

DEPARTMENT OF CINEMA STUDIES
REVIEW, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

Approved by the Office of the Provost January 23, 2023

I. OVERVIEW

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 document contains the following guidelines:

1. The procedures involved in professional evaluations in the probationary years before tenure;
2. The criteria for achieving a successful tenure decision and promotion to associate professor in the three areas of scholarship/creative practice, teaching, and service; and
3. The department's expectations for promotion from associate to full professor.

These guidelines are not a comprehensive account of all rules and departmental customs; rather, this document should be read in the context of conversations with the Department Head and appropriate members of the faculty and administration. This document will be available on the department's faculty page and on the Academic Affairs website.

II. PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND TENURE: PROCEDURES

The university's promotion and tenure procedures are described on the [Provost's website](#). This section outlines the specific promotion and tenure procedures for the Department of Cinema Studies. Additional information to support the faculty member and departmental committees' preparation of promotion and tenure materials can be found in Appendix 1: Tenure & Promotion Timeline for File Submission.

Pre Tenure Reviews

Each TT faculty member who has not received tenure and is not in the process of a tenure review is reviewed annually by the Department Head. These annual reviews provide an opportunity to evaluate the faculty member's performance and to address problems and support faculty members in their progress toward the mid-term and tenure reviews. The review is based on the candidate's annual report, which should include the following:

- A standard format CV that includes publication citations (list inclusive page numbers and/or word counts) as well as grants, courses, and committees to date (listed by year and/or term);
- A narrative description of the candidate's progress during the past year in research/creative practice, teaching, and service (a brief paragraph for each area will suffice); and
- A brief description of goals and plans for next year and beyond.

Mid-Term Review

At the midpoint of the promotion and tenure probationary period—typically in the spring term of the third year for faculty members who do not enter with prior credit towards tenure—the TTF member will undergo a mid-term review. The candidate's report, containing the items described in Article 20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement and below, will be reviewed by the eligible voting members of the Department.

This mid-term review involves a personnel committee report, a departmental vote, a report by the

Department Head, a review, summary report and recommendation to the Provost by the Dean, and a final decision by the Provost or designee as to the terms and duration of any subsequent appointment of the faculty member.

Per Section 13 of Article 20 in the CBA, the department head will initiate the mid-term review process by contacting the faculty member in the fall term of the year in which the review will take place and request the following:

- **Election of Criteria:** The criteria the faculty member chooses to be reviewed under, if any changes in criteria have occurred since the time of hire.
- **Curriculum vitae:** A comprehensive and current CV, including the faculty member's current research, scholarly and/or creative activities and accomplishments (such as publications, appointments, presentations, etc.).
- **Portfolio of Scholarship or Creative Work:** A comprehensive portfolio of scholarship, research and/or creative activity; and appropriate evidence of national or international recognition or impact.
- **Personal statement:** A 3-6 page personal statement developed by the faculty member evaluating their performance, measured against the applicable criteria for tenure and promotion. The personal statement should address teaching; scholarship, research, and/or creative activity; and service contributions to the department, university, profession, and/or the community. The statement should also discuss contributions to institutional diversity, equity and inclusion.
- **Teaching portfolio:** Representative examples of course syllabi or equivalent descriptions of course content and instructional expectations for courses taught by the faculty member, examples of course materials or assignments created by the candidate, examples of student work and exams, and similar material.
- **Service portfolio:** Evidence of the bargaining unit faculty member's service contributions to the department, university, profession, and/or the community (such as white papers authored or co-authored by the faculty member, commendations, awards, Op Ed pieces, and/or letters of appreciation). The portfolio may also include a short statement on the faculty member's unique service experiences or obligations.

Review for Promotion and Tenure

External Reviewers

By early spring term prior to the year when the promotion and tenure case is to be considered (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), the Department Head will consult with members of the department and prepare a list of external referees who will be invited to evaluate the research or creative 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 and abide by the following guidelines:

- External reviewers should generally be from comparable or more highly regarded institutions. Ideally, they should be Full Professors (or equivalent in field, domestically or abroad) who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's record.
- Dissertation committee members, close personal friends, former colleagues, collaborators during the review period, or other individuals who might be viewed as having conflicts of interest are not asked to be external reviewers.
- The University requires that an absolute 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 early September of the review year.

Internal Review of Candidate Materials by Tenured CINE Faculty

In the spring term before the promotion and tenure case will be considered (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), the department's tenured faculty will review the candidate's materials and provide feedback—with time for the candidate to revise materials as needed—before the file is submitted for external reviews. The goal of this session is to provide timely feedback (identifying technical errors, helping clarify narrative points, etc.) as the candidate prepares their statement, CV, and supporting documentation for external reviewers. A sample timeline is available in Appendix 1: Tenure & Promotion Timeline for File Submission.

Promotion and Tenure Committee and Report

During the spring term of the year prior to the tenure-decision year (usually the 5th year of the probationary period), the Department Head will appoint a promotion and tenure committee of tenured faculty to review the candidate. The Head may determine that participation from faculty with relevant expertise or standing in related departments is desirable, with approval from 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 referees' assessment of the candidate's work
- an evaluation of teaching that addresses student and peer feedback,
- and an assessment of department, university, professional, and community service, including contributions to institutional equity and inclusion.

The committee report must conclude with a recommendation to the department regarding a promotion and tenure decision.

The committee report is generally made available in the department office or via a secure server 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.

Department Meeting and Vote

The department will hold a meeting of eligible tenured faculty by mid-October to consider the committee's promotion and tenure recommendation for the candidate. Following discussion of the report and the case, the eligible tenured faculty vote by signed, confidential (electronic) ballot whether or not to recommend promotion and tenure. When all votes have been registered, the votes will be tallied by the Department Head, and the eligible voters will be informed of the final result. The anonymity of individual votes will be maintained, although signed ballots will be kept in a signed and sealed envelope or on a protected server by the Department Head in case they are requested by the Dean or the Provost. The Department Head does not vote.

Department Head's Review

After the department vote, the department head writes an independent evaluation of the candidate. The statement includes a description of the process, including any unique characteristics of the profession (e.g., books versus articles; extent of co-authorship; number or types of films directed; exhibition/dissemination context, 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 Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The deadline for submission of the file to CAS is November 1 for both tenure cases and full professor promotion cases.

Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and Tenure

This section outlines the accepted criteria for a recommendation for promotion and tenure in the Department of Cinema Studies. 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. Further details and explanations can be obtained from the Department Head, the Dean's Office, and the Provost's Office.

The Department follows the UO guidelines in reference to the expectations of a faculty member to be promoted:

- sustained, high quality, innovative scholarship/creative practice in the discipline, demonstrated through a record of concrete, accumulated research or creative accomplishment
- effective teaching in the classroom and contributions to ensuring academic success for students
- steady responsible service and leadership to our students and our department, our university, and our professional discipline more broadly.

Evaluation criteria are based on faculty performance in research/creative practice, teaching, and service, which are generally allotted proportional weights of 40:40:20, respectively. These weights may be adjusted for individual faculty if they have different professional responsibilities expectations. Any adjustments will be discussed annually with the faculty member as per Section 6 of Article 27 in the CBA.

III. SCHOLARLY & CREATIVE WORK IN CINEMA STUDIES

Cinema Studies, as a department and academic field, values both scholarship (by scholars) and creative work (by artists). As such, faculty in Cinema Studies may focus their efforts on scholarly oriented activities (like books and journal articles), creative works (such as films and other forms of moving image media), or a combination of both scholarship and creative practice. The following guidelines are the general promotion expectations of the department for creative, scholarly, or hybrid portfolios.

Excellence consistent with the guidelines articulated by the UO Provost's Office (<https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-evaluation>) is crucial in all professional evaluations of tenure-related faculty at the University of Oregon, whether it is achieved through scholarship, creative work, or a hybrid of the two.

Therefore, promotion to associate professor with tenure in Cinema Studies is most dependent on the quality and significance of the candidate's record as judged by members of the tenured faculty and by a panel of outside evaluators, who are experts in the candidate's fields of scholarly and/or creative work. Scholarly and creative output must be complete (i.e. "in production" for published works and at a comparable stage of completion for creative works) in order to be included in the evaluation of the candidate. Both the quantity and quality of scholarship and creative work are important for the evaluation. Quality, however, is the more significant consideration, in that no amount of quantity can compensate for low quality.

Scholarly Portfolio

In terms of research productivity, the usual expectation for receiving a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Cinema Studies is as follows: 1) completion of a scholarly book or a substantial number of refereed articles (a range of 6-8), and 2) evidence of the candidate's prospects for continued scholarly excellence and productivity, usually in the form of refereed articles on a second major project. Success in receiving a grant or grants associated with new research or other professional activity, such as conference presentations, can serve as evidence of continued scholarly excellence and productivity, although such activities carry less weight than the publication of peer-evaluated scholarship.

- In order for a book manuscript to be considered “complete,” it must be formally accepted by a professionally acknowledged university press or a comparable commercial press and must be “in production.” “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).
- In order for articles or book chapters to be considered “complete,” they must be accepted for publication and require no further revisions of any kind, with the exception of editing associated with production (such as copyediting and page proofs).
- For tenure files that contain scholarly material that is not yet in print, documentation from university presses, journal editors, or book editors attesting that the manuscripts in question are “in production” or “in press” is required. Manuscripts that are not explicitly “in production” at the time the department meets to vote on promotion and tenure cases in late October or early November will be considered “work in progress.”

Research Platforms, Dissemination, and Peer Review

Scholarly productions—whether in print or in films, videos, or multimedia platforms—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.
- While collaborative research is valued and co-authored scholarship counts the same as single-authored scholarship (unless otherwise noted on the CV), candidates for promotion and tenure must provide sufficient evidence of research independence.
- 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. Peer review is understood to entail assessment by at least one disinterested scholarly referee.
- Regardless of the medium, published scholarship that has been peer reviewed possesses more significance in the department’s promotion and tenure recommendation than scholarship that has not been peer reviewed. Examples of scholarly productions may include: critical editions, critical anthologies, book chapters and articles in edited volumes, as well as electronic research projects and tools.
- Non-peer reviewed essays written for a general audience, trade books, textbooks, translations, and/or pedagogically useful monographs may serve as evidence of a scholar’s continued standing in the field.

Creative Portfolio

In terms of creative productivity, the usual expectation for receiving a positive recommendation for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure in Cinema Studies is as follows: 1) completion and dissemination of a major peer-reviewed creative project and/or a series of small projects that establish a coherent creative profile, and 2) evidence of the candidate’s prospects for continued creative excellence, usually in the form of an expanding portfolio that shows prospects for the next major project. Such evidence may take the form of acceptance to exhibition venues where original work is disseminated (i.e., festivals, workshops, museums, galleries, digital platforms, etc.), invited talks, successful grant writing associated with new creative projects, media coverage and/or measures of the audience reached, or other professional activity consistent with the candidate’s creative practice plans. Conference participation also qualifies as evidence of continued professional activity, although such participation carries less weight than exhibition, work-in-progress, or grant acquisition in the assessment of creative productivity.

- Creative media work in the Cinema Studies Department may encompass many forms (narrative, experimental, documentary, and/or multimedia productions) and formats (film, video, multimedia platforms, and more). Media forms vary in length and should be evaluated according to their mode of creative practice; for example, video artists and experimental filmmakers may

work in shorter forms than fiction filmmakers.

- The length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of its quality, value, or the effort required to complete it. The candidate's creative portfolio may include a major creative project, like a feature film, and/or a series of smaller projects.
- In order for a produced work to be considered "complete," it must be formally accepted by professionally acknowledged outlets/venues for publication or dissemination, with no further substantive changes needed by the faculty member.
- For tenure files that contain creative material that is not yet in its final form, documentation from outlets/venues attesting that the creative work(s) in question are "in production" or "in press" is required. Creative projects that are not explicitly "in production" at the time the department meets to vote on promotion and tenure cases in late October or early November will be considered "work in progress."

Creative Work Platforms, Dissemination, and Peer Review

Creative practitioners work in many forms/formats, and their work is similarly evaluated and disseminated in a variety of ways.

- No distinction is made between the forms or formats used for creative works, although a very important distinction is made between the selection of a faculty member's creative work in venues that have been rigorously evaluated by practitioners in the field and those that have not. This may include showings at festivals or invitations to screen at museums, major academic association conferences, or exhibitions, etc.
- Peer review is understood to entail a rigorous selection process that results in public showings through festivals, theaters, museums, universities, galleries, curated digital platforms, etc. Similarly, being distributed on commercial or public television; appearing on a curated digital platform; winning grants, fellowships, residencies, awards/prizes; or commissions or consultation are understood to have undergone a rigorous selection process.
- It is the responsibility of the faculty member, in conversation with the department head and as part of annual reviews, to contextualize exhibition venues in terms of quality, visibility, aptness, etc. Annual reviews and other evaluative processes will be instrumental in tracking and narrating a creative practitioner's productivity and national or international recognition or impact. For portfolios composed of a major creative project, annual reviews should track stages of completion as part of their review narrative.

Hybrid Portfolio

For hybrid (critical and creative) portfolios, it is imperative that the candidate, Department Head, and Promotion & Tenure committee contextualize this path. The tenure assessment should holistically consider the ways in which a faculty candidate contributes scholarly and creative activities to the field of Cinema Studies. However, the Department stresses that the tenure assessment for individuals with a creative and scholarly profile does not imply a higher bar for promotion, nor should it require multiple tenure assessments. Hybrid productivity should be contextualized during annual reviews and other evaluative processes; depending on the research and creative work(s) that compose the portfolio, such reviews should track stages of completion and contextualize a hybrid candidate's productivity and national or international recognition or impact.

IV. TEACHING

Teaching is the heart of our profession and the area to which we devote most of our energy during the academic year. Moreover, as with research and creative work, teaching is a critical area for professional evaluation. The usual expectation for promotion and tenure is an established record of effective teaching in the classroom as defined, at a minimum, by the four standards of professional, inclusive, engaged and research-informed teaching approved by the University Senate on January 12, 2022. The Department may also take into consideration evidence of improved teaching performance resulting from pedagogical

training opportunities.

To determine if the candidate for promotion and tenure has met the department's expectations for teaching effectiveness, the department's promotion and tenure committee examines the entire teaching profile, including the candidate's record of course-development activity, supervision of graduate and undergraduate independent work, and mentoring of students. The committee also reviews all available information on teaching performance, including (but not limited to) Student Experience Surveys and peer evaluations performed by faculty colleagues. The department requires that tenure-related faculty cooperate in accommodating the curricular needs of the department at all levels. It is expected that research/creative interests will stimulate the development of new courses. These measures of teaching performance are carefully balanced in the committee's assessment of the candidate's overall teaching profile.

In preparing its report, the department's promotion and tenure committee also carefully reviews relevant sections of the C.V. and Candidate Statement, which include information on teaching philosophy and pedagogical objectives and methods. Finally, at the candidate's request, the committee takes note of course materials—such as syllabi, handouts, and exams—that the candidate has provided to illustrate their pedagogic practice; the committee may also note any letters of appreciation that the candidate has received and chosen to include in their dossier.

V. SERVICE

In order to achieve promotion to associate professor and tenure, candidates must establish a record of satisfactory service to the department, the university, the profession, and the larger community. The department attempts to limit assignments for untenured faculty to a single standing committee per term, but all tenure-related faculty are expected to participate in the full range of departmental deliberations at department meetings and in other decision-making contexts. Attendance at official department meetings and commencement is mandatory, except when other "university business" interferes, and is considered an important part of one's satisfactory service to the department. Creating connections across the UO campus is an important part of professional life; therefore, 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.

Professional service beyond the university is relevant to the promotion and tenure review and might include delivering public lectures to community groups, serving on governing committees of professional organizations, reviewing manuscripts for journals and university presses, performing other editorial responsibilities with a research journal, or reviewing grant proposals. Community service and outreach activities are also relevant to the service component of the dossier. While professional and community service activities bring important benefits, such activities carry significantly less weight in the promotion and tenure recommendation than research, teaching, and departmental and university service.

VI. DIVERSITY, EQUITY & INCLUSION

Cinema Studies is a department committed to equity, inclusion and diversity. Our scholarship, pedagogy, and practice explore a range of media objects and their contexts, including history, artistry, industry, identity, geopolitics, and systems of power. Our shared mission is to use our critical and creative tools to amplify underrepresented voices, interrogate power, drive change for both filmmaking practice and its academic study. Candidates should describe their contributions to helping to achieve this mission including institutional equity and inclusion. For examples of institutional equity and inclusion statements, see the Division of Equity and inclusion website: <http://inclusion.uoregon.edu/node/264>

VII. POST-TENURE REVIEW

Per Section 30 of Article 20, “third-year reviews will be informal reviews unless a department head and dean agree, or the Office of the Provost determines, that a formal review is necessary for the faculty member to meet expectations for a subsequent major review.” Per Section 29 of Article 20 in the CBA:

Following promotion, full professors will have alternating third-year reviews and major sixth-year post-tenure reviews. The primary function of post-tenure reviews is to foster continued faculty professional growth and is not a process to reevaluate the award of tenure. If a review is not successful, then a development plan may be established (Section 37). The post-tenure review process may not be used to shift the university’s burden of proof in a proceeding to terminate a tenured faculty member for cause.

Informal third-year PTRs 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 prepare a brief statement and share it with the the Dean and the Office of the Provost for approval. The statement will then be shared with the candidate, who may respond in writing within 30 days of receiving the statement. The statement and any response will be placed in their personnel file. If the department or unit head and dean agree, or the Office of the Provost determines, that a formal review is necessary to meet expectations on a subsequent major review, they will initiate the Formal Review process below.

Formal Third-Year Reviews and Sixth-Year Post-Tenure Review

The process of the review is described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, Article 20 (Sections 30 and 31). Since formal third year reviews and (for full professors) sixth-year PTR are expected to be a deeper review of the faculty member’s scholarship/creative practice, teaching, and service, the Department of Cinema Studies expects the candidate to provide a portfolio (of publications or documentation of other scholarly/creative activities) and information regarding service contributions, in addition to the materials called for by CBA/VO policy. 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. The department head will write a separate report that provides an independent evaluation of the faculty member’s performance.. For associate professors, the report will specifically present an honest appraisal of progress toward a successful review for promotion to full professor. 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, which shall be included in the evaluation file.

If the provost or designee concludes that the faculty member’s overall performance is unsatisfactory (see criteria below) in one or more areas (i.e., research, teaching, and service) during their sixth-year PTR, the provost or designee will consult with the dean and the unit head to determine if a development plan for demonstrable improvement is warranted. The plan will be developed with appropriate consultation and discussion among the faculty member, the department head, and the dean, and recommended to the provost. Ideally, there will be consensus regarding the development plan; if consensus is not possible, a plan receiving the dean’s approval will be forwarded to the Provost or designee for review and approval. Such development plan should be implemented as soon as practicable after a determination of unsatisfactory performance and have a goal of reaching satisfactory performance by the next scheduled 3-year post-tenure review.

If a faculty member has undergone an earlier sixth-year PTR that resulted in creation of a “development plan,” future PTRs 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. Therefore, the department head will use these reviews as opportunities to support faculty members in

this process and/or towards their chosen professional goals

VIII. PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Promotion to Full Professor: Procedures

The university's procedures for promotion to full professor are described on the Office of the Provost website <https://provost.uoregon.edu/ttf-promotion-tenure>. There is no fixed probationary period leading to promotion to full professor, but faculty will normally be eligible for promotion after six years at the associate professor rank. Earlier promotion to full professor is appropriate when the accomplishments since promotion to associate professor exceed promotion expectations, or in rare instances where called for in written hiring agreements. As stated in Section 21 of Article 20 in the CBA, there is "no requirement to initiate the promotion process to professor."

The Department of Cinema Studies internal procedures for promotion to full professor (regarding, for example, the selection of outside evaluators, rights of access to the promotion file, the selection of a departmental committee, meeting and voting protocols, etc.) mirror those of the promotion to associate professor, with the exception that only full professors participate in the department's promotion recommendation.

Promotion to Full Professor: Criteria

It is expected that associate professors in the Department of Cinema Studies will continue to excel in all four areas of professional activity (research/creative practice, teaching, service, and contributions to institutional equity and inclusion) after the tenure decision. Professional careers develop along various paths, especially after the promotion to associate professor.

While a record of excellent teaching and service—including significant contributions to department, university, and/or professional governance—is essential, the primary qualification for promotion to full professor is a demonstrated national or international prominence in scholarship and/or creative practice, as well as other impactful activities such as evidence of leadership in inter/national forums. The research and/or creative portfolio of a faculty member pursuing promotion to full should indicate a record of distinction. Scholars may achieve this distinction through the publication of a second scholarly book or a substantial number of refereed scholarly productions (a range of 6-8), while artists may achieve this distinction through the consistent completion and dissemination of peer-reviewed creative projects; both, however, must show continued productivity and high quality through an expanding portfolio and national or international recognition or impact.

Promotion to full, if sought, is governed by the same criteria regarding platforms, dissemination, and peer review as outlined for scholars, artists, and scholar-artists in III. SCHOLARLY & CREATIVE WORK IN CINEMA STUDIES.

APPENDIX 1: Tenure & Promotion Timeline for File Submission

a. Candidate Responsibilities for Promotion & Tenure Process in CINE (sample timeline, subject to change)

Candidate Responsibilities Timeline (to be updated w/accurate dates)

P&T File Elements can be found at <https://provost.uoregon.edu/pt-file-elements>

Item	Deadline
Candidate CV (draft) due to personnel committee*	Early April
List of candidate-proposed external reviewers due to department head	Early April (please send file separately)
Waiver statement due to department head	Early April
Personnel committee CV feedback due to candidate	Mid-April
Revised CV (signed & dated) due to department head	Late April
Candidate statement (draft) due to personnel committee*	Early May
Personnel committee statement feedback due to candidate	Mid-May
Candidate materials due to department head <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revised statement (signed & dated) ▪ Supplementary file <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scholarship ▪ Teaching ▪ Service ▪ Diversity & inclusion 	Early June

*Please provide as Word document so we can use Track Changes.

b. Departmental Responsibilities for Promotion & Tenure Process in CINE (sample timeline, subject to change)

Candidate responsibility | Departmental responsibility | CAS or Provost responsibility

Item	Deadline
Candidate CV (draft) due to personnel committee	Early April
List of candidate proposed external reviewers due to department head	Early April (please send file separately)
Waiver statement due to department head	Early April
Department head appoints promotion and tenure committee	Early April
Personnel committee CV feedback due to candidate	Mid-April
Revised CV (signed & dated) due to department head	Late April
Department Head solicits external reviewers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CV (signed & dated) ▪ Waiver status 	Early May
Candidate statement (draft) due to personnel committee	Early May
Personnel committee statement feedback due to candidate	Mid-May
Candidate materials due to department head <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revised statement (signed & dated) ▪ Supplementary file <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Scholarship ▪ Teaching ▪ Service ▪ Diversity & inclusion 	Early June

Department head reviews candidate materials	Mid-June
Department sends materials to external reviewers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CV (signed & dated) ▪ Personal statement (signed & dated) ▪ Scholarship portfolio ▪ P&T criteria 	Mid-July
External reviewer letters due to department head	Mid-September
Department head sends acknowledgement (gratitude) letters to reviewers	Continuous—as letters arrive
Materials provided to departmental promotion and tenure committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ External reviewer letters ▪ Candidate materials ▪ Teaching evaluations ▪ Peer reviews ▪ Student evaluations 	Mid-September
Promotion and tenure committee report due to department head	Early October
Vote by eligible faculty via signed, secret ballot. Head notifies candidate of how the discussion went—positive, negative, or mixed—at this point.	Early October
Department head prepares report	Mid-October
Digital dossier file preparation (CINE Manager)	Mid-October
Digital dossier file review by department head	Late October
File due to CAS	November 1
CAS meets with the candidate	Late Fall/ Early Winter
University review	Late Winter/ Early Spring
Candidate notified in writing of provost’s decision	Late April/Early May

APPENDIX 2: Common “Stages of Completion” for Creative Artists

Consistent completion and dissemination of creative projects is the usual expectation for receiving a positive recommendation for promotion to associate professor and tenure in Cinema Studies. Candidates may pursue a major creative project—and/or a series of smaller projects—that have been peer-reviewed and/or disseminated. In addition, evidence of continued productivity—development or completion of projects that signals an expanding portfolio—is required.

- If a creative artist is pursuing a feature film as their major project, department heads should track stages of completion and/or dissemination/evaluation as part of their review narrative. Stages of completion vary, but usually include development, pre-production, production, post-production, and distribution/exhibition. of a feature film.
- A creative practitioner may be tenure-able based on a series of completed shorts, then choose to pursue a feature film as their next project; in such cases, stages of completion also provide useful evidence of an expanding portfolio.

To support out-of-field evaluators’ review of a creative artist’s file, this appendix outlines a variety of stages and “products” that might help evaluate creative productivity. This example outlines stages for a feature writer/director and will be updated as needed to address specific specializations, such as cinematography, screenwriting, etc.

These expectations were designed in conversation with other UO departments, film schools, and professional organizations. Best practices, such as those outlined in the “UFVA Policy Statement: Evaluation of Creative Activities for Tenure and/or Promotion” (*Journal of Film and Video* v71, n2, Summer 2019), stress the importance of flexibility given the following:

- costs of researching, producing, and disseminating an artist’s work
- producing and distributing a film is exponentially greater than producing and distributing a scholarly research project
- the production and distribution of a film heavily relies on an artist’s ability to secure funds from a variety of sources, like competitive grants, partnerships, etc.

Flexibility recognizes that funding sources often depend on the larger economic climate and that UO’s internal resources for funding, equipment, and labor are currently limited.

Production Phases & “Products”

This is a sample of common production phases and “products” of fiction (feature) filmmaking. This list is not exhaustive and does not reflect all phases or products for all forms or formats. Similarly, the actual intensity of labor and time per phase can vary widely per project. Common “products”—potential points of evaluation and dissemination that may be useful points of evaluation per phase—are italicized below.

Development

- Research (Story)
- Story Development
- Outline
- *Screenwriting (revision, workshops, etc.)*
- Research (Collaborative): Production Partners, Grants & Labs, Fundraising, Workshopping Acting/Screenplay, Financing/LLC, Pitch Deck, etc.
- *Development Grants, Other funding sources, etc.*

Pre-Production (including contracts, etc.)

- Partner Commitments
- Budget, Schedule, Insurance
- Locations, Casting, etc.
- Prep: Pre-visualization, Floor Plans, Shot List, etc.
- Hiring Crew, Prep, Rehearsals, etc.

Production

- Prep
- Rehearse
- Shoot (Raw footage)
- Dailies

Post-Production

- Log/Watch Footage
- Funding/Second Editor Search
- Editing
- *Rough Cut, Fine Cut, Picture Lock*
- *Post-production grants, Other funding sources, etc.*
- Sound, VFX, Music, Color, Titles, etc.

Distribution/Exhibition:

- EPK, Distribution Plan
- Festival & Community Outreach
- Submission Process
- *Screenings*
- (Additional Distribution)