

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
School of Music and Dance

Musicology and Ethnomusicology Area, Music Theory Area

PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES

July 2007¹

I. PROMOTION AND TENURE REVIEW

A. Overview

Promotion to a tenured position in the School of Music and Dance at the University of Oregon depends on outstanding scholarly research and teaching, and satisfactory institutional and public service. Tenure-track faculty are hired with confidence that they have the potential to achieve these high standards and with the expectation and hope that they will become permanent colleagues. The purpose of this document is to codify school-wide and discipline specific tenure policies and expectations with the intention of promoting achievement among untenured faculty while minimizing undue anxiety and stress. This document discusses criteria for achievement in research, teaching, and service in preparation for applying for indefinite tenure and promotion.

B. Criteria for Tenure

The University of Oregon Faculty Handbook (11TH edition, 1999) lists four areas of competence upon which the institution judges faculty: (1) Quality of teaching; (2) Professional growth, scholarly activities, and creative and artistic achievement; (3) Leadership in academic and administrative service; and (4) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community. The handbook notes that these four elements may not carry equal weight. The following represents relative levels of importance attached to each element by the School of Music and Dance when considering candidates for tenure in the areas or disciplines of musicology, ethnomusicology, and music theory.

(1) Scholarly Activities

Development of a mature program of independent, scholarly research is an absolute requirement for a recommendation of promotion with tenure in the School. We expect that tenured faculty will perform at a national level with the best of our colleagues at other AAU research universities. The most important evidence to support achievement in scholarly research is a series of quality activities including publishing in refereed publications and making professional presentations that are judged to be significant by peers at the university and experts at other institutions. It should be understood that

¹ “D-R-A-F-T #4” removed from document header 02/10/2017

tenure candidates will strive to have their works appear in the best refereed journals in the field or book publication by the best academic publishers. A second criterion is evidence of a continuing commitment to research as evidenced by a body of work that is in progress and significant work being planned.

Written evaluations of the quality and significance of research endeavors will be obtained from outside reviewers; internal evaluations from school colleagues will also be solicited. Additional evidence of impact and stature in the field may sometimes include invited lectures and/or professorships, invitations to serve on journal editorial boards, and outside financial support. Scholarly work, however, will be judged on its own merits, not on the funding, which it may or may not receive. Furthermore, the school recognizes that standardized criteria cannot exist that will apply equally to all faculty members. Rather, we will make every effort to consider the various factors that impinge on each individual case, and judge accordingly.

Scholarly Activities--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:

All faculty are hired with the expectation that they will establish themselves as outstanding researchers and scholars. We try to facilitate this process by assigning reasonable teaching loads and reduced service expectations for untenured faculty. If, at tenure review time, letters from outside expert peers evaluate a candidate's research as less than outstanding, then it is unlikely that the school will recommend promotion. This is true even if teaching and service are judged to be outstanding. New faculty members especially need to be aware of a pitfall of university life: much of it, for example classroom teaching and committee meetings, is scheduled by others. Thus, it is important to maintain a focus on research as a high priority.

Publications resulting from work carried out while a member of the University of Oregon faculty will be given more weight in the tenure decision than those resulting from work carried out previously, usually the most recent six year period. Collaborative research efforts are encouraged and valued. It is also necessary to demonstrate independence with the clearest evidence being quality publications and presentations carried out solely by a single faculty member.

Although outside financial support for research is often helpful in the pursuit of high quality scholarship, we recognize the competitive nature of research funding in the arts and humanities as well as the lack of ample funding opportunities. Our school's emphasis is on research quality and significance, not on levels of research funding. A candidate's research funding will be considered within the framework of need and availability. Junior faculty should be cautioned that ability to attract research funding is not a substitute for high quality publications.

Documentation of scholarly research accomplishments is crucial. When a research project is complete, it should be submitted for publication promptly. A steady, consistent, and ongoing record of presentations and publications is evidence of

steady research progress. Except in unusual circumstances, a several year gap in one's presentation and publication record, followed by a burst of activity just prior to tenure review, will not generally inspire confidence that a candidate has a long-term commitment to research. Moreover, internal and outside reviewers alike will look much more favorably on a set of published papers and in-press papers than on a set of manuscripts nearly ready for submission. At the same time, the school discourages publishing before the work is ready, or a breaking apart of what might make a single very nice story into a collection of substantially less coherent pieces purely for the sake of increasing the number of publications.

Take opportunities to let discipline area members and other school-wide colleagues know about your research progress. The school includes considerable breadth, and generally colleagues in your own discipline area will be the most knowledgeable about, and have the most expertise to evaluate, your research program. The school at large recognizes this fact and at tenure time will place special importance on the recommendations that come from your faculty colleagues in musicology, ethnomusicology, and music theory.

There are several ways of informing members of the school about your research progress. If UO colleagues are at a professional meeting you are attending, you might urge them to come to your presentation. Asking colleagues to critique manuscripts and grant proposals is a superb avenue for evaluation in a way that will be of particular benefit to you.

In addition to published articles or a book, musicologists, ethnomusicologists, and music theorists are often invited to write reviews, critical editions, historical recording liner notes, extensive translations or encyclopedia articles, as well as having conference papers published in proceedings. These kinds of printed materials are also important to a tenure candidate's reputation and assist in providing additional evidence of the value of a faculty member's scholarly work and reputation.

It is also the expectation of the school that faculty demonstrate active and ongoing participation in the sub-discipline's professional societies and organizations through the regular presentation of scholarly papers at regional, national, and international meetings.

(2) Teaching Quality

One mission at the University of Oregon is to educate students by helping them learn to question critically, think logically, communicate clearly, act creatively, and live ethically. Therefore, outstanding teaching is an absolute requirement for tenure in the School of Music and Dance. Unsatisfactory teachers will not become tenured even if their research is stellar.

Teaching of graduate and undergraduate students will be evaluated based on the guidelines presented below from the "Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education" as compiled in a study supported by the American Association for Higher Education and the Education Commission of the States:

- Good practice encourages student-faculty contact. Student motivation and interest is encouraged by frequent student-faculty contact. Does the teacher spend the appropriate amount of contact hours in lectures, labs, discussions, office hours, and drop-in visits?
- Good practice encourages cooperation among students. Working with others often increases active learning. Sharing ideas and responding to others' thoughts can improve critical thinking and can deepen understanding.
- Good practice encourages active learning. Effective learning does not occur simply by sitting in class listening to a lecture, memorizing pre-packaged assignments, and spitting out answers. Does the teacher encourage students to talk about, think about, write about, and relate subject matter to past experience?
- Good practice gives prompt feedback. Knowing what you know and don't know focuses learning. Does the teacher provide frequent opportunities for students to demonstrate performance and provide early, prompt, and adequate suggestions for improvement?
- Good practice communicates high expectations. Expecting students to perform at a high level becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Does the teacher hold high expectations for students and communicate to students that level of achievement?
- Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning. Students bring different talents and backgrounds into the classroom and learn in different ways. Does the teacher give all students the opportunity to show their talents and learn in ways that work best for them?

The school also encourages the recognition of ethnic and racial diversity, and the fostering of an inclusive classroom environment.

The central criteria for teaching excellence are command of the subject matter, the ability to present key ideas clearly and logically, and the progress made by students toward mastery of the concepts that are central to the subject.

The school assesses quality of teaching in several ways: (1) Self-assessment of teaching performance; (2) Peer evaluation of classroom teaching; (3) Student evaluation; (4) Supervision of student research and reading; and (5) Contribution to the teaching aims of the school.

Self-assessment of teaching performance. Candidates will include in their candidate's statement for the promotion and tenure file a short narrative describing their teaching accomplishments and goals. The narrative will include: (1) A list of courses taught. (2) A statement of how the candidate's courses fit into the teaching goals of the school. (3) A self-assessment of strengths of the candidate's teaching program. Additional benefit may

be gained by a self-assessment of teaching weaknesses, but it is not required that the candidate point these out. (4) A statement of teaching plans for the future. This step should also be a part of the faculty member's annual reporting and review process with the dean.

Peer evaluation of classroom teaching. Serious, candid peer evaluation is weighted heavily in the overall assessment of teaching quality. Classroom teaching will be regularly evaluated, in accordance with university legislation.

Student evaluation. These evaluations include: (1) Opinions as evidenced from the standard student evaluation computer-scored forms. (2) Signed written statements from students on course evaluations. (3) In some instances, letters solicited from former students.

Supervision of student research and reading. Individualized teaching is a major aspect of university education. You will put significant effort into advising and mentoring undergraduate and graduate students. This may involve supervising research projects or teaching individualized directed reading courses. This important component of your teaching responsibilities may be evaluated by soliciting comments from those students whom you have supervised. If you have aided other students whose identities are less obvious, you may wish to list them in your self-assessment, or ask them to submit reviews to the school.

Contribution to the teaching aims of the school. (1) Does the candidate participate in curriculum development? (2) Does the candidate generate any special initiatives in teaching? (i.e., training grant director, innovative teaching programs, etc.) (3) Does the candidate's teaching program balance the needs of the school with specialty courses of the candidate's own choosing?

Teaching Quality--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:

Some new faculty will have had little experience being solely responsible for organizing and presenting an entire term's course. If this is the case, you may be assigned initially to team-taught courses. These assignments should be taken as opportunities to analyze critically various aspects of the course, including elements of instruction executed effectively by the professor(s) with whom you are teaching, and elements that might be improved. You should also take the opportunity to attend courses taught by other faculty members. Additionally, the university has a Teaching Effectiveness Program (TEP) that provides support and training for faculty at many different levels. We highly recommend the utilization of TEP's services to help enhance faculty members' teaching abilities.

Student evaluations are important, however it is not just the raw scores that we are interested in. Student comments will be interpreted in the context of the rest of the teaching record, as well as the context of the particular course. Sometimes very good

teachers do not get the best scores on student evaluations, and vice-versa. That is why we try to make a distinction between faculty member A with a score of 9 and comments like “this was a fun and entertaining class” and faculty member B with a similar score but comments like “the instructor really challenged me to think”. Likewise, we would try to distinguish between faculty member C with scores of 7 and comments such as “there was too much work for a 100-level class” and faculty member D with similar scores but comments such as “the teacher was arrogant and inaccessible” or “the teacher was habitually late for class”.

(3) Leadership in academic and administrative service

The University of Oregon Faculty Handbook lists as a criterion for promotion and tenure institutional service including school, college, and university committees on curriculum, personnel, and policies. The faculty play an important role in the governance and policies of this university, and the university in fact expects participation of its faculty members.

The school similarly expects a demonstration of competence in the area of institutional service at the level of the school and the discipline area. This does not imply that each faculty member must contribute in some fixed proportion to institutional service or that faculty must equally share responsibilities. In particular, untenured faculty will generally have lighter service responsibilities than tenured faculty.

Individuals bring different skills to institutional service and contribute at various levels from time to time within the framework of acceptable performance. Responsibilities at the various levels of organization must be weighed against each other, balancing heavy commitment in one area against lighter responsibilities in others.

Note, however, that a faculty member's first responsibilities are toward excellent research and outstanding teaching; exemplary service coupled with lackluster scholarship and ineffective teaching will not merit tenure.

Academic and Administrative Service--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:

The school realizes that administrative and committee responsibilities can detract from the main mission for untenured faculty: academic development, achievement of scholarly goals, and effective teaching. Consequently, untenured faculty are encouraged to exercise judgment in their allocation of time. Likewise, the dean and area head are strongly discouraged from assigning junior faculty time-consuming service assignments.

While untenured faculty and junior tenured faculty may wish to contribute to university governance and policy making decisions through service outside the school, this should ordinarily be discouraged among untenured faculty. Remember, service is no substitute for scholarship and teaching at tenure time.

(4) Service and activities on behalf of the larger community

The final criterion listed by The University of Oregon Faculty Handbook is community service. This includes academic contributions to community activities and public bodies, as well as to local, national, or international professional organizations. Examples in the local community might include developing arts enrichment programs for local children or involvement with a local arts organization in the area of one's academic expertise. Service activities for professional organizations might include serving as a regional or national-level officer or executive board member, hosting an annual meeting, reviewing of manuscripts, editorial responsibilities for the society's scholarly journal, and/or reviewing grant proposals.

The main point to consider with respect to community service is that it serves largely as an embellishment to one's list of scholarly activities. Service activities have a transient impact on one's scholarly reputation, and in no way substitute for direct involvement in an active program of research.

Community Service--Suggestions to Untenured Faculty:

Untenured faculty should be cautious in taking on larger responsibilities, such as membership on editorial boards or grant-review panels. While such activities can be quite educational, and they carry a certain amount of prestige, faculty who have not yet successfully developed their own research and teaching programs may be better off postponing such activities for a few years.

Invited lectures (seminars at other universities or at national and international meetings) provide substantial evidence of one's scholarly reputation. Service in an advisory role to governmental agencies and as officers in professional organizations also provide an indication of recognition, and to some extent of one's scholarly maturity. However, travel fragments time blocks that might otherwise be available for research and teaching. Thus, while untenured faculty are encouraged to present their research to colleagues outside the university, they should be cautious about traveling excessively.

II. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

A. Overview

In addition to regular post-tenure reviews (see UO Policy Statement 3.150, Post Tenure Review), there is also a review when a tenured faculty member is eligible for promotion to full professor. In general, the guidelines for promotion to full professor are the same as those for tenure and candidates are expected to sustain a national if not international reputation in their areas of specialty. We expect high levels of performance in all areas, while recognizing that the emphasis within the areas of competence may have shifted between the time tenure

was granted and consideration for promotion to full professor. It should be emphasized again that outstanding performance in one or two other areas is no substitute for evidence of outstanding scholarship. While there is an expectation in the School of Music and Dance that all of our tenured faculty will be eligible for promotion to full professor, promotion is earned and not automatic.

In general, consideration for promotion to full professor may come at any time after the granting of tenure. Normally an individual will be considered for promotion 5 to 7 years after the granting of tenure.

B. Criteria for promotion to full professor

The criteria for promotion to full professor are essentially the same as the criteria for tenure in the categories of scholarly activities and teaching. It is expected that tenured faculty will become more active and involved in providing university, professional, and community service. Scholarly activities, teaching, and service will be reviewed by a school-wide personnel committee elected from a list of eligible members. The committee bases its evaluation on a statement of accomplishments submitted by the applicant, other submitted materials, as well as materials not submitted by the person under review, such as student evaluations of teaching on file in the school. Outside peer review of research, and other information (e.g. comments from colleagues and students) must be obtained and used in the review.

C. Review process

The process is similar to that for promotion with tenure. The dean will provide the individual with a detailed list of what they should submit for their file. This information should be delivered to the dean's office by a specified date, typically June 1, of the year prior to consideration. The candidate's file will be available for review and vote by the full professors of the school. The personnel committee will also make a recommendation. The dean will summarize the results in a recommendation letter that goes into the candidate's file prior to submission to the Faculty Personnel Committee and Provost's Office. As with tenure decisions, the provost makes the final decision on the awarding of promotions to full professor. The candidate will be informed during the spring term of the final outcome.