as "Unsatisfactory." The candidate has not created artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level.

The following hypothetical examples describe profiles that warrant a given level of achievement in the artistic/creative categories including hybrid accomplishments that may overlap RSCA and teaching.

Artistic/Creative "Baseline":

Baseline: The candidate has, over the course of the period of review, created a body of completed artistic/professional achievements and shows promise of continued growth and success within their discipline.

Baseline 1. At least two appearances in a leading position—e.g., conductor, solo performer, creator, producer—with one or two reputable performing organizations.

Baseline 2. At least three appearances as a member of one or more reputable performing organizations such as ensembles, orchestras, theater or dance companies.

Baseline 3. At least three presentations in workshops, clinics, and/or masterclasses at local/regional high schools, community colleges, local groups, and/or local venues.

Baseline 4. Direction of a fully produced dance performance at a regional dance venue.

Baseline 5. One or two original choreographed works for one or more professional regional or national dance companies.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "BASELINE STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities that meet the level of Baseline. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a music artist may meet the baseline standard with three published articles, or might meet the baseline standard with a combination that includes

a) one performance as soloist or conductor with a reputable performing organization
b) a presentation in a workshop or clinic or masterclass at local venue

Artistic/Creative "Good":

Good: The candidate has created scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that constitute important contributions to the discipline and that help to enhance the scholarly/artistic/ professional reputation of the School, College, SJSU, or the CSU more generally.

Good 1. At least three appearances in a leading position—e.g., conductor, solo performer, creator, producer—with one or more reputable performing organizations, especially as part of a studied and purposeful pattern of accomplishment. Peer review may consist of published reviews in major newspapers or other influential and non-partial commercial media outlets.

Good 2. A series of up to four invited performances as a member of or in collaboration with regional, national, or internationally recognized reputable ensembles, orchestras, theater or dance companies.

Good 3. At least two presentations in workshops, clinics, and/or masterclasses at local or regional field conferences (such as CBDA-Bay Section or CASMEC).

Good 4. A full-length performance/recital consisting of the candidate's compositions or original choreography, performed by a reputable group unaffiliated with SJSU.

Good 5. Multiple invited commissions as creator for, or performances as, conductor or performer with a reputable ensemble. In some instances such ensembles are composed of professional musicians; in other cases, such ensembles consist of trained and dedicated performers whose primary source of income is something other than music.

Good 6. At least two fully produced dance performances at one or more regional dance venues.

Good 7. At least three original choreographed works for one or more professional regional or national dance companies.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "GOOD STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities listed above that meet the level of Good. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a conductor or performer may meet the "Good" standard with multiple solo performances or guest conducting appearances, or might meet the "Good" standard with a combination that includes

a) Two or more solo performances / conducting appearances, and
b) A CD recording, commercially released, and
c) One original composition or choreographed work for a regional performing organization

Artistic/Creative "Excellent":

Excellent: This level requires achievements of both sufficient quality and quantity to establish a significant, salient, and growing reputation within the candidate's field. Excellence in scholarly/artistic/professional achievement results from a body of work that is recognized as significant within the discipline.

Excellent 1. Five or more appearances as conductor, soloist, or in a leading role with a major performing ensemble, or as a leading member of a regionally or nationally recognized dance company. Peer review may consist of published reviews in major newspapers or other influential and non-partial commercial media outlets. In some instances, such ensembles are composed of professional musicians; in other cases, such ensembles consist of trained and dedicated performers whose primary source of income is something other than music.

Excellent 2. One or more commissioned works from professional performers or organizations (such as from a performer or ensemble that primarily makes their living from performing). The candidate must provide evidence that the work qualifies for this status: a signed contract (without disclosing financial consideration) showing the nature of the commission shall suffice.

Excellent 3. At least two presentations in workshops, clinics, and/or masterclasses at a national or international field conferences (such as Midwest, ACDA, NASM).

Excellent 4. At least two full-length performance/recitals consisting of the candidate's compositions or original choreography, performed by a group unaffiliated with SJSU.

Excellent 5. A series of at least four original choreographed works for one or more professional dance companies, demonstrating a studied and purposeful pattern of accomplishment.

Excellent 6. One or more artistic artifacts that have received notable awards or honors from highly-regarded professional or national competitions for scholarly or creative activity. Awards/fellowships are evidence of work that demonstrates peer-reviewed acknowledgment in the candidate's field of expertise. Awards or fellowships that compensate with funding should not be treated as a type of RSCA product, however. The credibility of the work, established prior to receiving the award or fellowship that garnered the award, shall be reviewed or assessed.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "EXCELLENT STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities listed above that meet the level of Excellent. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a composer may meet the "Excellent" standard with multiple performances of original compositions, or

a) Two or more performances of original (composed or choreographed) works by professional ensembles, and
b) A professional video or audio recording of original works, commercially distributed, and
c) Multiple conference/workshop/masterclass, etc., presentations.

SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DANCE
OPTIONAL EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS

Achievements in the areas of research, scholarship, creative activities, and professional accomplishments will undergo review as part of the RTP process in the School of Music and Dance. The School RTP Committee may review the work and indicate the extent of its quality and significance. Work accepted by an editorial or review board or jury in of itself constitutes an evaluation of that work (S15-8, 2.3.1.3). For work that has not been accepted by an editorial or review board or jury, candidates for tenure or promotion may choose to include external reviews of their RSCA activities (S15-8). Faculty in the School of Music and Dance may elect to submit their entire RSCA portfolio for external review.

If a candidate elects to have external reviews, and in keeping with the Collective Bargaining Agreement Contract (2014-2020), the recommended process in the School of Music and Dance is described below. These recommendations encompass research, scholarly and artistic and professional activities and are based on precedent from the School of Music and Dance RTP review process, current academic literature on the subject of external reviews and follow university policy (S15-8) and the SMD RTP Guidelines.

PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. At the beginning of the RTP review process and being advised by the Director and the School RTP committee, candidates will select material to be included in the dossier (documentation of RSCA activity) to be sent to external reviewers. The Director will be in charge of making these materials available to reviewers in timely manner while safeguarding confidentiality of the review process.

2. Only material that is in the dossier can be sent out for external review.

3. For the selection of reviewers the candidate will submit two names, and the SMD RTP Committee and Director will submit two names. Out of these four names, two will be selected to constitute the candidate's external reviewers, one from the candidate's list and one from the RTP Committee's list.

4. Candidates must write a statement identifying their relationship to external reviewers, if any, including any potential conflict of interest. (S15-8, 2.3.1.3).

5. The candidate will be notified of the Committee's choice of reviewers. Candidates may identify any suggested reviewer from the Committee's list that they perceive as holding a negative bias towards the candidate. The name may still be included in the final list of external reviewers, but the RTP Committee shall note the potential negative bias of the reviewer.

6. In the case where a reviewer requested by the candidate is the same as one requested by the Committee, the choice will be identified as mutual. The Director and the RTP committees can ensure that no more than one duplicate name is on the final 2-name list. If all the names are the same, two reviewers will be selected, regardless.

7. Reviews should be from experts in the candidate's (sub)field (in academic or professional organizations related to the candidate's field of work) but not that candidate's collaborators, friends or individuals invested in the candidate's success.

8. External reviewers will be asked to comment on the quality and/or significance of the candidate's work according to the norms in the field and expectations set in the SMD guidelines. Only RSCA work *included in the dossier* may be reviewed.

9. Materials made available to reviewers:
    - Statements from the candidate on her/his RSCA activities.
    - Link to an online portfolio (Optional).
    - Examples of materials:
        - Scholarly work, creative works, audio recordings, performances (video and/or audio recordings [online portfolios], programs), scores, any material that documents the activity in as much detail as possible.

10. External reviewers are informed that, per SJSU RTP policy, their review letters will be included in the candidate's dossier and will be available to the candidate during the RTP process.

11. Reviewers will be asked to summarize their current position or job title, expertise, and in what capacity they know the candidate; disclose any potential conflict of interest. (S17-8, 2.3.1.4)

12. Review letters are to be sent to the SMD RTP Committee for inclusion in the dossier.

RTP Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines
School of Music and Dance
Hybrid (Scholarly &Artistic Activities)

By a vote secret of _12_ for, _0__ against, _1__ abstain, _0_ absent, the FT faculty of the School of Music and Dance approves these guidelines; September _21_, 2021

INTRODUCTION

The School of Music and Dance (SMD) has developed Scholarly/Artistic/Professional Achievement Guidelines to assist committees and administrators outside the School at all levels of review to understand standards appropriate to the applicant's profession (S15-7 - 4.1.5.), and to ensure fair and equitable application of these standards to the broader procedures and criteria of University policies.

The SMD has determined that the standard criteria for Teaching and Service serve the needs of our School, but that the great diversity and range of artistic, creative, and scholarly achievements in the fields of music and dance warrant an explanation of School-specific guidelines.

The SMD regards scholarly work, artistic creation, and performance as equivalent. Our guidelines explain a candidate's merit in light of their work's originality, breadth, richness, productivity, and depth of creative expression and scholarly achievement.

We have defined RSCA achievement on the basis of three levels: baseline, good, and excellent. These levels of achievement outline the process whereby candidates narrate their creative/artistic/scholarly productivity in the context of S15-8.

ARTISTIC/CREATIVE AND SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

The SMD faculty is comprised of dance and musical performers, dance and musical directors, choreographers, composers, conductors, educators, music historians and music theorists. The RSCA activities of SMD faculty can be understood, generally, to fall into two distinct categories: artistic/creative and scholarly. Each music and dance discipline provides its own avenues for creative output and the transmission of knowledge. Faculty may be engaged in artistic/creative or scholarly work, or their work may include *both* categories. The SMD faculty recognizes that scholarly and creative activities can be represented by a wide variety of artistic expression appropriate and acceptable for RTP candidates in the disciplines of music and dance.

RTP RSCA GUIDELINES

The SMD's RTP RSCA standards are guided by the belief that faculty are expected to carry out work that has made substantial contributions to their respective artistic or scholarly fields, the mission of San José

State University, and the mission of the SMD. Faculty contributions shall be available in ways that permit informed response, including peer review.

S15-8 states that "Levels of achievement shall be awarded appropriately not only in the individual category but also for the level of synergism that could not have been achieved without the overlap." (S15-8, 2.0). Accordingly, a candidate's dossier may span both creative and scholarly accomplishments. Candidates should clearly communicate how their work meets the following guidelines, identifying their contributions to different categories as appropriate.

Candidates will identify which aspect of their RSCA projects are to be evaluated as creative accomplishments, and which aspects are to be evaluated as scholarly accomplishments. Each entry shall be evaluated according to the respective criteria described in the list of hypothetical examples (see below), keeping in mind that this list is not exhaustive, but rather a sample of the types of activities that candidates in the School may produce. In accordance with S15-8, if a single project or entry in the dossier spans both artistic and scholarly achievements, these aspects will be assessed by their respective criteria (artistic or scholarly). Further, these may be assessed at different levels of achievement. For example, the artistic aspect of a specific project may qualify as Excellent while the scholarly aspect may qualify as Baseline, rendering a total combined ranking of "Good" for the project.

VENUES BEYOND CONVENTIONAL PERFORMANCES, RECITALS, AND PUBLICATIONS

As appropriate, candidates should request outside reviews of their activities, so that these contributions are documented and reviewed, and not merely enumerated.

PEER REVIEW IN OUR DISCIPLINES AND THE NEED FOR DOCUMENTATION

For many artistic/creative/scholarly activities, peer review is documented, and expressed either in traditional academic or non-traditional formats. Peer review of scholarly articles in music and dance is no different from that in similar fields within the humanities. Peer review of experiential creative work, however, sometimes finds expression in formats outside the norms of traditional academic discourse.

For example, peer review of a performance may be documented by published reviews and/or evaluations in printed or on-line media, sometimes including responses in the same artistic expression as the work itself (e.g., a dance review that is itself a dance).
Another example: Peer review may be expressed and evaluated by consideration of invitations to perform, conduct, or choreograph highly regarded ensembles and companies, in concert series, summer workshops, or festivals; or via invitations to speak at concerts, conferences, and colloquia. In many cases, the *invitation* to create, perform, or present may be evaluated as a peer review, acknowledging that the invitation is based on the prestige the musician/dancer acquired over many past performances. Indeed, the reputation of a faculty member through their artistic/creative/scholarly activities is one of the most important forms of peer review in the field of music and dance. For composers or choreographers, distinction is also demonstrated through repeated performances of works that further enhance the artist's stature.

Candidates are expected to provide evidence of the works and activities cited in their RTP files in the form of concert programs, invitation correspondences, performance contracts, evaluation letters by the candidate's peers or other individuals possessing the background to provide substantial critical commentary, and other similar types of documentation.

Evidence for a peer-reviewed article would satisfy the university policy "acceptance of scholarly or artistic work by an editorial or review board (or jury) constitutes and evaluation of that work" (S15-8, 2.3.1.3) since "published or otherwise completed works that are peer-reviewed or juried will normally receive the greatest weight." (S15-8, 2.3.1.4) Journals and books published through academic presses are typically peer reviewed. We embrace the policy's requirement that peer-reviewed or juried published work will normally receive the greatest weight. We believe, however, that many other forms of artistic achievement and scholarship that are not *conventionally* peer reviewed are, nevertheless, valuable and highly appropriate. Consequently, we encourage SMD faculty to pursue all forms of artistic creation, performance, and scholarship, but require that candidates "request that disciplinary experts provide evaluations of any of their work to be included in the dossier," especially of work that is not conventionally peer reviewed. (See *School of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*, below.)

Whether reviewing artistic, scholarly or professional achievement, "external reviewers must be objective, and any relationships that could compromise objectivity should be disclosed in the evaluation." (S15-8, 2.3.1.3) For example, a candidate with extensive performance activities or numerous non-reviewed or community concerts and events, should seek a review from one or more independent experts from within their discipline to determine the quality, extent, and impact of their contributions.

Given the unfamiliarity that many University's committees will have with the diverse range of artistic and creative achievement appropriate to our multifaceted disciplines, candidates are advised to document whether and how each achievement is peer-reviewed, and sensibly explain all non-traditional reviews of their work.

LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

The following three levels—baseline, good, and excellent—offer examples of scholarly/creative activities within our disciplines that demonstrate quality and quantity of work to satisfy the requirements for tenure and promotion.

EXAMPLES of LEVELS of ACHIEVEMENT

S15-7 (4.2.1) requires that guidelines provide hypothetical examples of profiles that would warrant a given level of achievement. The School of Music and Dance provides these sample profiles, remaining acutely aware that they should be "inclusive and not exclusive in nature." If a candidate from the SMD has achievements that are roughly parallel with the kinds and levels of achievement outlined below, these hypothetical profiles serve as a fair scale to assist in the evaluation and level of achievement attained by a candidate. We anticipate, however, that some candidates will have types and combinations of achievements not anticipated in these guidelines. Such achievements should be assessed using the more general language of the policy on Criteria and Standards (S15-8).

Given the School of Music and Dance's mission to cultivate and grow ties in the Bay Area and California, within our home community as well as reaching out to other locations globally, to provide educational leadership in our artistic communities, and to provide leadership in the dynamic and innovative nature of media for artistic/creative and scholarly work, we view:

- our faculty's artistic/creative and scholarly activities in local performance venues, places of worship, K-12 schools, and community colleges as important and critical to each faculty members' individual mission within the University;
- the application of artistic/creative and scholarly activities through the training of music and dance teachers and advisory services to local school districts and non-profits as having high social impact;
- the publication within open access journals and media as valid, provided they meet the same standards for peer review and ethics as traditional journals.

Unsatisfactory: Any candidate not meeting the standards of "Baseline" will be evaluated as "Unsatisfactory." The candidate has not created scholarly/artistic/professional accomplishments that meet the baseline level.

The following hypothetical examples describe profiles that warrant a given level of achievement in their respective scholarly/artistic/creative categories including hybrid accomplishments that may overlap RSCA and teaching.

Artistic/Creative "Baseline":

Baseline: The candidate has, over the course of the period of review, created a body of completed scholarly/artistic/professional achievements and shows promise of continued growth and success within their discipline.

Baseline 1. At least two appearances in a leading position—e.g., conductor, solo performer, creator, producer—with one or two reputable performing organizations.

Baseline 2. At least three appearances as a member of one or more reputable performing organizations such as ensembles, orchestras, theater or dance companies.

Baseline 3. At least three presentations in workshops, clinics, and/or masterclasses at local/regional high schools, community colleges, local groups, and/or local venues.

Baseline 4. Direction of a fully produced dance performance at a regional dance venue.

Baseline 5. One or two original choreographed works for one or more professional regional or national dance companies.

Scholarly "Baseline":
Baseline 1. At least two single or co-authored articles in scholarly journals, or book chapters in collections from academic or educational presses, especially as part of a promising pattern of accomplishments.

Baseline 2. A consistent series of articles or local/regional conference presentations presented to music/dance audiences, and/or academic or disciplinary professionals, provided these presentations/articles are linked to the faculty member's areas of disciplinary expertise or contribute to better teaching. Such documents should receive positive independent reviews. (See *School Of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*, below.)

Baseline 3. Occasionally, items from the above may overlap with elements of creative activities such as presentations at scholarly conferences, musical or dance workshops, clinics, concert, and/or master-classes at regional, national, and/or international venues. In such cases, the candidate shall demonstrate that these activities are linked to the faculty member's disciplinary areas of expertise, and shall present these activities to independent review (see *School Of Music And Dance Optional External Review Process*.)

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "BASELINE STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities that meet the level of Baseline. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a music historian may meet the baseline standard with three published articles, or might meet the baseline standard with a combination that includes

a) one single authored article, and
b) one book chapter editorially reviewed, and
c) one musical performance as a soloist.

Artistic/Creative "Good":

Good: The candidate has created scholarly/artistic/professional achievements that constitute important contributions to the discipline and that help to enhance the scholarly/artistic/ professional reputation of the School, College, SJSU, or the CSU more generally.

Good 1. At least three appearances in a leading position—e.g., conductor, solo performer, creator, producer—with one or more reputable performing organizations, especially as part of a studied and purposeful pattern of accomplishment. Peer review may consist of published reviews in major newspapers or other influential and non-partial commercial media outlets.

Good 2. A series of up to four invited performances as a member of or in collaboration with regional, national, or internationally recognized reputable ensembles, orchestras, theater or dance companies.

Good 3. At least two presentations in workshops, clinics, and/or masterclasses at local or regional field conferences (such as CBDA-Bay Section or CASMEC).

Good 4. A full-length performance/recital consisting of the candidate's compositions or original choreography, performed by a reputable group unaffiliated with SJSU.

Good 5. Multiple invited commissions as creator for, or performances as, conductor or performer with a reputable ensemble. In some instances such ensembles are composed of professional musicians; in other cases, such ensembles consist of trained and dedicated performers whose primary source of income is something other than music.

Good 6. At least two fully produced dance performances at one or more regional dance venues.

Good 7. At least three original choreographed works for one or more professional regional or national dance companies.

Scholarly "Good":

Good 1. An academic book, edited volume or scholarly music or dance edition of a pre-existing work.

Good 2. A publication of a series of articles or chapters, whether single-authored or not, appearing in reputable academic journals or chapters in book anthologies.

Good 3. A series of peer-reviewed publications, joined with media interviews and/or editorials. These activities must be independently reviewed and found to have a benefit to the public and also linked to the faculty member's areas of disciplinary expertise.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "GOOD STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities listed above that meet the level of Good. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a conductor or performer may meet the "Good" standard

with multiple solo performances or guest conducting appearances, or might meet the "Good" standard with a combination that includes

a) Two or more solo performances / conducting appearances, and
b) A CD recording, commercially released, and
c) A single authored peer reviewed article

Artistic/Creative "Excellent":

Excellent: This level requires achievements of both sufficient quality and quantity to establish a significant, salient, and growing reputation within the candidate's field. Excellence in scholarly/artistic/professional achievement results from a body of work that is recognized as significant within the discipline.

Excellent 1. Five or more appearances as conductor, soloist, or in a leading role with a major performing ensemble, or as a leading member of a regionally or nationally recognized dance company. Peer review may consist of published reviews in major newspapers or other influential and non-partial commercial media outlets. In some instances, such ensembles are composed of professional musicians; in other cases, such ensembles consist of trained and dedicated performers whose primary source of income is something other than music.

Excellent 2. One or more commissioned works from professional performers or organizations (such as from a performer or ensemble that primarily makes their living from performing). The candidate must provide evidence that the work qualifies for this status: a signed contract (without disclosing financial consideration) showing the nature of the commission shall suffice.

Excellent 3. At least two presentations in workshops, clinics, and/or masterclasses at a national or international field conferences (such as Midwest, ACDA, NASM).

Excellent 4. At least two full-length performance/recitals consisting of the candidate's compositions or original choreography, performed by a group unaffiliated with SJSU.

Excellent 5. A series of at least four original choreographed works for one or more professional dance companies, demonstrating a studied and purposeful pattern of accomplishment.

Excellent 6. One or more artistic artifacts that have received notable awards or honors from highly-regarded professional or national competitions for scholarly or creative activity. Awards/fellowships are evidence of work that demonstrates peer-reviewed acknowledgment in the candidate's field of expertise. Awards or fellowships that compensate with funding should not be treated as a type of RSCA product, however. The credibility of the work, established prior to receiving the award or fellowship that garnered the award, shall be reviewed or assessed.

Scholarly "Excellent":

Excellent 1. At least four publications, several of which appear in professional (e.g., peer-reviewed) academic or educational journals.

Excellent 2. An academic book or edition published by a reputable (e.g., peer-reviewed) academic or educational publisher.

Excellent 3. A portfolio of regular peer-reviewed publications such as that described above (Scholarly Good 3) may qualify as "excellent" if accompanied by a series of reports, extensive conference presentations, and/or academic lectures. Such documents/activities shall be independently reviewed and linked to faculty member's areas of disciplinary expertise, and/or found or contribute to better teaching.

GENERAL COMMENTS ABOUT "EXCELLENT STANDARDS"

The RTP Committee of the School of Music and Dance [including the Director] shall determine the quantity and significance of activities listed above that meet the level of Excellent. During the review period (six-year probationary period; five-or-more-year post tenure period), this may be met by multiple similar items or a combination of items. For example, a composer may meet the "Excellent" standard with multiple performances of original compositions, or

a) Two or more performances of original works by professional ensembles, and
b) A professional recording of original works, commercially distributed, and
c) Multiple conference presentations.

SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DANCE
OPTIONAL EXTERNAL REVIEW PROCESS

Achievements in the areas of research, scholarship, creative activities, and professional accomplishments will undergo review as part of the RTP process in the School of Music and Dance. The School RTP Committee may review the work and indicate the extent of its quality and significance. Work accepted by an editorial or review board or jury in of itself constitutes an evaluation of that work (S15-8, 2.3.1.3). For work that has not been accepted by an editorial or review board or jury, candidates for tenure or promotion may choose to include external reviews of their RSCA activities (S15-8). Faculty in the School of Music and Dance may elect to submit their entire RSCA portfolio for external review.

If a candidate elects to have external reviews, and in keeping with the Collective Bargaining Agreement Contract (2014-2020), the recommended process in the School of Music and Dance is described below. These recommendations encompass research, scholarly and artistic and professional activities and are based on precedent from the School of Music and Dance RTP review process, current academic literature on the subject of external reviews and follow university policy (S15-8) and the SMD RTP Guidelines.

PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS

1. At the beginning of the RTP review process and being advised by the Director and the School RTP committee, candidates will select material to be included in the dossier (documentation of RSCA activity) to be sent to external reviewers. The Director will be in charge of making these materials available to reviewers in timely manner while safeguarding confidentiality of the review process.

2. Only material that is in the dossier can be sent out for external review.

3. For the selection of reviewers the candidate will submit two names, and the SMD RTP Committee and Director will submit two names. Out of these four names, two will be selected to constitute the candidate's external reviewers, one from the candidate's list and one from the RTP Committee's list.

4. Candidates must write a statement identifying their relationship to external reviewers, if any, including any potential conflict of interest. (S15-8, 2.3.1.3).

5. The candidate will be notified of the Committee's choice of reviewers. Candidates may identify any suggested reviewer from the Committee's list that they perceive as holding a negative bias towards the candidate. The name may still be included in the final list of external reviewers, but the RTP Committee shall note the potential negative bias of the reviewer.

6. In the case where a reviewer requested by the candidate is the same as one requested by the Committee, the choice will be identified as mutual. The Director and the RTP committees can ensure that no more than one duplicate name is on the final 2-name list. If all the names are the same, two reviewers will be selected, regardless.

7. Reviews should be from experts in the candidate's (sub)field (in academic or professional organizations related to the candidate's field of work) but not that candidate's collaborators, friends or individuals invested in the candidate's success.

8. External reviewers will be asked to comment on the quality and/or significance of the candidate's work according to the norms in the field and expectations set in the SMD guidelines. Only RSCA work *included in the dossier* may be reviewed.

9. Materials made available to reviewers:
    - Statements from the candidate on her/his RSCA activities.
    - Link to an online portfolio (Optional).
    - Examples of materials:
        - Scholarly work, creative works, audio recordings, performances (video and/or audio recordings [online portfolios], programs), scores, any material that documents the activity in as much detail as possible.

10. External reviewers are informed that, per SJSU RTP policy, their review letters will be included in the candidate's dossier and will be available to the candidate during the RTP process.

11. Reviewers will be asked to summarize their current position or job title, expertise, and in what capacity they know the candidate; disclose any potential conflict of interest. (S17-8, 2.3.1.4)

12. Review letters are to be sent to the SMD RTP Committee for inclusion in the dossier.