These guidelines provide a basis for the evaluation of faculty scholarly, creative activity and research resulting in publication within the film, radio, television, and other recording media. The following criteria are outlined: (1) significance, (2) authorship, (3) production, (4) distribution, (5) public response and critical reviews, and (6) funding. Included in the recommended reporting procedure are 3 elements of evidence to be presented by faculty: (1) scholarly activity and significance, (2) distribution, and (3) critical reviews. (KP)
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I. Introduction

A. Purpose

The objective of this statement is to provide guidelines for the evaluation
of faculty scholarly, creative activity as evidence of research resulting
in publication within the film, radio, television and other recording media.

B. Rationale

Art is needed because it is irreplaceable as a human endeavor to convey
experience outside science and technology, to enrich human creative abilities,
to confront humanity with itself by revealing in art's direct, intuitive and
personal approach the conditions of existence, and to give expression to
humanity's aspiration, yearnings and dreams.

Film, radio and television, because of their ubiquity, are media capable of-
communicating to humanity a full awareness of the human condition. In addition,
they can closely duplicate the characteristics of contemporary society and
humanity's view of itself.

The best place to synthesize the needs for art and humanism, and the awareness
and study of film, radio and television, is the educational institution where
the goals are the development of the powers of understanding and judgement.
Moreover, educational institutions offer media materials, expertise and time
to develop and experiment.

C. The Academic Reward System

While the unity of humanities-art and film-radio-television will best flourish
in an academic environment, that environment will be significantly more nurturing
if faculty research for scholarly productivity in film-radio-television
is recognized by various academic reward systems across the country.

It appears that most academic institutions which require significant research
for tenure, promotion and salary adjustments also provide the vehicles for
reporting creative activity as well as traditional publication. Most faculty
evaluation forms provide categories to report musical composition, recitals,
recordings, exhibits, performances, theater, film, radio or television productions
in addition to the more traditional books, articles, reviews and criticism.

The difficulty appears to rest with the EVALUATION of non-print publications
of creative scholarly research. University administrators and faculty evaluators unfamiliar
with the evaluation of creative activity are in need of criteria and procedures to evaluate
the work of faculty peers who do not use the traditional print mode of publication.
II. Criteria

Several broad areas for evaluation of film-radio-television creative activity as evidence of scholarly activity are proposed:

A. Significance--The production should present significant knowledge, insight and/or originality. A unique contribution should be made in any one of the following areas: content, form or expression.

1. Fresh subject matter which serves to enlighten, enrich or provide insight to the perceiver is expected.
2. Innovative, exploratory or experimental production techniques should be in evidence.
3. Original methods of involving the perceiver in the aesthetic experience ought to exist.

B. Authorship--A film, radio or television production requires the involvement of a great number of people. Publication credit should accrue only to those who have primary responsibility for the overall creation of the work providing content, structure and leadership.

C. Production--The highest appropriate level of filmic and electronic production standards should be met, including writing, direction, performance, design and technical quality.

D. Distribution--The production should have been perceived by a large and/or expert audience on three bases each indicating criteria in a decending order of importance.

1. Selection of Exhibition or Broadcast:
   a. A juried presentation
   b. An invited presentation
   c. Another mode of selection

2. Number Involved in the Presentation:
   a. A one person presentation
   b. A small group presentation
   c. A large group presentation

3. Geographic Distribution of Presentation:
   a. International
   b. National
   c. Regional
   d. Local

E. Public Response and Critical Reviews--The production must be subject to the response of its public, the appraisal of peers and the evaluation of critics qualified in the medium of the production. Awards and prizes would also be considered within this criterion.

F. Funding--Competitive grant funding although not a requirement for publication credit is a mark of distinction and should be a consideration within faculty evaluation.
III. Procedure

In order to report creative activity for purposes of tenure, promotion and salary adjustments, three elements of evidence must be presented in the faculty applicant's dossier.

A. Evidence of Scholarly Activity and Significance--This statement includes information on the authorship, primary sources, and documentation of the work. Time and effort expended, production proposal, line script, shooting script or some other documentation of the objectives, methodology and significance of the work should be included.

B. Evidence of Distribution--This statement is an up-to-date log of the number and stature or reputation of the exhibitions or broadcasts.

C. Evidence of Critical Reviews--This is an accumulation of all available audience responses, peer appraisals and critical reviews.

IV. Conclusions

It is hoped that the preceding rationale, criteria and procedures for the evaluation of faculty scholarly activity as evidence of research resulting in publication in film, radio or television will be used both by those who pursue the academic rewards of tenure, promotion and compensation, and by the institutional administrators and faculty who evaluate such activities and are charged with decisions affecting tenure, promotion and compensation.