

**DEPARTMENT OF GERMAN AND SCANDINAVIAN
REVIEW, PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES**

I. Procedures

A. Preamble

This policy applies to all represented faculty and is intended to comply with all provisions of Article 20 of the CBA. In the event of any discrepancies or inconsistencies, the CBA language applies for represented faculty. This policy also applies to all unrepresented faculty, unless a university-wide policy exists that contradicts the terms of this policy.

This policy is focused primarily on the criteria by which faculty are evaluated. Detailed descriptions of the processes by which reviews are conducted are presented in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and in relevant UO policies for unrepresented faculty. Procedures specific to the Department of German and Scandinavian are presented below. This document will be made available in the department or unit (as well as on the Academic Affairs website).

B. Department-Specific Procedures

i. Annual Reviews

Each tenure-track faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review 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. These reviews are conducted by the head of the Department of German and Scandinavian each year and are due in the Dean's Office at the end of April. 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 or another tenured faculty member will make a classroom visitation, review the material and write a formal statement on performance. The statement is then discussed with the candidate. The faculty member may submit a written response to the statement within ten 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 May 1 of the review year. Annual reviews will not be used for the promotion and tenure review.

ii. Contract Renewal/Third-Year Review

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. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following: (1) a CV, lists of publications and grants, and lists (by year and term) of their courses and committees to date; (2) a narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and (3) a brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond. 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.

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.

iii. Review for Promotion and Tenure

a. External Reviewers

In consultation with tenured faculty, the department head will assemble 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. 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.

b. 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.

c. 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 divisional 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

II. Guidelines

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 following criteria are based on faculty performance in research, teaching and service, which are allotted proportional weights of 40 : 40 : 20, respectively.

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.

A. 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 their 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 peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters articles (two or more) 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 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. Quality as well as quantity counts. For a strong case for tenure, the candidate should have a book, completed and accepted for publication, as well as some articles published in major refereed, peer-reviewed scholarly journals. 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.

i. 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.

B. 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 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 coordination duties, might teach fewer courses than other faculty members.

C. 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 their 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 substantial contributions to the department, college, university, and profession.

III. Post-Tenure Review

A. Third-Year Post-Tenure Review

Primary responsibility for the third-year PTR process lies with the department head. The third-year PTR should be commenced by the department head no later than during the Winter term, in order to allow it to be concluded before the end of the candidate's third-year post-tenure. The department head will contact the faculty member and request a CV and personal statement, including a discussion of contributions to institutional equity and inclusion. The department head will add to the evaluative file copies of the faculty member's teaching evaluations received during the period under review, including quantitative summary sheets and signed written evaluations, as well as any peer evaluations of teaching conducted during the review period. Consistent with department policy and practice, the file will be reviewed first by a committee, which will provide a written report to the department head that may be used as received or placed in additional written context by the department head. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. If the faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a development plan due to unsatisfactory performance (see discussion of sixth-year PTR, below), the faculty member's success in addressing concerns will be discussed. The report will be signed and dated by the department head and shared with the faculty member, who will also sign and date the report to signify its receipt. The faculty member may provide a written response if they desire within 10 days of receipt of the PTR report; an extension may be granted by mutual agreement between the faculty member and the department head. The report and, if provided, response from the faculty member, will be placed in the faculty member's personnel file as maintained at the unit level.

B. Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20, or in parallel University policy for unrepresented faculty members. Since the sixth-year PTR is expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, and service, the Department of German and Scandinavian expects the candidate to provide a portfolio of publications (or documentation of other scholarship activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/UO policy.

A development plan is required for faculty who are not achieving a satisfactory level of performance. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan, but if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean's approval will be forwarded to the provost or designee for review and approval.

If a sixth-year PTR results in creation of a professional development plan, future PTR for the faculty member will include consideration of the extent to which the terms of the development plan have been met. However, progress toward meeting the goals of such a development plan need not and should not be evaluated solely within the context of the PTR process.

See this site for more information: <http://policies.uoregon.edu/policy/by/1/03000-human-resources/post-tenure-review>