

Department of Cinema Studies

Merit Review Procedures

This document explains the procedures for merit evaluation of tenure-track faculty (TTF), Non-tenure track-faculty (NTTF), and Officers of Administration (OAs) in the Cinema Studies Department at the University of Oregon. These policies supplement, and are intended to be consistent with, the policies set by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the University of Oregon and United Academics (CBA). Where conflicts arise, these higher-level rules and policies apply.

Approved by the Cinema Studies Faculty October 2019

Revision approved by the Office of the Provost October 31, 2019

Tenure-Track Faculty

This document details the merit evaluation policies and procedures for all tenure-related faculty (TTF) in the Cinema Studies Department.

The following policies apply to all tenure-track faculty members in this department:

1. Each faculty member must be evaluated for merit; no one may choose to opt out.
2. Each faculty member who meets or exceeds expectations will receive some merit increase.
3. This document clearly expresses the criteria by which a faculty member is not meeting expectations
4. Each faculty member will be informed of their merit raise after it has been approved by Office of the Provost.
5. Each faculty member is eligible for consideration for the highest merit rating regardless of their type of appointment or FTE.

Evaluation Criteria and Procedures for TTF

1. Two tenured core faculty members will be elected annually by the TTF core faculty, using written or electronic ballot, during the first core faculty meeting of the Fall term.
2. For faculty with joint appointments, merit reviews for salary increases are conducted based on the faculty member's tenure home policies and the faculty members' employment contract as governed by the University. Cinema Studies will consult with home unit, as needed, to provide documentation of performance evaluation for the Cinema Studies portion of the joint appointment.
3. Each eligible faculty member will submit a current CV highlighting professional accomplishments, courses taught and service commitments since the last merit overview, or for the period as designated by the Provost. In addition, faculty

should submit a one to two-page Report on Professional Activities highlighting specific accomplishments, as well as any specific challenges and setbacks since the last review. The Department expects all faculty to contribute to the enhancement of equity and inclusion in the Department, the University, and the community at large. Faculty are expected to document their contributions to equity and inclusion where appropriate in their report. A template for this report is provided below in Addendum #1. Course evaluations, if administered during the review window, student experience surveys, and peer teaching reviews, when available, for each faculty member will be assembled by the office staff and made available to the Head and the Merit Review Committee.

4. In the evaluation of tenure track faculty (TTF), the following criteria will be used by the Merit Review Committee for the assessment of the relevant areas:
 - a. Research: TTF are expected to meet or exceed expectations in research, teaching, and service. In the area of research, a faculty member who is not actively involved in ongoing research projects as demonstrated by a steady rate of publications and preparation of new work for publication (whether through submission or invitation) and through presentation of new research at regional, national, and international conferences and through invited lectures, would fall below departmental expectations. Paramount in the evaluation of a faculty member's research is evidence of active and ongoing scholarship, as measured by a record of publication. A scholarly monograph published by a professionally recognized press is of the highest value, followed by peer-reviewed articles (in print or electronic format) and book chapters in volumes of the same quality and visibility as the aforementioned monograph. In each instance, the significance of the contribution to the faculty member's field will be taken into account. This same criterion (impact on scholarship) will also apply to other forms of publication. Additionally, presentations at professional conferences and invited lectures also qualify as evidence of ongoing scholarly activity, though these carry less weight than publications in the overall assessment of a faculty member's research.
 - b. Creative or Research-hybrid Work: These are areas that may differ in form from work that emerges from traditional research. However, creative work often utilizes traditional research from a multitude of disciplines. In the Cinema Studies Department, this work could take the form of (although not limited to): the writing/screenwriting and/or production of videos and films; the creation and exhibition of multi-media works, editing, cinematography, and the production of media products in all forms, etc. The mode of production (experimental short, feature film, screenplay, etc.) will be used to contextualize the dissemination/distribution/exhibition and impact of the work, which will serve as the primary criterion for assessing

merit. See Addendum #3 for general criteria for evaluating creative and/or research-hybrid work.

- c. Teaching: The Cinema Studies Department expects strong dedicated teaching and mentoring of its undergraduates, as well as graduate students where appropriate. TTF are expected to share responsibilities for courses taught at all levels of the curriculum. In assessing teaching, the Merit Review Committee will examine the entire teaching profile, including the faculty member's record of course-development activity, supervision of independent work by students, and the mentoring of graduate students when applicable. The Committee will also review available information on teaching performance, including, but not limited to, course evaluations if administered during the review period, student experience surveys, peer evaluations by faculty colleagues, and teaching awards, including course development grants. If "Course Evaluations" are included in the review materials, the numerical scores provided cannot be used as the sole standard for assessing teaching quality. Evaluators or evaluating committees must make reasonable efforts to ensure that the numerical scores reflect the teaching strengths and challenges identified in more substantive sources such as peer reviews, qualitative comments from students, instructor self-reflections and teaching statements, and other relevant information.

(NOTE (Added by the Office of the Provost): For all reviews to be decided Fall 2020 or later, any references in this document to standards or metrics for teaching quality are replaced by Section 9 of the August 2019 MOU between the university and United Academics that defines standards for teaching quality. The standards defined in the MOU are to remain in place unless and until the unit modifies those standards in accordance with the MOU and the CBA defined process for modifying unit policies. MOU can be found at <https://hr.uoregon.edu/ua-mou-course-evaluations-article-20.pdf>)

- d. Service: All TTF are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at faculty meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Members who have been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor are expected not only to engage in more service where the operation of the department is concerned but also to serve on college and university committees, as well as service to other departments (search committees, exam committees, etc.). Service to the profession, which may take the form of serving on editorial boards or on the boards of professional organizations, reviewing manuscripts for presses, and reviewing personnel cases at other institutions is also expected. TTF who do not participate equitably and responsibly in department service obligations would fall below departmental expectations for service.

5. On the basis of the information collected, the appointed faculty members (or the Department Head, for members of the Merit Review Committee) will rank each eligible faculty member's performance in the categories of research, teaching, and service, according to the following scores:
 - 4 Excellent (exceeds expectations; sets the standard for excellence)
 - 3 Very good (frequently exceeds expectations)
 - 2 Good (meets and occasionally exceeds expectations)
 - 1 Satisfactory (meets but does not exceed expectations)
 - 0 Unsatisfactory (does not meet expectations)
6. In evaluating TTF for merit, the areas of research, teaching, and service are assigned the following respective weights: 40%, 40% and 20%. Untenured faculty who have been specifically protected from heavy service commitments will be evaluated accordingly for their comparatively lighter service load.
7. The Department Head will meet with the appointed Committee members to compare rankings. The Head will provide a written summary of this discussion, which will become a part of the departmental merit review file.
8. For faculty on sabbatical or research leave, including unpaid research leave, research will be evaluated as departmental merit policy dictates. For terms with no assigned teaching as a result of a sabbatical or funded course release (e.g. through OHC or other units) or an external grant, the faculty member will be evaluated as meeting teaching expectations during that term. If a faculty member is on sabbatical or unpaid research leave and so has no required service, the faculty member will be evaluated as meeting expectations for service during that term, though they may receive a higher rating based on actual service during that period.
9. The total points for all faculty awarded by the Committee are tallied and subtracted from the total maximum points (12X number of faculty under consideration). With further consideration of each individual's professional responsibilities and total contributions, the Department Head will award these remaining points at their discretion. (The total points earned by one faculty member may exceed 12 as a result).
10. The merit increase awarded to each faculty member is calculated based on their total points earned (Committee-assigned + Department Head-assigned) relative to a percentage of their base salary. The method used for this calculation is outlined in Addendum #2.

Evaluation Criteria and Procedures for Career NTTF

1. In cases of Career Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF), the Head will appoint a committee consisting of at least one TTF and, when possible, one NTTF at or above the rank of those being reviewed.
2. For faculty with joint appointments in other departments, merit recommendations will be subject to any guidelines specified in the Memorandum of Understanding governing that joint appointment.
3. Each Career NTTF will provide, along with a cv, an activities report, outlining their work and accomplishments during the reporting period. The report should be restricted to the performance of those duties specified in their job-description, as well as activities that may enhance their ability to perform those duties.
4. The Head will meet with the appointed advisory faculty members to compare rankings. The Head will provide a written summary of this discussion, which will become a part of the departmental merit review file.
5. The evaluation of Career NTTF is weighted in accordance with the specifics of the position. Areas that may be considered, depending on the individual's position description, are as follows.

Teaching. The Department of Cinema Studies expects strong and dedicated teaching and advising at the undergraduate level. The Committee will also review all available information on teaching performance, including (but not limited to) evaluations by faculty colleagues, course evaluations (if administered during the review window), student experience surveys, and teaching awards. If "Course Evaluations" are included in the review materials, the numerical scores provided cannot be used as the sole standard for assessing teaching quality. Evaluators or evaluating committees must make reasonable efforts to ensure that the numerical scores reflect the teaching strengths and challenges identified in more substantive sources such as peer reviews, qualitative comments from students, instructor self-reflections and teaching statements, and other relevant information.

Service. For Career NTTF whose position includes a service component, signs of satisfactory performance include a readiness to share in departmental duties such as committee work and student advising. Service on committees and work on projects or conferences within or beyond the department are deserving of special merit. Career NTTF who do not participate equitably and responsibly in department service obligations would fall below department expectations for service. NTTF are also expected to extend their service beyond the department to college and university committees. Consistent failure to do so would fall below department expectations.

Professional Enhancement. This may take the form of research but also participation in forums, such as national conferences and workshops, that contribute to and enhance the individual's pedagogical or service profile.

6. On the basis of the information collected, the committee will rank each eligible NTTF's performance in the relevant categories according to the following scores:

- 4 Excellent (exceeds expectations; sets the standard for excellence)
- 3 Very good (frequently exceeds expectations)
- 2 Good (meets and occasionally exceeds expectations)
- 1 Satisfactory (meets but does not exceed expectations)
- 0 Unsatisfactory (does not meet expectations)

7. The Department Head will meet with the appointed advisory faculty members to compare rankings. The Head will provide a written summary of this discussion, which will become a part of the departmental merit review file.

8. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation will be based on the extent to which the individual has met or exceeded expected performance of their duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews. When requested, the Department Head will provide the department's merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

9. The proportion of points earned by each career NTTF to possible points will be calculated. The amount of the merit increase will then be determined by the relative proportion of points earned and their relative proportional FTEs.

Evaluation Procedures for Officers of Administration

Department Heads will base their merit increase recommendations on the performance reviews of the OA during the review period. If there has not been a performance review within the past year, the Department Head will undertake such a review. The review should evaluate the OA's performance of the duties and responsibilities described in the OA's position description and their current job duties. While OA reviews are conducted by the Department Head, they should also consider, when possible, feedback from relevant constituent groups both internal and external to the department or program. The Department Head's merit increase recommendation should be based on the extent to which the OA has met, not met, or exceeded expected performance of their assigned duties and responsibilities, as indicated by the relevant performance reviews. When requested, the Department Head will provide the department's OA merit increase recommendation to the CAS Dean. The actual merit award will be based on funding availability and university criteria.

Equity Adjustments

The ad hoc Faculty Merit Committee and/or NTTF Merit Committee, elected or appointed as described, will advise the Head regarding equity adjustments using funds made available to Cinema Studies for distribution in the review period designated by UO Office of the Provost.

This work is separate from the work of merit allocations.

Equity increases are intended to address inequities in base salary caused by salary inversion and/or salary compression. *Salary inversion* is defined as the condition in which a faculty member who has less relevant service or who holds a lower academic rank is earning a higher salary than a faculty member who has more relevant service and/or who holds a higher academic rank. *Salary compression* is defined as the condition in which the range of salaries among full-time faculty at the same academic rank does not vary appropriately in relation to years of relevant service. It is understood that, although other types of salary inequities may exist, this process is prohibited from giving those types of inequities consideration. Based on the equity pool, inversion inequity will be addressed first. Then compression ratios will be calculated to determine the distribution of additional equity funds. One hundred percent of funds available will be used to support equity adjustments within the department.

Faculty will be notified individually of any equity raise assigned. Faculty who have concerns about their allocations should consult with the Department Head.

Equity adjustments for bargaining unit members will be made in alignment with the university's contract with the bargaining unit.

Addendum #1

Faculty Report on Professional Activities:

Name

Present rank

Date appointed to this rank

Courses taught during the reporting period

Course development

Graduate or Undergraduate-student committees

As chair

As member

Publications

Books

Edited Volumes

Articles

And/or Creative Work (see
Addendum #3 for evaluative criteria)

Work in Progress.

Papers presented at conferences

Invited Lectures

Awards

Contribution to Equity & Inclusion

Service for the Department

Service to the College and University

Service to the Profession

Addendum #2

The percentage of merit increases will be calculated as follows:

- A. The maximum number of points under consideration by the committee for each faculty member ("FAC POINTS") is multiplied by the number of faculty.
- B. The total number of points awarded by the committee for all faculty is subtracted from A. The difference equals the number of points to be assigned at the department head's discretion.
- C. The total points for each faculty member (awarded by the committee + awarded by the department head) is calculated.
- D. The "point proportion" is calculated for each faculty member as the total points earned (committee + dept. head) divided by "FAC POINTS."
- E. The "effective proportional increase" is calculated:
 1. Each faculty member's salary is multiplied by the "point proportion" earned by that faculty member
 2. The sum of the salaries calculated in "(1)" is calculated.
 3. The amount of funds allocated to CINE for the merit increases is divided by "(2)" to calculate the "effective merit pool percentage."
- F. Each faculty member's merit percentage increase in salary is equal to the "effective merit pool percent" times the "point proportion" as calculated in "D." The sum of these increases will equal the amount of the merit increase pool.
- G. The amount of each faculty member's increase is calculated by multiplying the percentage increase calculated in "F" by their base salary.
- H. The sum of these increases calculated in "G" will equal the amount of the merit increase pool.

Addendum #3

Merit Review Criteria for Evaluating Creative and/or Research-hybrid work

When evaluating creative work, the number of works completed is only one factor when reviewing creative activities. Creative works should be evaluated through a series of interlocking factors:

1. Each creative activity's **mode of production**—such as an experimental short video, feature film, screenplay, animated short film, large-scale public video installation, etc.—will serve to contextualize the following criteria;
2. **Status of the venue and/or distributor and/or curator** (for example, museums, galleries, film festivals, online platforms.) It is important to note that many celebrated creative activities had their beginnings in smaller venues and/or in venues dedicated to promoting diversity;
3. **Standing of collaborators**, if any (for example, collaboration with other filmmakers/artists);
4. **Technical complexity or technique** involved in the production of the work (for example hand-drawn animation, authoring a piece of software, acting as both writer, director, music composer, etc.) and may be presented for evaluation separately if appropriate;
5. **Impact of the work** within the subfield and/or across fields (for example, a filmed dance performance that is reviewed by both well-known film and dance critics, a sound/image work about a traditionally disenfranchised community purchased by a museum and shown at a festival focused on diversity), works that are exhibited in multiple US locations, works that capture an international audience, as well as recognizing a spectrum of intended audiences, from commercial to more avant-garde/experimental/emerging modes of activity (for example, from major distributors, and Netflix distribution to “fringe” art festivals, pop-up galleries, salons, etc.);
6. **Innovative qualities** of the work as situated within a spectrum of established traditions through emerging fields, with recognition for creative work that extends beyond what might be considered “normative”.