

DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN AND SCANDINAVIAN
PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE

May 16, 2011

I. Procedures

a. Preamble

The University's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the Academic Affairs website

<http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/content/promotion-tenure-guide>

Below are specific procedures for the Department of German and Scandinavian.

b. Compendium of Procedures

i. Annual Reviews and Contract Renewal

Each assistant professor will be reviewed annually by the department head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate whether the faculty member is progressing towards a favorable promotion and tenure recommendation and offer an opportunity to address any problems in a timely fashion. In the middle of the promotion and tenure period, typically in the third year for faculty members who do not have prior credit towards tenure, the faculty member will undergo a contract renewal. The contract renewal is a thorough review that involves a departmental personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a review by the Department Head, and approval by the dean. A fully satisfactory review indicating that the faculty member is on track towards promotion and tenure will lead to a contract extension up through the promotion and tenure year. If the contract renewal process determines that the faculty member's record is not satisfactory and that promotion and tenure are not likely, the faculty member will be given a one-year, terminal contract. A faculty member may also be given a renewable contract that does not extend to the promotion and tenure year if there are questions as to whether the faculty member will have a record meriting promotion at the end of the promotion and tenure period. In such cases, the faculty member will be required to go through another contract renewal process prior to the promotion and tenure review in order to determine if the faculty member has been able to remedy the shortcomings in the record identified in the contract renewal process.

Annual reviews of untenured faculty are conducted by the Head of the Department of German and Scandinavian each May. The faculty member submits an up-to-date CV, copies of signed teaching evaluations plus a narrative describing accomplishments and goals for the coming year. The department head will make a classroom visitation, review the material and write a formal statement on performance. The statement is then discussed with and signed by the candidate.

Third-year review for Contract Renewal: In the third year of a faculty member's regular service, the tenured faculty will review and evaluate performance in the categories of research, teaching and service. The review should be candid and include, if necessary, specific suggestions for improvement. This review should be signed by the department head and by the person reviewed. A copy will be placed in the latter's personnel file but will not be used for the tenure file.

The third-year substantive (post-tenure) review: This review is conducted jointly by each individual faculty member and the appropriate dean, department, or program head. The faculty member submits by March 15th of the review year an updated vita and bibliography, and a summary statement of activities and accomplishments in the areas of research, teaching and service covering the previous three years. The dean, department, or program head reviews submitted materials then prepares a brief statement evaluating the performance of the faculty member and, for associate professors, commenting on the degree to which the faculty member is on target for promotion. This statement is given to the faculty member and signed by the faculty member to indicate that he or she has read it. The faculty member may submit a written response to the statement within thirty days. A copy of the statement and any response by the faculty member is to be filed in the faculty member's personnel file no later than June 15th of the review year. This review is an element of annual salary adjustment decisions.

The sixth-year major review: The sixth-year major review should occur during the sixth year following the last promotion in rank, receipt of tenure, or the last sixth-year major review. The review should occur during the winter and spring terms. The faculty member to be reviewed will be notified by the appropriate dean, department, or program head no later than October 15th of the review year. The report of the elected standing committee is submitted to the department head who then reviews all relevant information and prepares a summary sixth-year major report. These two reports are given to the faculty member and signed by the faculty member to indicate that he or she has read them. The faculty member may submit a written response to these reports within thirty days. A copy of these two reports and any response by the faculty member is filed in the faculty member's personnel file and a copy of these two

reports and any response by the faculty member are forwarded to the appropriate dean no later than June 15th of the review year. A positive evaluation at the sixth-year major review of a faculty member holding the rank of Full Professor or Tenured Senior Instructor results in a recommendation to the Provost of an increase to the base salary of that faculty member according to guidelines established by the College of Arts and Sciences. Other faculty rewards should also be considered by the review committee for recommendation to the dean or department head.

See this site for more information:

<http://policies.uoregon.edu/policy/by/1/03000-human-resources/post-tenure-review>

ii. Review Period

A candidate is normally reviewed for promotion and tenure in the sixth full-time equivalent year of service. An accelerated review can occur in an unusually meritorious case or when credit for prior service at another institution has led to a contractual agreement to this effect at the time of hire. The terms of hire should make clear where on the timeline an individual faculty member stands; from that time on, subsequent advances in rank will be awarded according to established promotion procedures. In all other cases in which credit for prior service at another institution is agreed upon, scholarly work completed by the faculty member during those years will receive full consideration during the promotion and tenure process. Should a faculty member who has agreed to an accelerated review at the time of hire choose to delay that review for the full six years of full time service, scholarly work completed prior to arrival at the University of Oregon will be of secondary consideration during the promotion and tenure process and consideration of scholarly achievement will focus on work completed during the six full-time years of service at the University of Oregon. The University also has Parental Leave/Pregnancy and Medical Leave policies that can affect the timing of promotion by “stopping the tenure clock” for a pre-specified and contractual period of time. Faculty members considering such leaves should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/>. Faculty members should discuss the timing of leave and its relation to the promotion and tenure decision with the department head who may also consult with the dean and the provost to ensure that there is appropriate and clear written documentation of leave agreements.

iii. External Reviewers

In the spring term prior to the year when the tenure case is to be considered, the department head will consult with members of the department and, when appropriate, members of any UO research institute/center with which the faculty member is affiliated, and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research record of the candidate. Subsequently, the

candidate will be asked to submit a list of potential external referees to the department head. These processes must be independent. External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be full professors who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record. Generally, dissertation advisors, close personal friends, or other individuals who might be viewed as having a conflict of interest, are not asked to be external reviewers. The University requires that a clear majority of the reviewers come from the department's list of recommended reviewers; there must be at least five letters in the submitted file. If the department's list of recommended external referees overlaps with the candidate's list of recommended external referees, these referee's names will count as department-recommended reviewers. External reviewers are generally asked to submit their letters by late September or early October.

iv. Internal Reviewers

The department may also solicit on-campus letters from those familiar with the candidate's teaching, scholarship or service. In particular, inclusion of an internal review is the norm when a faculty member is a member of a research institute/center. This review is prepared by the director of the institute/center, in consultation with its senior members.

v. Degree of Candidate Access to File

The candidate must submit a signed waiver letter in the spring term prior to the file being sent to external reviewers. The candidate can waive access fully, partially waive access, or retain full access to the file. The candidate should consult the Academic Affairs website <http://academicaffairs.uoregon.edu/> for a complete description of the waiver options.

vi. Candidate's Statement

The candidate is required to prepare a personal statement in the spring term prior to promotion and tenure consideration. The statement should describe the candidate's scholarly accomplishments, agenda, and future plans. The Office of Academic Affairs indicates that a five-page, single-spaced statement is ordinarily sufficient. The candidate's personal statement also should include a section describing his or her teaching program, indicating courses taught, pedagogical objectives and methods, and any past, present, or future course development activity. It should also contain a discussion of service activities for the department, the college, the university, the profession, and the community. The personal statement should be accessible to several audiences, including external reviewers, fellow department members, other university colleagues, and administrators. Thus, the personal statement should strike a balance between communicating with experts in the field and those who are not

members of the discipline and who may not be familiar with the candidate's area of research. Candidates are encouraged to seek advice on their personal statements from tenured colleagues.

vii. Dossier

In addition to the letters from the external reviewers and, when appropriate, internal letters, including one from a candidate's research institute/center director, the dossier should include: (1) a signed and dated current curriculum vitae; (2) copies of all significant publications, which may include "in production" or "forthcoming" work (an unpublished work may be described on the C.V. as "in production" or "forthcoming" if it has been accepted in its final form; there must be written affirmation [may be an email] from the editor of a press for a book, the editor of a journal for an article, and the book editor for a book chapter, as to its full acceptance and a statement that all requested revisions have been submitted and that the work in question is no longer subject to authorial or editorial change beyond those required by the publication process); works in progress may be included as the candidate chooses; (3) a signed and dated candidate's statement; (4) a signed copy of the waiver or non-waiver letter; (5) a list of courses taught by term and year with numbers of students and numerical evaluation scores provided to the department by the registrar; (6) syllabi and other course materials; (7) a list of all Ph.D., M.A./M.S., and undergraduate honors theses, with an indication of whether the candidate was the committee chair or a committee member; (8) signed student comments; (9) peer evaluations; (10) external reviewer biographies and a description of any relationship between the candidate and the review. Candidates should be sure to submit updated information to the department head as to the ongoing status of all submitted publications (acceptance, in production or forthcoming, and appearance, with the necessary documentation) throughout the promotion and tenure process; the department head should notify the CAS Associate Dean with responsibility for promotion and tenure when new information becomes available.

viii. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term, and prior to the deadline by which the tenure case must be submitted, the department head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. If there is an insufficient number of tenured faculty in the department to constitute a personnel committee, the department head should select committee members from tenured faculty in other related departments with guidance from the dean and the appropriate associate dean. This committee will be charged with submitting a written report to the department evaluating the candidate's case for promotion and tenure. In particular, the committee report will include an internal assessment of the candidate's work, a summary and evaluation of the external and internal referees' assessment of the candidate's work, an evaluation of teaching that includes a discussion of the numerical student evaluation scores, written comments, and peer reviews, and an assessment of

department, university, professional, and community service. The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding promotion and tenure. The committee report is generally made available in the department office to all tenured faculty of appropriate rank for review prior to the department meeting. Both associate and full professors vote in promotion to associate professor and tenure cases, but only full professors vote for promotion from associate to full professor.

ix. Department Meeting and Vote

In general, the department will hold a meeting in mid- to late October to consider its promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Voting members meet and discuss the committee report and the case. Following discussion, members vote by signed, secret ballot on whether to recommend promotion and tenure (or just promotion in the case of a promotion to full professor). When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied, usually by the department head, and the department will be informed of the final vote tally. The anonymity of the individual votes will be maintained, although the signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope by the department head in case they are requested by the dean or the provost. The department head does not vote.

ix. Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes a separate statement. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; significance of order of names on publications, etc.). The statement also offers a recommendation regarding the case for promotion and tenure that may or may not agree with the department vote. The department head's statement, the personnel committee report, the recorded vote, and the materials submitted by the candidate are added to the dossier. The completed file is then sent to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is generally in the middle of November for tenure cases and late November for full professor cases.

x. College and University Procedures

1. Once the file reaches CAS, it goes to the Dean's Advisory Committee (DAC), which is comprised of two faculty from each of the three divisions within CAS (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). If a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, s/he is recused from discussion and voting. The DAC reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The DAC then votes on whether the candidate should be recommended to the dean for promotion and, if appropriate, receive tenure. 2. After the file leaves the DAC, the dean receives the file and writes a

letter evaluating the research, teaching, and service record of the candidate based on the contents of the file. This letter indicates whether the dean supports or does not support promotion to associate professor and tenure or promotion to full professor. After the letter is completed, the candidate is invited to the dean's office for a meeting. In the meeting, the dean indicates whether or not he or she is supporting promotion, reads a redacted version of his or her evaluation letter, and answers any questions with regard to the position taken on promotion and tenure. The candidate may request a written summary of the dean's review after the meeting with the dean, even if the candidate has fully waived his or her access to the file. In most cases, the dean will meet with the candidate in the months of January, February, or March.

3. After the file leaves the College of Arts and Science (CAS), it goes to the Faculty Personnel Committee (FPC), a ten-person committee including CAS and professional school faculty members (if a member of the candidate's department is serving on this committee, he/she is recused from discussion and voting). The FPC also reads the file and writes a report evaluating the candidate's research, teaching, and service. The FPC votes on whether the candidate should be recommended to the Provost for promotion and, if appropriate, tenure.

4. Once the FPC has completed its deliberations, the file goes to the provost's office. The provost ultimately makes the promotion and tenure decision and all earlier deliberations, reports, and votes in the file are advisory to him or her. The provost reads the file and writes a brief letter describing his or her position with regard to promotion and/or tenure. If the promotion and tenure decision is a difficult one, the provost may in rare cases invite the candidate for a meeting. The provost's decision with regard to promotion and tenure is communicated by letter in campus mail. Except in rare and difficult cases, the provost has agreed to provide a decision in campus mail on May 1st (or before May 1st if it falls on a weekend). In other cases, the candidate will receive the letter on or before June 15th.

II. Guidelines

a. Preamble

These guidelines outline the departmental criteria for recommendation for promotion and tenure in German and Scandinavian. They provide a specific departmental context within the general university framework for promotion

and tenure of faculty. The guidelines that apply to the candidate's promotion file are generally those in force at the time of hire or at the time of the most recent promotion.

The Department of German and Scandinavian values excellence in both teaching and research. Excellence in one dimension alone may strengthen a case, but by itself will not be sufficient to ensure tenure and/or promotion.

b. Research

In making a recommendation for promotion and/or tenure at the department, college, or university levels, committees consider first and foremost the candidate's accomplishments as a research scholar. Normally, this is measured by her or his publication record. Faculty are expected to publish regularly.

For every tenure-track faculty member in the Department of German and Scandinavian, the primary goal should be to have a completed, peer-reviewed, authored book manuscript accepted for publication at a university or similar academic press. Its equivalent in the form of 6-10 peer-reviewed articles and book chapters may well result in a successful tenure case, but the publication of a monograph along with some articles makes a stronger case for promotion. The number of articles required depends on their length, substantive quality, impact and visibility, and also the volume and quality of other less directly related published work. The following also may constitute original scholarship: translations, critical editions, critical anthologies, and electronic research tools when they include a strong scholarly component (critical introduction, critical apparatus, commentary etc.). In the majority of cases the acceptance of a book for publication by a professionally acknowledged university or commercial press is a necessary (although not sufficient) condition for receiving promotion and tenure. When a dissertation has been converted into a book manuscript intended for submission to a press, tenure committees generally expect that substantial revision and additional research have augmented the manuscript's quality. For a strong case for tenure, the candidate should have a book, completed and accepted for publication, as well as some articles (3 or more) published in major refereed, peer-reviewed scholarly journals (e.g. *PMLA*, *New German Critique*, *Germanic Review*, *German Quarterly*, *Scandinavian Studies*). Quality as well as quantity counts. Publications should make a significant contribution to scholarship, as evaluated by recognized experts in the field according to current standards. Additionally, the record and the candidate's own statement should indicate ongoing scholarly activity, attendance and participation at national and international conferences, and the promise of future productivity.

Recent trends in the publication industry favor increased use of electronic and digital formats over traditional print. This change in format, however, does not alter the rigor of the scholarly review process. Scholarly publications in forms other than print (for example, projects in film or video) are evaluated according to prevailing standards in relevant research areas. No distinction is made

between electronic and traditional print publication of scholarly books, articles, or other research projects, although a very important distinction is made between academic publications that have been rigorously peer refereed by scholars in the field and those that have not received such evaluation. Scholars of German and Scandinavian letters, culture, and thought often publish in both US and international venues. The standard practices of evaluation at each press and its standing in the field are considered in the review process.

c. Definition of Completed Manuscript

A manuscript must be complete, accepted by a publisher, and “in production” in order to count towards promotion and tenure. This condition is essential with book manuscripts. “In production” indicates the completion of all work on the manuscript by the author, including all revisions, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting, page proofs, and indexing). Similarly, articles and book chapters must either be “in print” or “forthcoming” in order to be counted as publications. “Forthcoming” means that an article or book chapter has been accepted for publication and requires no further authorial revisions or editing, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs). A letter to this effect from a journal editor or editor of a volume of essays for each “forthcoming” publication is required. Generally, it is expected that the book should be “in production” and that each listed article or book chapter should be “forthcoming” by the time the candidate meets with the dean.

The terms of the original appointment (the 'job description') may define the nature of publications and the process of evaluation. Departments of foreign languages often hire language teaching specialists (LTS) who have as a primary responsibility the supervision and development of language instruction. Their assignment varies from other foreign language faculty members, and evaluation should reflect this difference. It is required that the LTS have a scholarly book published by a major press or substantial articles in refereed journals (those that publish research on issues of special relevance to teaching specialists, such as: *Die Unterrichtspraxis* [AATG], *Foreign Language Annals*; *Modern Language Journal*, *ADFL Bulletin*, etc.). Such scholarship may address issues relevant to the field of language instruction. When they embody up-to-date research in second-language pedagogy, textbooks and other published pedagogical materials (national tests, videos, computer software, etc.) are credited in the evaluation. These materials must be considered in terms of how innovative and influential they have been throughout the language teaching community. In all cases, quality is primary. Additionally, the record should indicate regular participation at national and international conferences, and the promise of future research activity.

For promotion from associate to full professor, the department expects the candidate to have a second book published or in production, or the equivalent in articles, which are either in print or forthcoming.

d. Teaching

The Department of German and Scandinavian values excellent teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Moreover, the Department expects that tenure-related faculty will share departmental responsibilities for classes taught at all levels.

In assessing teaching quality, the Department relies on a variety of sources, including numerical data compiled from student course evaluations, signed comments on student evaluations, a sample of course materials (e.g., syllabi, tests, homework assignments, etc.), and classroom visits by colleagues. The university has initiated a policy of peer review and evaluation of teaching in order to provide comprehensive and convergent evidence of faculty's teaching effectiveness. Each tenure-track faculty member must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer during each of the three years preceding the faculty member's promotion and tenure review. Each tenured faculty member with the rank of associate professor must have at least one course evaluated by a faculty peer every other year until promotion to full professor.

Documentation of activities is important. Special note will be taken of mentoring and supervision of graduate students and of advising and supervision of undergraduate students.

In assessing the teaching record of a language-teaching specialist, the usual criteria will prevail. However, it is understood that the LTS, because of supervision and co-ordination duties, might teach fewer courses than other faculty members.

e. Service

Service plays an essential role in promotion considerations. The Department expects its untenured members to participate responsibly and cooperatively when called upon for service within the Department, but in final analysis, service counts significantly less in consideration for tenure than either teaching or research. Untenured faculty members may find it appropriate to accept some limited college or university-wide committee service with the guidance of the department head. However, they should not undertake time-consuming commitments on major university committees.

Service to the profession, while not a major element in a tenure or promotion decision, is evaluated favorably and may indicate as well that the faculty member has the esteem of his or her professional peers. The Department recognizes service on national committees, membership of editorial boards, manuscript evaluations for journals and presses, etc., as service to the profession. Expectations for the LTS remain substantially the same as those for all candidates seeking tenure and promotion in the department.

In the case of promotion from associate to full professor, service is weighed heavily, and the candidate should have made an important contribution to the department, college, university, and profession.