In merit and promotion cases, faculty in the Department of Film & Media who are engaged in creative practice are evaluated on the basis of their productivity and the quality and impact of their work, just as other faculty are. The Film & Media Department emphasizes creative media practice in a scholarly context, where the critical relationship to film and media scholarship informs experimental and exploratory approaches to practice. We also support the ongoing rethinking of what constitutes creative research in the context of changing media environments. Faculty may participate in a wide range of media practices, each with their own contexts and rubrics for assessing impact and accomplishment. This document delineates guidelines for assessing faculty achievements that are primarily creative or that involve a hybrid, practice-based approach to research.

**Explication of creative media work:** In their self-statements, faculty engaged in creative or hybrid work should explain the nature and the aims of their practice and list the specific accomplishments that they have submitted for assessment. The candidate should describe the artwork and discuss the intellectual, aesthetic or political contexts it is working within: how does the work contribute to the candidate’s practice as an artist/educator/researcher/thinker, and how does their work augment or challenge the broader field of media arts? What are the significant innovations of this work? While published scholarship is not required of media artists, faculty who do write critically about their work or the work of others should also include these publications in their dossier. The department recognizes that film and media production is by its nature often collaborative. For such collaborative work, the responsibilities and contributions of the candidate should be spelled out in detail and distinguished from those of the collaborator(s). The department also recognizes that major productions often take several years to produce, with production timelines having to accommodate the obligations of full-time teaching and the constraints of outside funding, grant cycles, etc. Candidates should therefore include a discussion of works in progress.

**Assessment of achievements:** Reviewers will look for evidence of the work’s quality and impact in its field on the basis of a variety of factors that depend on the specific nature of the work. Criteria for assessment may include: the number and distinction of the venues in which the work is presented; grants and awards received; and reception by knowledgeable critics, scholars and peers who serve as reviewers and jurors. These criteria should be applied flexibly, since the means of establishing distinction in media art vary widely across different modes of production, depending on distinct aesthetic and critical discourses and publics. It may be the case that the kind of practice for which a faculty member has achieved a high level of recognition in one area is unknown or undervalued in another area of practice. It is crucial then, that criteria for assessment take into account the context of the work, as we describe below. In the case of collaborations across disciplinary, media, or demographic boundaries, it may be appropriate to assess innovation and impact by invoking critical questions and metrics from fields outside of the media arts. Below, we delineate some of the criteria for assessment that are relevant to different forms of practice. The list is not exhaustive. The field of film & media arts is changing with the advent of new technologies and new economic models for funding, production and exhibition; we expect our faculty to be responsive to those changes, so our models of assessment should be responsive as well.
Guidelines for assessing different modalities of film and media practice:

1. Media production oriented towards commercial distribution. Indicators of quality and impact might include film or exhibition rights bought by commercial distributors for theatrical release, television broadcast, or streaming; inclusion in major film festivals; critical impact, such as reviews in commercial and industry media, as well as critical writing in academic and cultural fora; prizes or awards from film festivals, industry guilds and associations.

2. Independent film and media production, both feature-length and short. Measures include selection in national and international film and media festivals; television broadcast, online streaming, or exhibition in universities, media arts centers, and museums; juried awards, from film festivals, or industry guilds and association; critical impact, in the form journalistic reviews, and/or critical writing in academic and cultural fora.

3. Hybrid practices. A form of integrated creative practice and critical scholarship is increasingly common in academic film & media studies, as media technologies become more accessible and available for research, and as practice-based and hybrid PhD programs have become part of academic curricula in art schools and universities. Such practices may include a combination of peer-reviewed published writings and media production works, rather than a single major work, such as an authored book or feature-length film. The context for such media work might be primarily in academic contexts, evidenced by, for example, selection for conferences and university symposia. Short films might be included in group programs or exhibitions rather than solo exhibits. Here the department will make a holistic assessment of the quality and quantity of the work.

4. Avant-garde, fine art and experimental media practices. With nontraditional and experimental media, traditional distribution criteria may not be relevant, as the work may circulate in nontraditional fora, for example in free and public online platforms such as Vimeo and YouTube. Here, quantifiable evidence of the work’s impact may come in the form of critical and scholarly writing on the work; university presentations and talks; invitations to contribute to group or solo shows, screenings, exhibition at museums/galleries, nontraditional arts festivals, and presentations in alternative cultural and community spaces. Formats might include animation, cine-poem, photography and expanded installation. As with poetry or musical composition, such short works are often highly labor-intensive and can be considered equally significant to long format works. For this reason, we discourage the use of length alone as a criterion of evaluation; the works should be evaluated through considering their production process in relation to distribution and critical reception.

5. Computer-based and online media work, such as computer animation, interactive web-based projects, virtual reality, gaming, digital coding, etc. Once again, such works should be considered in relation to the specific contexts and discourses from which they emerge. Some of this work is designed to exist online or in streaming contexts, and/or requires specific technology (such as VR headsets) that make public accessibility limited. Still others may be speculative works—akin to architecture or musical composition—written, but never able to be actualized. For these works, quality and impact can be evidenced through participation in new media festivals, symposia, academic conferences, and through critical writing on the work in journals and books, or other contexts that place this work into larger discourses.
6. Co-creation and collaborative media work. Collaborative media projects with groups, organizations and community-based media projects that are not singly authored and may be ongoing. In this category, we can also include forms of creative media practice oriented around pedagogy, that include collaborative presentations with students. Such work may be designed for broad public exhibition, but also made to be circulated in specific pedagogical or activist contexts. Here, the work should be evaluated in tandem with the faculty member's description of the work's aims and impact, as well as documentation and critical writing about the work.

Factors in assessing productivity: Because the production process for media arts is often protracted, requiring long periods of time from conception to realization--research, fund raising, script development, production, post-production, exhibition and distribution--what constitutes productivity varies from production to production, and so productivity is understood as process as well as product. The commitments of maintaining a full-time career as a professor may require production schedules to be structured around the academic calendar, often limiting production schedules to semester and summer breaks. These schedules are also structured by funding cycles, which often require years of advance planning. Similarly, in evaluating critical reception, reviewers should keep in mind that gallery and museum exhibitions are often programmed several years in advance. In these cases, descriptions of works in progress should include evidence of documentation of development and process. This may include screenplays, detailed synopses, production schedules, sample reels, grant applications, rough cuts, evidence of funding received, commitment to exhibit work, from public showcases.

Teaching and mentoring: A practitioner's contributions in teaching, mentoring, and service should be evaluated in the same way as the contributions of other faculty. However, it should be noted that production faculty devote considerable out-of-classroom hours throughout the year to providing critiques of student work in studio courses, making themselves available for consultation in production and postproduction phases, and organizing student exhibitions as well as public presentations of student work. Such work should be given appropriate weight in reviews.