

Filmmaking Research Network Workshop

7 December 2017, University of Sussex, UK

Workshop transcript

Participants

Joanna Callaghan, Sussex
Susan Kerrigan, Newcastle, Australia
Sean Maher, QUT, Australia
James Verdon, Swinburne, Australia
Duncan Petrie, York
Lizzie Thynne, Sussex
Virginia Haworth-Galt, British Universities Film and Video Council
Catherine Grant, Sussex
John Wyver, Illuminations
Adrian Goycoolea, Sussex
Alistair Cole, Newcastle
Eric Knudsen, Central Lancashire
Nas Massoumi, Bristol
Ian MacDonald, Newcastle

Session 1: PERSPECTIVES

Developing research culture: Duncan Petrie, York

Thank you for inviting me, I kind of feel a bit like an imposter, given I'm not a filmmaker. My background is very much in more conventional forms of scholarly inquiry. Although, having been trained as a sociologist, I've always been interested in human agency and its relationship to institutions, which I think has actually meant that a lot of the work I've done has been focused on other people's practice. What I'm going to talk very briefly about is what's been happening at our department at York, the department of Theatre, Film, and Television which I'm Deputy Head of. Previously, I've been chair of research and was involved with the REF return last time, and I'll be head of department from 2018.

The department has a strong emphasis on production, in all of our degree programmes. And this includes PhDs by Creative Practice, and also Masters by Research. We're a Russell Group University so staff research is quite generously supported. We all have access to £1000 annual research allowances, there are other contestable funds for pump-priming, there are regular research leaves, etc. We've also developed quite significant and important partnerships within the industry via film and TV production projects. We have a department whose resources are available for commercial hire and this has led to a close relationship with a local production company called Green Steen. We've recently, our interactive media centre department is a partner in a big £5 million initiative called Digital Creativity Labs, which involves a lot of work with various companies and industry more generally.

One thing I will make clear, is that most of our outputs thus far, in terms of what we might call filmmaking research, have not been films. There are some interesting reasons for that. In terms of the key achievements, before putting the challenges, filmmaking provided one of our impact case studies at the last REF. It wasn't judged to be a brilliant impact case study, but at least it allowed us

to make a return because as a new department, at one point it was touch and go whether we'd manage to return as a department.

We have been able to draw heavily on the expertise of staff who are practitioners or have been industry professionals to develop a number of projects on, and involving industry. My colleague John Mateer had a couple of successes from getting money from knowledge transfer projects. And he's been working on a number of important issues; the industry academic partnerships, and also perceptions of practitioners working in Higher Education. So we're doing a lot of auxiliary, or ancillary work on some of the issues that this network will be very engaged with. There's also been a lot of focus put on the development put on cross-discipline projects; the film and TV side of the department is trying to work with the theatre side of the department, who are trying to work with the interactive media on a number of initiatives that are slowly coming through.

The key thing really to share, is some challenges that we've had. Various things, some of which will be familiar to you. Production opportunities don't always arise in relation to when people have time off teaching, and so trying to organise that when something does arise and someone wants to take advantage of it, usually because the funding is available, that's one of the issues we've had. Being able to count production funding that comes in, in the way that we can count research funding is a major challenge because the university are far more supportive if we can find ways to account that; so we're looking at ways of developing an in-house production company to try and channel things through the books. Getting some staff with industry backgrounds to be prepared to contextualise their work is an issue; some of them will play ball, some of them won't, some of them it's a case of helping them understand that if you do this, it makes it a lot easier to tick the boxes that allow us to keep going and do things. Reconciling mainstream production with research agendas; we've had a number of people who have got incredibly successful careers, but in mainstream, and finding a way to get that to work in relation to the various sort of research streams that we have is another challenge – but it is one that I'm optimistic about. One thing that has happened, unfortunately, is that staff can come in from industry and be more likely to be hired on teaching scholarship contracts and that's often something they say they prefer as well because they might be a little uncertain about how they might develop as researchers.

I mentioned that one of our impact case studies was a production project but there is an issue about how to develop most effective impact case studies, that's something that will face all of us, I'm sure. And also developing support in appropriate projects for PhDs by Practice; the first film based one will graduate in the New Year. There's two or three others coming through, we've a number of successes on the Theatre side. But so far, the main focus on Creative Practice has been on writing, but we are starting to make more films as part of our project. But we've had a lot of people want to do a PhD by Practice but actually what they want to do is use the equipment to make a film. It's that; if you want to do a PhD it's a very different thing, if you want to make a film go make a film. That's something we can discuss.

The immediate opportunities and benefits of this network, from where I stand, are finding ways for me to think about and address some of the issues I've just noted, I'll happily expand on them later on if it's of interest. Just the ability to share expertise and good practice because we've built the department up from the ground and we've been very internally focused and we're now at a point where it's going to benefit all of us to be more outward looking. This involves developing collaborative projects, not just across the department but with other institutions. And to identify ways of being able to support and encourage production staff more effectively, that's something that's going to be a priority for me when I become the next head of department because we're now bedded-in, and I see a lot of potential that isn't being realised. We need to find the right way to do that.

Australian Higher Degree Research: Sean Maher, Queensland University of Technology

Thanks for this opportunity to outline where I'm coming from in terms of this research network and how I want to engage with it.

My engagement with Creative Practice in research was focused around postgraduate supervision and our postgraduate programmes. I'm at QUT and I came through a system that was highly supportive of Creative Practice as a research mechanism in a PhD. Now that I'm embedded at QUT and I run a postgraduate programme in the film screen animation department, obviously I'm looking at the next level of where we go with that. The centre that I was connected to was an externally funded centre of excellence, and it was about innovation in the creative industries so I was in a terrific multi-disciplinary, inter-disciplinary environment with all kinds of PhD researchers, across media and humanities. That centre wound down, as it was only funded for between 5 and 10 years, and some of us PhDs remained at QUT and we retreated back into disciplines. My aim as a postgraduate co-ordinator in this specific discipline, is how do we come back, how do we recreate an environment where you get that stimulation, where you have PhD students, how can that be a hotbed of creativity and research?

What I'm talking about is very specific QUT lens in the sense that we've just had a major restructure in the creative industries faculty. I think QUT had the first creative industries faculty in Australia, it was part of the appeal for me as PhD candidate. Now we are in a new iteration where the faculty has restructured, re-prioritised, and we've put in three research centres. One is quite traditional: the digital media research centre, that is really the next light on the centre of excellence that I'm attached to, but there's two key research centres that are very practice based. There's a design lab and another creative lab. My discipline, in animation would be very tied into the creative lab and the mission for that creative lab is that it would organise all HDR environments and applications throughout the faculty and align all HDR candidates with bigger research programmes. I'm probably moving into that lab and representing film, screen animation postgraduate candidates and programmes and look at how I can extend on what was happening in that centre for excellence for future HDR candidates.

When Susan proposed the network and invited me to attend, that's obviously the lens that is happening in my institution and my own career that I thought would be a strong connection and a contribution I could make to the network.

You can see that it's probably quite similar to the UK. We have a very established PhD programme, it's very standard to people to want to do a PhD and come and make a film. It's a sliding scale about much weight that film will have and it maxes out at QUT at 75% and as Duncan outlined, it's key that it's a PhD. It sounds like from the conversations we've had that the network is very similar issues that you're confronted with, with candidates arriving to sign up for a PhD, but it's more about making a film. At the same time, there's also a shift; there is a growing literacy about what practice entails at a university, and if you're in a PhD programme, our website is certainly full of guidance about what is expected if you come in as a practitioner, or as a honour student and you're going to make a film; it is a research intensive experience and exercise.

They're the kind of programmes I oversee. I think Joanna wanted me to highlight that PhDs are free in Australia. That's through RDS, our research training scheme. You get three years, up to four where you are fully covered and ideally at PhD level you're also gaining scholarship. It's tax free, about \$26,000 a year. So they are very well supported candidates. If you can get that kind of funding, you don't get the debt for your Masters by research or PhD. QUT has a good track record of getting our

Creative Practice PhD candidates scholarships, so they are competing against traditional scholarships which is fantastic. There has been a development in the 10 years I've been at QUT, moving in the right direction.

The issues seem to be common across Australia and the UK – it is often about funding. Within the big picture, how much funding we are managing to attract, and how our environment facilitates that kind of funding. Getting our non-traditional research outputs to count in the key research codes; always dealing with methodologies and ensuring there is rigour underpinning practice based research and practice based PhDs. I think that's a conversation that will continue in that environment, I'm not seeking to solve that, but I hope there is a literacy that moves across supervisors and departments so there is a lot more to draw on, and a lot more case studies and examples and precedents to help. We're always going to deal with some nomenclature around creative practice, the kind of research that is connected to practice that underpins our non-traditional research outputs. That final point about really having a critical mass of supervisors who can take on these candidates; I think my department is quite typical in that there is scarcity of qualified, appropriate supervisors who can take on this growing demand for Masters by Research, and PhD. So there's a bottle-neck of who is adequately skilled and experienced and background with an NTROP actually themselves to take on these candidates. So we have to grow that pool. And I think that's beginning to happen.

The final point is also something consuming the department, and we've spent time with our central research office about co-publishing model. It's obviously a standard academic practice in traditional research, there's no problem with PhD candidate co-publishing with their supervisors, getting second, third author status on those collaborations. I think that's a tricky area when it comes to practice based research and practice based PhD students; how do you come on? Do you come on as an associate producer, a supervising producer? And we're trying to work out some frameworks and guidelines around that because that's another great way to legitimise that practice based output that happens in that HDR space and that the time and effort you're putting in as a supervisor, you're getting that payback that traditional supervisors get in the outputs of your candidates. A series of acknowledgements in that co-publishing model.

I want to give a snapshot of the environment beyond QUT, but our creative labs seems to be mirrored across the Australian tertiary landscape. Whilst the creative lab is not externally funded, the view is we will ultimately attract central Canberra funding for a lab like that. I think it's similar objectives across these other institutions. I think it's an important step, I think it's the scientific model that we tend to cluster research and HDR programmes and inter-disciplinary approach through labs like this. Certainly, QUT that's the strategy of forming a creative lab. It's really great to see that happening across the landscape and not just traditional research, but practice based research is front and centre of these new kind of research labs.

Our creative lab connects to the underpinnings of the creative industries faculty which is outward looking in terms of where a traditional creative sector and creative arts practices can engage other areas, whether it's Health, whether it's Engineering, all those other environments that are at university that we know are the powerhouses of research and funding, which we are competing against and which are starting to appropriate from our research methods and filmmaking practices. We need a more even playing field, I guess, and our lab is an attempt to do that, to stand us on our own two feet and engage us as equal partners in those collaborations. QUT again has a good track record on doing that. It's very technology driven, some of those engagements in the digital arts, and my particular discipline will have to embrace that and think outside the box and push for that equal footing about how we are a full research partner, and not a service partner. We've all had experience of that. I think our lab will position us on an equal footing.

Just an example of what labs aim to do; outward looking, how to scale up projects, they represent an opportunity to scale up projects and partnerships. Considering we're launching it next year it's not a bad start. We're leveraging existing partnerships and pooling them into labs. These research centres can be flagships, just like other centres have been in other areas of the university. QUT talk a lot about the big environment that we're in and education is a dynamic growth sector for Australia now, we know it's a global business. As filmmakers, we're in this incredible environment, and it's about rethinking some of those approaches that we came into that sector with from our industry; it is small but it's often striking and that can be inward looking and we're in this education space and it has to be outward looking. It's fostering that approach, and changing the culture.

Methodologies: Susan Kerrigan, Newcastle

I'm going to talk about methodologies and I think it's quite nice to talk to this group of people about this because there's so much I don't need to say, so much you understand because you're already doing it. In terms of methodologies, what's important is that we come up with some common languages, so we know what we say when we talk about creative practices.

As research based practitioners, there's so many different nomenclatures that we're using and in Australia we're trying to talk about what that means, and what we're using. Sean and myself and three other people wrote an article, published last year, and it's called 'Screen Production Enquiry: A Study of Five Australian Doctors'. I had this idea that as we've all done PhDs, they must all be the same. In writing the article I discovered we were using very varied disciplinary approaches, they were influenced by sociology or the creative arts, and we were trying to make sense of that. That meant I could think around where are we all in the same language.

Craig Backy and I had a book come out with Palgrave called Screen Production Research. It's a combination of UK and Australian authors, and a couple of people from the US. There are people in this room putting forward some of their work for chapters, and we're happy it will be a key, seminal text. It will start to define what we mean when we say 'filmmaking'. In Australia we use the term filmmaking, but more broadly we use the term screen production. I think that's a bit of a difference to what's happening in the UK where the world filmmaking is solidly used. In that article we wrote, we came to the conclusion that filmmaking is a method, and that's the method that joined all our PhDs together, and we're using different methodologies. We argued that maybe screen production enquiry could be methodology, but felt that wasn't quite right, but things will filter down before we settle on a term. I think the most important point is that understanding how we enquire into our practice is what sets us apart from the industry and it's the thing that Duncan referred to in terms of people coming in and just want to make a film and access the equipment. I've had similar conversations and highlighted that in order to access that equipment, you've got to have a line of enquiry which is going to be useful in emerging knowledge in how you're going to do that. That's been my interests now in terms of methodologies and methods.

Peer review: Catherine Grant, Sussex

My background is kind of like Duncan's in that I never used to be a filmmaker but I definitely am primarily using film making methods in my research now and that's been the case for the last 7 years. But I also want to talk about the very traditional background as a film studies scholar. So I'm going to speak about peer review as somebody who bridges these two different fields, as somebody whose been involved in conventional forms of review, I've been on the editorial board of the journal Screen since 1995 so that's the vast majority of my peer review experience Double blind peer previewing of written works in the field of film and media studies. But in the last 15 years I've been

working around various forms of assessing practice, both in terms of setting up practice research criteria in my previous job at the university of Kent, and establishing criteria for research PhD, assessing research PhDs as well as supervising them. In the last 7 years I've been involved in establishing a new field of practice based research around videographic, film and moving image studies. Using online publishing, but also digital video production, making videos, using Linux techniques and found footage from the films we're studying in order to turn the medium of our investigation into a medium of our research as well. In the last years I've been working with other people to establish publishing contexts for our work and have been involved in setting up several online platforms peer reviewed research journal.

To give some perspectives on peer review and filmmaking research, what I'm talking about today are notes towards a planned seminar by the Filmmaking Research Network which will happen in just over a year's time. What I'm talking about is, what might we usefully use that time for, in order to have a good curriculum for that seminar. For background, there's quite a lot of work on the different elements of scholarly peer review, now. But it's usually been the process of subjecting novel scholarly work to scrutiny before that work can be published in a journal or as a book – and this is almost entirely about written work. Why do we have peer review? Well, there's lots of reasons, one of the most important one for filmmaking research is a global one around the way universities operate and the way that they get funding, and the way respect is accorded to emerging disciplines, and so on. One of the most important things we have to have is debate here and in filmmaking context generally, because it really matters in the world. Without peer review it would be very hard to get an emerging discipline accepted as a discipline in the academy. Peer review also has local benefits, it is something that's very important for practice researchers to consider; an improving function. It's often the case that when it's submitted in draft form, it's subjected to review, suggestions are made for improvement, those improvements are carried out, and then the work is accepted for publication. But what happens in a filmmaking context, how easy is it to improve filmmaking research? Do we want to subject ourselves to that? Often practice researchers might feel that their output is finished in some sense and they don't want to tamper with it because of their artistic aims and methods in order to improve it for publication.

A lot of people have considered these issues, and Joanna and Susan are no exception in their statements for the case for support to the AHRC for this network. One reason why we might want to think about peer review is we are still dealing with a field of research which is not well defined. So another advantage of peer review might be a contribution towards this definition. As people who are also here today have written, there's also a lack of expertise, I think another of the speakers so far have mentioned a lack of capacity in people who can assess research work in institutions, in relation to higher degrees and publishing these works or authorising more broadly. In order to help define and clear up misunderstandings around practice research, the kinds of discourse that are generated through peer review might be really useful for us to think about.

I think it's also interesting on an individual level, and I speak as a practitioner over the last decade, that sometimes what we're doing in our practice research can be so inchoate and unformed to us. We can articulate some research aims and questions for it, but having the discourse produced back to us by people looking at the work is hugely beneficial. Also when someone has that process done to their written work, it improves it. That process of improvement is partly about informing you of what you have done, reflecting back the aims of the work to you.

Filmmaking research is an umbrella term, it covers a huge number of different genres. And I'd also argue different ways of thinking about the new knowledge that it produces. So again, written exegesis and supporting research statements is definitely something that the network will be looking at. In a way, what I'm here to talk about is the inadequacies of peer review as it is currently

conceived in conventional academia. What about impact? What impact can a written work have, can this be taken into account in the forms of peer review we're developing? And where that is not the case in written research, in written research review there may be attention paid to the reach or the significance of the work, but generally it's paid to the originality of the work and the rigour of your work. So as we think about our lack of capacity for peer review in filmmaking work, we need to think; do we simply want to replicate existing models or do we really want to pay attention to the specificity of our emerging field in order to develop specific methods. Must we mimic or should we throw away the rule book, or are we going to throw away the baby with that bathwater?

How further to develop publication alternatives? I would suggest, that a lot of the discussion about peer review is linked to what we mean by publishing filmmaking research. As we're developing new methods for that, I think we should be thinking about peer review hand in hand with those processes of thinking. For example, considering the industry context of quite a lot of filmmaking research, how can we bring industry into these discussions? Also, what are the other forms of review which are not the conventional blind peer review where everyone can say what they think because nobody is ever going to know who said that. And look at other forms like curating; discourse produced by a named person in the public domain. Blurbing, reviewing, these are other models that even conventional forms of written academic research are investigating. I think, Eric, who is the editor for the journal of Media Practice, struck the right note in 2015 in looking ahead at all these issues which is with confidence. We need to be confident about what we're doing, and not defensive. If you start from a position of confidence, these things are not problems, they are opportunities for us to refine.

In the last thing I want to say I want to look at three existing examples of this which all have confidence, they all strike this positive note and are very confident about using the differences of filmmaking research to inform a different style of peer review. They are all online journals, obviously online journals have that fundamental affordance of being able to embed digital review work. That's how we can publish this work, it's not like we have DVDs in the back of Media Practice every month; we can publish this work in a variety of ways online. Now Screenworks is a profoundly foundational publication of these three, founded in 2005 by Jon Dovey with amazing peer review system that from the beginning combined elements of traditional peer review around anonymity of the reviewers in the first instance, but then wanted to have openness and transparency as well so those reviews got published online. That journal is now edited by Charlotte who's further developed from these methods. So Screenworks is the granddaddy. The middle one is a journal that I founded with US colleagues in 2014 to published these videographics film from image studies things. We borrowed, stole, acknowledged our stealing from Screenworks in that we have a completely open peer review from the beginning in that we don't have anonymity at all, when reviewers agree to review work they do so knowing that their names will be published and their reviews will be published. And then the final publication that is also represented in the network, is the journal coming out of the Sightlines project in Australia which is thinking even further.

I wanted to show you a picture of In Transition, which is a slightly different layout than Screenworks. Screenworks has this 'Screenwork' at the top and then you have to scroll down for the research statement to get to the reviews. You can see that In Transition we had to adopt this system, which is a nice way to look at practice research and academic context. The video is definitely, being on the left in a Western culture, the important thing. The author's statement is the piece on the right but immediately below the video are the peer review statements. In a way then achieve more equivalency as legitimised written discourses about the video work; which I think is very much how we want to see things. Now, Sightlines is amazing because it does things pretty similarly to Screenworks and In Transition, but it does a few other things which are very interesting indeed. First of all, people don't have to submit supporting written statements, sometimes peer reviewers are

working on the basis of the screen work itself. But also, all work submitted to the journal is published; just think about that. The peer reviewing does not achieve a screening process, it may achieve an improving process. So that's a really radical development. What would it mean if you read a screen work that was rubbish, and two reviewers said it was rubbish, and that rubbish screen work was published along with reviews saying it's rubbish, that's really fascinating. Because if you had those scathing reports, you probably wouldn't want to publish your screen work, I think that's probably how it would work but it's only been going since 2015 so who knows.

Does peer review do more harm than good? Or does it do some harm, with this question of improbability, do these forms of publication ghettoise the work? They make it acceptable to academia, but do they make it less acceptable to the way films are normally received by the public? What if filmmakers want to make money from their work? And there may be models of curating or blurbing work might be as interesting as strictly speaking peer reviewing it. I would argue that in fact we can do all these things at once, one of the things we're really interested in looking at is enlisting the help of professional associations in these discussions about the value of the work we produce and about how we authorise that work and approve of it in academia. Some of the organisations, MeCCSA, BAFTA, BFI, AHRC and the BUFC or Learning on Screen as well. I also think that holding workshops or training events is the first step in this because one thing I have learnt as an experienced peer reviewer is that the more you do it, not only the easier it gets, but the more insightful your reviews get. The more you do it, the more you read of those reviews so these public forms of peer review publication are essential and training workshops in which we expose people to those discourse would be very useful.

Platforms for research assets: Virginia Haworth-Galt, British Universities Film and Video Council

The work of the filmmaking research network is very interesting to Learning On Screen, we were previously BUFC. A hope for us is that this can bring new work to our collections and we can make these collections available to the academic community. We're particularly interested in working with you all in developing our plans to host audio-visual research outputs on our video on demand platform – our BoB platform. To summarise what I'm about to say, we are very interested in contributing to the supporting infrastructure for this work, both during and after the project.

As an organisation, Learning on Screen aims to provide strategic resources and to be a specialist contributor to the information infrastructure for the UK further and higher education sector. We would like to make sure that we're sharing our resources properly, with the network. I'll just give you a whistle-stop tour of what we do and what's available to you.

We have a range of academic databases and resources, all of which we would describe as being scholarly, reliable, accessible, constantly growing and developing. You can search across the entire range of our databases via a federated search and these databases include TRILT, which stands for television and radio index for learning and teaching and it currently has over 26 million records on there, going back to the 1920s. We also have things like the Channel 4 press packs, on a fully searchable database, and then weekly press packs from 1982 to 2010. We've got the News on Screen database which has 185,000 newsreel and cinemazine stories, 60% of which are direct linked to the films by British Pathe or Movietone. Some material available are from some of research projects, which include the BECTU history project, which is a history of women in the British film and television industries, which explored the contribution of women from 1933 to 1989 and that included data from the archives of BECTU and firsthand accounts from some of the women working in the industry. We've also got a TV database of media materials which has 30,000 titles available throughout the world. We've got the moving image gateway which is a subject in depth database of about 2000 websites relating to moving image.

There's one other thing, we've also got some physical resources. We have a library and our recently refurbished library has got space for researchers to use. So we've got three research desks in there, people are very welcome to come and use this space, it's in our building in central London. Our library has a small but unique collection which traces the development of how visual media has been used in teaching, it's got about 4000 books and pamphlets and about 3000 journals and newsletters. There's a significant collection of educational film distribution catalogues in there as well.

We also have specialist training courses, such as one dedicated to finding and using audio visual materials in research, there are a number of courses in copyright, and we just launched a new suite of courses in understanding moving image metadata. And then we have BoB which used to be called Box of Broadcasts and that's our on demand TV and radio service for education, which has a growing archive of over 2 million programmes and you can do clips and playlists and citations on BoB.

While we've now built on our platform, we've been delivering BoB for quite a few years, previously we delivered it with a commercial partner and it was on a commercial platform, but we've now brought the platform in house which means that we can continue to develop it to ensure that we're meeting scholarly needs. Now it's in house we're looking at the way we can use the platform to host audio visual research outputs. We did some general perspective of research last year and now we want to get much more specific as we move towards developing that as one of the things we do with BoB. We're very interested in exploring the development of this with the network.

I think those are all the things that Joanna and I thought might be useful for me to share today, are there any questions?

[Charlotte] I'm interested in meta data and futureproofing. Because Katie was introducing various online submissions and we embed stuff that's on Vimeo and I'm worried about future proofing should something happen to Vimeo. And the other one was about metadata because I know you've done a lot of work about metadata and integrating the metadata from TRILT with BoB, so could you say something about that?

[Virginia] Yes, so next year, when we brought BoB in house, we called it the Avril project. Avril phase one was building the platform in house and Avril phase 2 is looking at integrating TRILT with BoB and looking at the next stage of development to make sure that all our resources sink in. So that will be part of that, we are starting that in February 2017.

[Lizzie] It's interesting to hear that you're thinking about hosting practice based research outputs. Have you had any thoughts yet about how those might be selected, whether there might be a review process, how might that work?

[Virginia] So that's the next stage of development that we'd like to do, understanding those things. This time last year we did some general sector research over whether or not this is something people would be interested in, what the current issues were, and trying to get a general sense of it. Now we're ready to try and start working towards shaping up what those specifics might be. That is very much the next stage, trying to work with people to thrash those things out to get those things right.

Independent film distribution & niche audiences: John Wyver, Illuminations

Joanna asked me to speak about distribution in particular and I fear I'm only going to offer some very banal thoughts. Before I get to those, I'll just give you some background on me and what I might

be able to contribute to the discussion as it goes forward. I've got three roles in my professional life; I run an independent production company, called Illuminations, it was set up alongside Channel 4 in 1982, specialised in making arts and performance media programmes ever since. I'll talk a little bit about the journey that company has gone on, and in relation to how the work that we've made has gone out into the world in different ways over the years. I work for the Royal Shakespeare Company as their director of screen productions; both advising them on how to develop filmed and broadcast productions out of their work, but also producing their live cinema broadcasts. So we've done 13 now, live cinema broadcasts from Stratford, another one in January. Much of my work, both as a producer and as a researcher in the last couple of years has been focused on questions of translating stage work to the screen, both in film contexts and in live broadcast contexts. I have a modest senior research fellowship at the University of Westminster where I have been very involved in trying to take forward research work about the relationship between stage, theatre, television and film. I was principle investigator on an AHRC funded project called Screen Plays: Theatre Plays on British Television, which is documented the plays originally written for theatre that have been made for television since 1930.

In that context, work that I have done as a professional producer has been integral to the school's submission for the 2014 REF and I just wanted to echo some of the points that Duncan made about the difficulty of reconciling mainstream professional production with the expectations of research culture, and the framework that REF puts in place. So four of the works that I've been involved with in a professional context were submitted to REF, and in a related way, they became the basis of an impact case study. We spent a lot of time working through questions about the legitimacy, or not, of that work as research and how it could be understood and framed. Specific questions about authorship of that, I'm not a filmmaker, I think of myself as a creative producer, I work with a very wide range of other collaborators, to produce very high level, very expensive work. These pieces have budgets of up to a million pounds, they are deeply integrated into the mainstream media structure. I don't make that work as an individual, but at the same time I think I have a very significant initiating, shaping, framing role in that work. Trying to define that sense of authorship in research contexts is a very tricky issue, I don't think we've begun to really address that. I would also say that although that work, thinking in terms of what Catherine is saying about reviewing responses, although that work has become the basis of a small, growing amount of traditional research work in terms of scholarly article and books chapters, it's never responded to as research, it's responded to as production in mainstream context. I haven't felt yet that there's any kind of dialogue, printed or otherwise, understanding that practice as research. I think that's probably my problem in terms of how it's framed but it's another significant issue.

Very briefly in terms of what Illuminations has done; we started, like hundreds of others, as a small independent production company making films about the arts and culture for Channel 4. I'm very cautious about framing this as a golden age, but there was a period of 5 or 6 years where much of the output of Channel 4 could be understood as filmmaking research in the way in which we now think about it. Work by many, many others in those early years was absolutely about using practice to investigate the possibilities and parameters of filmmaking practice. I think there are a lot of lessons there, and there's a lot of archival material there that can be drawn on to help understand some of the questions we're talking about. John Ellis is another key figure in this discourse, very involved in a production company called Large Door, has recently without any concern for rights or ownership, put online quite a significant number of the films that he made with others for Channel 4 in those early years. The work that he did for Visions, a series about cinema and television culture in the mid 80s, is absolutely pertinent to a lot of this work. Now that it's freely available, until somebody objects and it's taken down, I think it's a really useful resource.

That culture carried through in a diluted form within television, within the BBC, until around 2000. And then there's a real sense that on around the 1st January 2000, British Television changed fundamentally. The whole framework of the explosion of distribution channels, the dismantling of a few of them, kind of shifted the basis of television and meant that that culture that we had all found small little niches in, disappeared. A lot of what I've been involved in since then is trying to find other kinds of practice to sustain a small but still commercially viable production company. A lot of what we did from 2002 to 2008-9 was make self-resourced, low cost video work about the visual arts which we distributed ourselves, first on VHS and then on DVD, some educational licences, some broadcast screenings, and so forth. Just about sustaining a business which allowed us to make low cost profiles of both living and recently deceased contemporary modern British artists. Building a library in that context which had a distribution channel through traditional forms of distribution. That sort of came to an end around 2008 as cultural organisations, particularly, Tate, started doing what we were doing, but doing it for free. And it was then impossible to compete in that context. Since then we've been working with a real cobbled together, mixed economy of production funding from public sources, Arts Council England, from the Space, and others, as well as bits of broadcast and bits of other possibilities to create different kinds of work, and much of that has been about performance. The key thing there is, at each of those stages, we tried to understand from the very beginning what the distribution strategy of that production was. I think it's a very simple lesson to put on the table; but if you're making a feature film you have a distribution strategy, you probably, almost certainly have a sales agent, you have an understanding of audience before you turn over. And I think that idea is crucial to this development field, if we want it to be more than the possibilities of production without much sense of an audience.

Understanding that distribution model and understanding the implications of that distribution for things like rights and permissions and the involvement of others is really crucial. In that discussion there's a real sense you have to address the dynamic of revenue and reach. Is this about trying to make some return on your own investment and resource in time terms, or in terms of investment of others in public or private sources, or is it simply about getting as many people as possible to see this. They're not completely distinct questions, they've got connections and relationships, but they're also two different ways of thinking about what you're doing. In terms of then developing your audience for that, there are lessons to be learnt from the way in which documentary film culture has reinvented itself in the last decade. Much of that has been about documentary makers realising there are particular audiences with particular interests that they can address and engage.

The environment group Context is an obvious one, where there is a pre existing audience with a concern and demand, a need for that kind of work, and making work which identifies that audience, fulfils their needs, and is able to reach them through a really sophisticated marketing and social media strategy is a key to getting some of those significant documentaries out into the world and giving them impact. So I think that sense of having an idea of pre-existing audience – and those audiences just might be audiences for, in very generic terms, art-house films. And I think that's what Josh's work, which he so successfully did, is a very rare way of achieving that impact. So a conscious address to an art house audience, which he was able then, with his partners, to capitalise on brilliantly. I don't know that that's a form that can be easily recruited. But I think there are other kinds of audiences which can be drawn on, worked with, engaged with, activated, by social media. The more you can understand that at the early stages of production and the more you can relate that to the research aspirations that you have, perhaps the more successful work will be.

Research frameworks: Excellence in Research Australia (ERA): James Verdon, Swinburne

I want to really briefly drill into that research framework that we operate with in Australia, and certainly in the first half you'll just be mentally mapping that against the REF, and then about half

way through there's going to be departures where what's happening is going to be very different to what's happening in the UK.

There are two main research data collections that happen in Australia, the ERA that I am predominately talking about today, the other is called HERDC which the Higher Education Research Data Collection and that happens annually and its just about volume, but it's also very restrictive in that the only things that can be submitted to that are conference proceedings, journal articles, book chapters and monographs and that's it. And it's really just about registering everything that's produced. The ERA is much closer to the REF and it the university will curate a particular response, in a similar way to happens in the REF, and approximately a third of the eligible outputs will be put in, there's evidence collected around that, all the stuff you would expect. The classifications are set up differently in that we have 21 divisions and the division is Studies in the Creative Arts and Writing but from there we drill down and it seems we drill down in a much more granular way, so within division 19 there are classifications, there are 6 divisions within that Creative Arts and Writing. The one that we claim is referred to 1902 as is Film, Television and Digital Media. Within that there are 6 further codes, which are 6 digit codes. Film, Television and Digital Media is the one that is most often referenced but within that there are some local exclusions, and also some interesting inclusions. Within Film, Television and Digital Media, Cinema Studies is there, Computer Gaming and Animation, Electronic Media Art, Film and Television, Interactive Media, and Film, Television and Digital Media are also classified, so there is a real level of granularity that we can work at, at 6 digit code level to really look what's happened. So when you're slicing and dicing, thinking about rates of success, submission, all of those other things that might happen around the rest of the Australian Research Council's work, everything is classified by those codes so you can haul lots of data out. We have lots of issues around under representation and proportionate funding to big areas and as you drill into those areas you start to build a bigger picture about what are the emerging research areas, whose getting money, based on ARC stuff and you can also be aware of where are those publications coming from, and how are they classified.

You can split codes, so you can have a publication and have a split between Media and Communications and another area of Film, Television and Digital Media and that can as wide as you want it to be. So you can do something in Astrophysics and Film, Television, and that's fine.

2018 is our next submission, it's a three year cycle. There's been a sign that lots of things are going to change, but the ARC has not released anything, but they have said there will be some measure of impact, but how impact will be defined and how it will be measured is unknown. The big argument at the moment is will it be case study based or will it not. At the moment, the ARC website says 'we do not measure impact' but we know it's coming. So we're very interested to look to England to see what's happened. The other big thing that's changing is there will be no funding attached to the rankings, and to the outcomes of the Excellence in Research Australia framework. Previously funding has been based on research, as you'd expect, but now it's going to be used for league tables, it's useful, but there's no funding attached to it. It's uncertain what that means for how funding will be allocated. It's a bizarre position for a university to be in, but certainly it's going to shake things up. We think that the Federal Government has a very strong mandate around applied research and is moving away from pure research. Then, impact coming in, and those things coming together, will shake things up.

The code 1902, Film Television and Digital Media, does encompass both traditional and non traditional outputs. Like, Cinema and Screen Studies is sitting in there alongside the work we do and certainly there's a disproportionate amount of submissions in the way in which those submissions are crafted. So for us, that's good attention because you have rankings and measures of excellence where universities are comparing to each other, but the kinds of things going on are completely

different even though we have that granular level. That's been an issue for us, and it's based on Australian and New Zealand research clusters.

For us, we still have those issues around traditional and non-traditional [outputs], but certainly in tracking and being aware people are putting work in the wrong codes, it's very useful. Our department focus on code 1902 but because of some of the exclusions, our game staff are not happy about that in particular, because they want to comply in other codes, but in our institution they have to focus there.

The biggest exclusion is that film and television script writing is not included in film, television and digital media. It's included in Performing Arts and Creative Writing. You can use other codes, but the home code where that would go by default is somewhere else which is hugely problematic for us. Lens based practice, including photography, is included in Visual Arts and Crafts which is somewhere else, so again if you are doing professional practice based stuff, particularly around cinematography, you have huge issues about where that might go, and where the university might put that. Often you're thinking about where is this going, what's the narrative around the code, and in terms of the institution, where do we want put those things. For individual researchers, and also for clusters of researchers who are trying to build an identity, a profile, get support from their institution, it can be really difficult.

In terms of non traditional research outputs, NTROs as they are called in Australia, there's a huge variety of practice within different institutions. Up until now, my institution have never submitted a non-traditional research output, apart from reports and other kinds of non-creative practice. Previously, they didn't see the value in it, but when I put to them 'here's what we could be doing, and here's how it would map to Research Australia score card', they were asking 'why haven't we been doing this? We should have been doing this!' It wasn't previously part of their narrative. In most cases, institutions will listen to you, you just have to go and tell them what it is and how it might work for them as a value proposition and then often the reception you get it really good. We've had really good success at our university, and that's been used elsewhere. There are a number of other Australian institutions that have done really well and have consistently been submitting non-traditional research outputs and doing very well having that recognised at a Federal level, for a number of years. It's just that it's different practices. The University of New South Wales has come out really well, QUT has done very well, there are a number of places where that case worked, where that narrative worked. But not everyone has adopted it. For any place that has a strong cinema and screen studies culture, they may not want to 'contaminate' it in any way, they want to make sure the ranking they get is based on that recognised outputs.

I hope that's useful.

Research frameworks: Research Excellence Framework (REF): Lizzie Thynne, Sussex

I've got a few notes, including how practice based PhDs still have a slightly ambivalent status in certain institutions.

The REF has been going since 1986, it distributes about 2 billion pounds now, it's roughly every 6 years. The last two REFs we've had to submit four outputs per research-active person, there has been a selective process whereby if your work was not considered to meet the top two grades, you were excluded, or you didn't have an average point and met the grades, then you were excluded on the basis of originality, significance and rigour.

The next REF, like you, we don't know how we're going to be assessed. So the next REF is due by the end of 2020 and there has been a review of the process in light of the recognition of the extreme cumbersomeness and expense of the process, by Lord Stern who has published a review which has a positive aspect, I think. The suggestion that Stern is made is that not everyone should have to submit 4 outputs, potentially you can only submit 2. Or you could submit 6 if you've produced 6 brilliant outputs.

I think this could be thinking about the implications of this in terms of practice. Personally, I've been lucky to work in universities where practice outputs have always been included in the REF. One of the potential advantages of what Stern is suggesting is that rather than being obliged to submit at least 4 outputs, one could potentially put a lot of effort into one or two major practice projects with a level of complexity, a lot of work into the impact of them. Which might be to the advantage of certain kinds of practice items, rather than producing four smaller, potentially lesser pieces. Not least of all because of the effort we all know is needed to acquire sufficient funding to produce work that reaches the required level of profile for funding. Therefore, also potential to achieve the requisite levels of significance and reach. I think that's a potentially positive aspect of this new regime which will be finalised by next summer.

There is still an issue, in my view, and I know from other institutions in Britain where it is still the case, whereby at least from the perspective of managers – especially senior managers – practice is seen as risky. Perhaps because practice outputs are maybe not as easily commodifiable within the research economy, at least as far as research is seen according to dominant definitions. And I think it's the time and funding sometimes needed to produce them at all. I think this anxiety is not necessarily sorted out by the REF feedback which I think has gradually improved and become much more positive in terms of recognising the worth of the practice submitted, certainly I think that was the case in our school last time. Despite various last minute management panics about our outputs, which was actually partly to do with the sorts of concerns and worries about how it should be presented in order to justify its research claims.

To go away from the mechanics to conceptual and discursive issues to do with the REF and practice. Here, I think it is important to learn from some of the work that has been done in the past, that we don't reinvent the wheel. Some of these discussions have been going on for a very long time. I particularly want to mention Practice as Research and Performance, which was a previous large-scale AHRC project which many people here were involved in and which had the luxury of a 5 year funding to develop all kinds of discussions about practice, as well as various outputs. One of the publications from that you might be familiar with was called 'Practice, Research and Performance on Screen' which came out in 2009 and there was in fact a chapter on peer review which I contributed to, as well as various examples of practice that were produced in connection with that project, or were influenced by it. One of the things that came out in a lot of the discussions, which were particularly wonderful because they were interdisciplinary, they weren't just looking at the media, they were also about theatre, about dance, which therefore introduced a lot of interesting ideas about documentation, about audiences, about process, which are often implicit in filmmaking but because of the end-orientated aspects of film production, are not so much acknowledged as in those other disciplines. There was also a lot of discussion about the tension between the needs of audiences and the demands of the research framework.

I think there does remain a tension for practitioners, where research is defined into predetermined research questions and to particular forms of extractable knowledge or even methods which are transferable to other contexts. When I think about these issues, there is an article by Bell which was published in 2006 in the Journal of Media Practice which I find quite inspiring, where he talks about the distinction between new knowledge objects, and original art objects, and the difficulty of

reconciling those two concepts of the object which come from either a research framework or a creative production context. At the time Bell was querying the RAE criteria and the problems with the idea of defining research as systematic and REFable research methodology and research questions. Which as we know has come to us from a science context. One of the things he talks about is the difficulties of drawing generalizable conclusions from a piece of practice or the idea that one can generate a context-free methodological precepts, both of these things coming out of social science and science which remains an issue in terms of the definitions of impact that remain in the REF. He argues that the primary purpose of the artist is the art object, it's making work and not abstract knowledge objects. And following Curry, he proposes that the finished piece be approached in relation to processes and performative acts that give rise to it, and not just the immediate encounter with a work of art, which he calls aesthetic empiricism. This approach is, to some extent, embodied within the requirement to produce portfolios within the REF, to accompany practice outputs which also hopefully will be facilitated by the probable new rules of the REF where if outputs were pure outputs when you submitted, this would allow submission of more substantial portfolios and illuminating the performative status of the work.

Just a little bit on impact. One of the other recommendations of Stern is that impact should be linked to a potentially larger body of work, for instance where the school or the university have an interdisciplinary focus, and also wider impact of teaching and public engagement, that again potentially has some good news for practice people. However, the other aspect of this is precisely the thing I've already talked about: that there is sometimes difficulty in demonstrating significance of an individual piece of work. Because of the way that impact is defined in terms of its useability, which is often quite functional in terms of changes in methods and so on, which are not necessarily generalizable from individual pieces of artistic practice.

Remaining delegates give short responses

Charlotte Crofts, UWE

I want to make four really brief points. One is I submitted practice and I did this thing where I submitted my practice film and article as one item to a peer reviewed website, which relates to the last point you made and the portfolio, being able to get one thing. I was involved in writing a case study that had practice in it, so that can be done.

I'm involved with BAFTSS, which is the British Association of Film and Television Screen Studies and they've introduced special interest groups, so there's now a model practice that I'm co-convenor of, and we've submitted a practice panel to their conference which is happening in April. Our panel is going to be about screenwriting genres. There's also Practicable that Katie and I, Sarah Atkinson, and Sarah Barrow are judges of, and the practice award also gets featured on Screenworks, which I'm one of three associate editors of. In terms of peer review, we have interest in alternatives to peer review as sometimes peer reviewers don't even seem to watch the film. There's issue at peer review for practice which are really interesting. But we developed a system where we don't publish everything even if it gets negative reviews, but sometimes if it's had a positive review and a negative review, we may allow the person who submitted to have a rejoinder and get a bit of dialogue. I think it's really important to make that public and doing that out loud. The ethos behind that is very much to do with making practice explicit, it's a new field, it's an emerging field, so we can start to be recognised. But whether that's making it very different from a normal peer review process, and therefore somehow ghettoising it, I don't know. I think practice is really interesting, we accept publications so if anyone is a practice person and wants to submit stuff, then please do. We've also got Special Issue on radical film coming up, the deadline is the end of January. And another call being developed which isn't public yet which is going to be around displacement.

Nariman Massoumi, Bristol

I'm very new to this whole process because I've been an early career researcher, finished my PhD and graduated in July. I was teaching at Bath Spa, I had a post there for a couple of years, then I settled at Bristol. I mention that because, it's quite interesting for me, the different universities. Bristol is a Russell Group university, but Bath and Bristol are different in terms of research, league tables, books. The relationship to practice research was much more creative industry, commercially focused. They have a creative writing programme there, their practice research seems to be much less hung up about practice in some ways so all the PhDs students do is publish a novel and so on. But I was coming to Bristol University research was much more important, whereas the only people who seem to understand practice research are the people involved in it; the research managers, the people responsible for research are really interested in it, but they don't seem to have the kind of interest where they actually know what it is. It's kind of a strange phenomenon

The only thing I wanted to raise, in relation to some of the stuff about peer review, I've just started being involved in Screenworks, was that one of the obstacles of peer review, first of all I don't understand if the REF requires submissions of practice work that has been peer reviewed because it seems to me you can submit practice work without it so in a way where does the peer review fit within that, why are we doing it? The second thing is, if you're making practice for festivals, commercially viable, all those kind of things, there is a problem there with open access, it seems to me that one of the reasons we don't get submissions is people don't want their films freely available online, there's ways in which we can work with that. I think there are opportunities where we would have a password within the submission, but it basically requires an interested viewer to go in, and in some ways it creates a kind of informal obstacle so it doesn't mean that it's just available. I'm interested in talking about that.

Eric Knusden, Central Lancashire

I just want to pick up on one thing about the issue of quality. The fact that we need to be able to sit down with our colleagues in medicine, in the physics, and we need to be able to collaborate if we're going to be able to access the kind of funding and institutional support that some people have mentioned earlier. I think this is about stopping and talking about practice, and talking about research, and actually having a common understanding of what we mean by generating new knowledge, new understanding, new applications and being able to talk about practice as methods, methodologies. And there is evidence of new knowledge. And perhaps developing a language where we can talk with confidence with our medical colleagues, saying 'yes, I've made a contribution toward new knowledge, new understanding'. This comes back to the issue of quality because I think a lot of the people who are assessing practice work who don't know what it means to generating new knowledge in this field, we don't have the common understanding of it. The new knowledge can be both tacit, or it can be very systematic and everything in between. But I think we need to go back to basics and have some kind of common language around knowledge.

Adrian Goycoolea, Sussex

I think this talk we're having is useful for me trying to get clarity as to what exactly it is I'm doing as a practitioner within academia and thinking about exactly what you were saying about creating new knowledge. One question I have is where does the new knowledge lie, as a filmmaker, is it in film studies? If it is in film studies, then what does our methodology add to the study of film? Is filmmaking a separate field that isn't film studies? If so, how does academic research sit alongside industry practice? Who should be our audiences? Is it inside or outside of academia? Is it both at the

same time, and if so that's incredibly difficult to speak to both of those audiences at the same time. Does filmmaking work necessarily require written supporting statements or even parallel article publication? If so, why? Why do scholarly articles require supporting video statements? This is not to say that we shouldn't contextualise our practice within existing scholarship, we require our PhD students to do so, but it requires us to perhaps do more labour, more work, or a more complicated way of doing our work than our non-research colleagues. Does filmmaking research require footnoting and citation? If so, what would that look like? Would that be citation of scholarship or other practice research? Again, I think this is about having a sort of conversation with existing practitioners, existing scholarship, existing bodies of knowledge. Is all filmmaking researchers object of study the craft of filmmaking? Which seems to be often the discussion, that you make this thing in order to study the craft of filmmaking and that's seems a little bit limited to me. Perhaps it's a sub-field like Linguistics or Grammatology, as a sort of way of understanding the way in which filmmaking speaks. But that shouldn't be all that we are doing, although it could be interesting. Those are my questions.

Tony Dowwmunt, Goldsmiths

I just want to add to what Lizzie was saying, there was also an organisation called AvPHD which I was involved with as an online presence and I think it would be interesting to return to the issue of PhD at some time today.

Picking up on what John was saying about the mainstream, about the relative statuses of practice and theory within a media and communications department. I see practice research as being a hybrid between mainstream practice and academia. What worries me is that some of our approaches to practice researches that I think we've given too much to the economy and industry of academia and not enough to the other end of that. In particular, I think that somebody who just works as a mainstream industrial practitioner is, in a really discriminated against position in terms of employment and recognition because of this research contracts, for example. At Goldsmiths, we're developing non-research contracts for practitioners. It seems to me that one of the things that we have to hold out for, particularly in solidarity with our more practice orientated colleagues, is equal status for somebody who doesn't do research, who just carries on being a practitioner and that requires a massive institutional shift. We have to develop to say 'actually there are forms of work that aren't research, but are research equivalent' in terms of someone's access to seniority and promotion and all of those things. Unless we do that within academia, we're going to lose colleagues who are working within the industry who have no interest in writing that 300 words to be REF recognised.

Ian McDonald, Newcastle

To briefly outline the operation at Newcastle, because it's quite new. My background, I'm essentially a sociologist who ventured into filmmaking as an extension of my sociological practice. I was in an institute which had that clear separation which had that clear separation between practice and theory. My experience was the practice wasn't seen as legitimate in an academic environment. In order to continue to do that, I had to leave, and went to Newcastle to set up Film and Culture to bring theory and practice together. Launched in September 2015, as a place where practice-led teaching and research. Currently we have undergraduate degrees, a cohort of 50 students, one in film and media which focuses on documentary, one on film practices, which extends the documentary to more experimental forms. We also have a small community of PhD students. Explicitly, a 3+1+3 journey for students, focusing primarily on documentary.

The values, what film means, because we're small, we have a particular approach to film making. Firstly, it's an embodied practice, we're clear about that, it's about the filmmakers relationship to the world. We do that to avoid the fetishisation of technology which students seem to have. Secondly, it's about cinematic. Belief in the importance of cinematic as a form of filmmaking and viewing, but also a critique of the cinematic. And it's a political practice as well. We convey our commitment to social values, to making a difference, to making some kind of change. All this comes together with the notion that what we're trying to create in the film and culture lab, is that we want this to be the site for theoretical debate and the sweat of creative practice. That really sums up what we do. We've been doing this in isolation because we want to create our identity and now we can look outward and that's what's good about this network.

Alistair Cole, Newcastle

About disciplinary, the idea of screen production enquiry, it's a strange thing we face as practice based researchers, and I face with my research which is that you have two elements going on: research into your own practice and also the enquiry itself. For me, as an investigative Anthropologist I have the chance to write about that, but also the film itself has a way that can engage with that research. I think that dualism we have is pretty particular. When we're talking about other disciplines, we need to engage with other disciplines and bring them in. I've worked in partnership with an anthropologist and that was really valuable to me to that. The second thing I want to touch upon is this idea of peer reviewing. It was really interesting to me to think about it in relation to my project and peer reviewing a future documentary process in that it's really difficult for us to give the feature documentary to a journal because we have got distribution deals, we've got things locked in before you release it. In that sense, it's really difficult to have something peer reviewed when it's finished because you can't change it, and this role of improving is really key for that: so where does it come in? There is this thing that happens in industry, around the rough cut development stage. I've been to events where you review rough cuts and it is a space in which you go through the rough cut and then you go to the audience testing stage, and these are moments where you're looking to improve your film and I wonder if there's a role for peer reviewing, for us to think about peer reviewing as a stage of practice. A journal release could happen after you've done a festival run, after you've broadcast.

Session 2: Workshop discussion in breakout groups

The workshop discussion will be based on the FRN strands, but the approach is to focus on a film genre (see below) and use that to address the list of trigger topics. Topics to trigger conversations use as appropriate:

- *What are the opportunities and challenges for this genre in relation to research criteria? (for example REF, institutional definitions)*
- *Are there exemplars or best practice models/case studies that can be cited? (provide specifics of the project, journal, etc)*
- *What forms of dissemination are appropriate? Are there better ones than others?*
- *Which funding bodies support this genre?*
- *What funded research projects are you aware of? Give details*
- *Does this genre attract PhD students? Why?*

Genres: Professional Practice, Interdisciplinary, documentary, fiction, essay film, screenwriting, digital media hybrid works

Professional Practice – examining industry working practice for example the study of professional practice like cinematography or editing.

Interdisciplinary Practice – filmmakers working with researchers who are outside the discipline.

[Group 1: Documentary - Tony] The first remark is documentary; a genre or a mode? But we didn't go into that! The second bit of the discussion is about whether documentary commonly is about other things rather than being about filmmaking itself, so we were aware that a lot of the time some documentaries generate new knowledge about history or other academic areas. We also felt strongly that any filmmaking process is not just about what it's about but it's also about how it treats that subject, so we weren't making a distinction about content and form, in that way.

We thought that because documentary is relatively cheap in relation to other filmmaking forms often acts as a sort of RND for filmmaking as a whole, so it's enabled to be more experimental. We then had a long discussion about ethics; both in relation to the ways in which documentary film making ethics is a very separate subject from university ethical requirements and what the contradictions between those two things were and are. We talked a lot about Kyle McLaughlin's Inside Stories which is an instant project which to some of us was an example of good ethical practice.

Then we had a long conversation about PhDs and really the balance between practice and theory in a PhD. Whether you started with practice and then picked up on theory later, or the other way round, and what the balance was between practice and theory in a PhD and crucially, what is the film itself in conversation with; is it in conversation with other documentary forms, is it in conversation with social issues or history. I think all of us were used to having two supervisors on any practice-theory project and that often one person would be a documentary practitioner and the other person would be competent in the theoretical area that the PhD was in conversation with.

Then we got on to dissemination and talked about film festivals, and the problems and constraints around peer review as a way of assessing documentary practice and research projects. There was some concern that getting really involved in the REF requirements and for peer review as a whole would severely limit the scope of the work that people can get involved in; that we would get too focused on institutional REF outputs rather than just making the films we wanted to make. There was some recognition that there is a need for a non-profit niche dissemination system. The kind of conversations it is possible to have within academia about film research projects are often deeper than you would have at a festival or a Q&A.

We also discussed the issue of length; the difficulty of submitting to festivals films that were 45 minutes long. There was an issue of dissemination there too.

[Group 2: Fiction/Narrative, Duncan] We also started off with definitions and the whole thing about, looking at fiction, what did we mean by that? We were talking about story and narrative, which is just as appropriate to non-fiction as well. Later on, we started to break it down and think about different elements of the creative process, so the way in which various things come together. One thing that was very clear about most of the sort of practice we were talking about was that it was collaborative, it necessarily involved people working together, bringing different types of skills and expertise and indeed creative elements to the process. We decided that, first of all there are a lot of challenges because something like fiction is more associated with the mainstream, and this whole thing of the mainstream versus the academy, and it seems like this creates more challenges. On the other hand, there's a sense in which you can see fiction and fictional forms of storytelling as being necessarily more experimental because you are creating elements that don't necessarily exist before hand, there's an opportunity there in terms of how you might interrogate your research questions.

We saw it in relation to the REF and institutional definitions, that there are certainly challenges there.

We identified a whole range of exemplars or best practice, starting off with the work of my three colleagues. But then we also ranged around other examples of work being done by academics and PhD students, so very early career academics. Also looking at more recent film history; people like Clio Barnard who come out of an academic context. But also casting back, Pierre Greenaway came up at one point, something like *Kathy Come Home*, Loach, Gardner and Sandford in that instance, and thinking if something like that were to be made. Obviously, that would hit the impact agenda very, very effectively given what it did, causing questions to be asked in Parliament, etc. There's quite a lot of exemplars out there that we ought to be finding ways to draw upon and be inspired by and think about how we could frame things to meet some of the challenges I alluded to a moment ago.

Forms of dissemination created an interesting discussion about the desire of filmmakers to have a life for their work before it becomes institutionalised within the culture of publication outlets that REF would demand. We were looking at what point that might be feasible, and what you might aspire for your work to do first in terms of reaching a broader audience, going through festivals, finding other sorts of platforms, before it becomes freely available on your university server.

Funding bodies, again, there are challenges and opportunities there. Challenges in the sense that we might find that AHRC might not readily look at this stuff – or maybe they will – but it's not four square mainstream for them. On the other hand, talking about some of the industry funding bodies, this would be seen as far too esoteric, and the stuff that we used to make 30 years ago but not necessarily anymore. But we've got a number of different bodies listed here from AHRC, to the Arts Council, the BFI potentially, the British Council funding for festivals, that sort of stuff. We were looking at things like sponsorship, private investment, crowdsourcing, which is certainly something our students are doing more of. In fact, it's part of their professional training is to learn how to do some crowd sourcing for the project. So then funded research projects were implicit in a lot of the stuff we talked about.

Attracting PhD students, yes, it's very attractive for PhD students, Eric has lots of examples, we've got a quite a few. This is probably seen as a bit sexier for students. I guess some students won't have had that point of having to imbibe a word where it seems that the different areas don't talk to each other or seem mutually exclusive; maybe they do see it as a stepping stone to an industry career. I think the last thing we'd want to do is undermine that; all we need is more examples of people who are able to transition to a world of scholarship to a successful industry career, while maintaining that sense of being serious about what they do. You can imagine the industry might get very interested; at the end of the day, the industry is looking for success stories.

[Group 3: Interdisciplinary, Susan] Our topic was interdisciplinary filmmaking and in terms of challenges, the first thing we discussed was that there can be some equity issues in bringing film makers onto interdisciplinary research projects; sometimes you might be that you're not seen as contributing to the process of mediating the research into the audio visual form, but that you're just there to make that researcher look good. That might be an issue for some projects. The other thing we talked about collaboration as a challenge and an opportunity on interdisciplinary projects; it has a double edged sword. In terms of opportunities we talked about interdisciplinary projects might be able to realise multiple outputs around the material and I gave an example. In multiple outputs, there is more unused material that might be from a filmic work rather than a written work. I had an example of an honours student research project, they came onto a larger project I was working on and made a short film about creative industries in Hunter region and in his honours dissertation he

was studying embodiment of filmmaking and various forms of Bourdieu's cultural capital and habitus and social capital and economic capital. He wrote a paper on that, which was published. I realised that what we had in the film was interviews with local creative industries people which he hadn't tapped into in his research, so we transcribed that and tried to put forward an article for the journal of Creative Industries, which was about the content of the film. It didn't make it through peer review as a standalone transcription of the film, but with the peer review feedback we added more and got a publication from it. What we got was three outputs; one is the film itself, one is the creative industries article about the content of the film, and one is his study of his own embodiment of his documentary practice. We're talking about interdisciplinary research giving you opportunities for multiple outputs of research.

We talked about exemplars which I'll talk about when I talk about models of funding, because they became the same thing. Forms of dissemination which were appropriate for interdisciplinary films; we went through the normal film festival, broadcasting, academic conferences, teaching and learning contexts. Then Alistair talked about his film distributor and that there are a couple of distributors in the US – Icarus and DER. DER in particular, could really see the value of the film work having been showcased at academic conferences, that that was new markets for them.