Theme 5: The evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media

Theme 5 is divided into seven thematic sub-sections (5a through 5g).

a) Many dimensions of standards: Measuring individual attainment
b) On our own terms
c) Evidence to be submitted for performance evaluation
d) The professional portfolio
e) The range of work in pre-production
f) Broadcast and distribution of film and digital media
g) Film festivals, competitions, other special events

> *Four years ago, the administration began accepting media projects that were presented at conferences, submitted for awards, or publicly sold as scholarship* (Respondent #1).

The evaluation of works of art, even by professionals, is highly subjective, especially with respect to contemporary work. Therefore, there is a built-in respect for individual points of view. At the same time, in all of the arts disciplines, there is recognition that communication through works of art is impossible unless the artist possesses a significant technique in his or her chosen medium. All aspects of a film or media production work, including the technical, creative, business and legal aspects, should be acknowledged during a performance evaluation, but this has not been the case as demonstrated by a range of data. Faculty work in film and digital media is an integrated whole---involving technical, creative, legal and business expertise. Corporate, commercial, and industrial productions usually rely on a group of specialists, to lesser and greater degrees and in various ways, to realize the intended work; while auteur filmmakers work alone, or perhaps in very small teams, approaching the four requirements (technical, creative, legal and business) as an integrated whole that would otherwise be accomplished by several persons working in collaboration.

Broadness, not vagueness, in the scope and nature of work must be considered during a performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media; not just the artifacts that represent the finality of work. The unique and specific aspects of work in the particular field of film and digital media should guide the evaluation criteria and process. Wait and Hope (2009) contribute a useful analogy:

> If you want to use a computer, you have to work with that computer according to the nature of the programs it contains. In other words, you have to work with the computer on its terms and not yours. In a way, different fields of study and practice are analogous to the computer in the sense that they have their own systems. They have their own mechanisms, their own pathways, their own structures of information. If you want to work with any given field in any kind of sophisticated way and actually help it improve, you have to learn a tremendous amount about that field. It is impossible to make suggestions about improvements to the internal workings of a computer system unless you know in great detail how such systems work and what various options are for certain kinds of decisions (p. 12).

Filmmakers integrate pre-conceptualized aural and visual strategies to develop the plan, treatment and content for creatively illuminating the conclusions of research, in an artistic, aesthetic, communicative, and unique way. In the following section I describe some examples of evidence that represent any of the phases of work that are inherent in the process of making work in film and digital media. I argue that many aspects of work can and should be recognized during a performance evaluation of faculty performance in film and digital media.

a) Many dimensions of standards: Measuring individual attainment

Standards imply a working formulation of ideas about the attributes of successful work. Standards or expectations can be expressed in many ways---for example, levels of technique, degrees of breadth and depth, types of knowledge application, and so forth (Wait and Hope, 2009). Wait and Hope (2009) provide a list of attributes and characteristics of individual achievement in an effort to define achievement and quality:

Characteristics and Attributes of Individual Achievement

- Basic professional-level knowledge and skills
- Personal vision evident in work
- Conceptual acuity and creative virtuosity at multiple levels of complexity
- Imagination and ability to channel imagination to reach artistic goals
- Technical virtuosity
- Conceptual and technical command of integration and synthesis

At the individual level a tremendous amount of educational time and energy is spent developing and honing skills of self-evaluation to the highest possible level. This is absolutely critical in the creation of a work of art or design where evaluation is constant throughout the entire creative process, and especially in the final product itself. In fact, virtuosity in constant adjustment is a significant goal. Wait and Hope (2009) write:

> Now we would suggest that to some extent meeting the standards set by NASAD and by individual institutions enables development of work with these attributes by practicing professionals. However, the attributes are not manifested in the same way. Their actual realization is subject to preferences or individual aspirations and standards of quality that are internal to the kind of work being done and to the development of each artist or

> even each work of art or design (p. 9-10).

What makes all of this extremely difficult for those on the outside to understand is that there is almost never a pure correlation between knowledge and technical skills on one hand and artistry on the other. So performance evaluations move from what is easy to measure to what is difficult to measure, and ultimately to matters of personal aesthetic preference.

b) On our own terms

Artists and designers of any ilk need to make effective evaluations and assessments on a daily basis. They are critically aware of the things that they know and do. The problem that faculty face in performance evaluation, according to Wait and Hope (2009), is the artist-faculty's inability to convincingly express to others "what we do"---what he/she knows, what is done, and what can't be done (p. 12). Wait and Hope (2009) suggest that art and design professionals work their whole lives to improve their powers of self-assessment and add:

> …the problem is not that we do not know how to make assessments and evaluations, but rather that we are not as adept as we need to be in explaining to others what we do, how it works, and why it works. We also need to improve our abilities to debate effectively when our explanations are rejected. (p. 1).

Wait and Hope (2009) advise that faculty in art and design fields, including film and digital media, think more deeply about communication, with the goal of maintaining assessment on terms useful and productive for the art and design profession. Artistic work involves making choices and combining those choices in the creation or presentation of a work of art or design. To some degree, works of art or design are developed for a particular place, purpose, or time---

reinforcing the notion of uniqueness and specificity in the artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media, proposed earlier in this chapter. Wait and Hope (2009) express concern about acceptance of an institutional ideology that merely emphasizes procedures, but offer no specific approach in return. Wait and Hope, (2009), as recommended in Chapter 5, do emphasize the need to consider ways and means of keeping assessment on our own terms, meaning that the process and criteria is determined in-house by those who know and have done the kind of work under review. As discussed and recommended in Chapter 5, the absence of assessment on our own terms is a particular contextual problem that those of us at the borders are facing at this time (Wait and Hope, 2009).

c) Evidence to be submitted for performance evaluation

The arts disciplines use a wide variety of evaluation mechanisms, including critiques or peer review by one person or more, public presentations such as screenings or concerts or exhibitions, both formative and summative evaluation, and others. Mechanisms include, but are not limited to:

- Auditions
- Portfolio and document reviews
- Examinations
- Juries
- Master classes
- Competitions
- Performance, or studio exhibitions
- Technique lessons and classes

- Rehearsals
- Public screenings and exhibitions
- Public performances

The more advanced the artist (faculty member or student), the more that evaluation of technical proficiency recedes in favor of the artistic attributes.

The first and foremost point that must be understood about the recognition and evaluation of work in the arts is that achievement and quality come from the work of an individual, or a group of individuals. Individuals vary in the range, scope, and depth of their backgrounds, abilities, education, talents, and vision. The work in the field of film and digital media, and the arts as a whole, needs many people fulfilling different functions at high levels of excellence. In addition to creation and performance, individual achievement and quality by faculty members is essential in teaching, scholarship, research, the arts therapies, the management and support sectors of the arts, and so forth. Each of these areas requires a deep understanding of what the arts are, in essence, and how they work as a mode of thought and action.

The promotion and tenure review/evaluation has three basic parts: 1) the documentation the faculty member provides, 2) the materials the committee collects, and 3) the review of the material by the committee (Diamond, 2002). Diamond (2002) writes: "A well-prepared faculty member can go a long way in making his or her case by providing a strong context and solid documentary materials for the committee to consider" (p. 17). Boyer (1990) and others (Gray, Adam, Froh, and Yonai, 1994) have described alternatives to the three-part model of teaching, research, and service, the following sections are based on the notion that it is a faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the approach, significance and quality of the work being submitted for evaluation, with the hope that fair and relevant criteria will be used by informed, qualified,

and experienced evaluators.

d) The professional portfolio

At the beginning of this paper, I started by trying to articulate what are some of the most fundamental aspects of work in the field of film and digital media. I did this, in part, because many of these practical notions and theoretical concepts are taken for granted—or overlooked entirely---to the point that a faculty member may be unaware of how much to incorporate into a dossier for review and evaluation. What is obvious to the faculty member who works in the field is not obvious to others. I hope it was helpful to articulate the scope and nature of these activites and theoretical foundations, and point out the constant assessment in which filmmakers already engage as they do their work on a daily basis---in teaching, research and service. Only when the faculty appreciates with full awareness what has been done, can that faculty member convincingly demonstrate the vitality, uniquness and specificity of one's approach. According to Wait and Hope, (2009) "we must make what is obvious to us more obvious to others" (p. 12).

Having identified in Chapter 4/Theme 4 what can be known for sure about the process of work in film and digital media, and what cannot, and/or the areas or levels where there is likely to be evaluation consensus and where there is not, the faculty member will then be in the position to explain what has been done with honesty and integrity, defeating false correlations that outcomes ideologists are prone to seek (Wait and Hope, 2009).

Seldin and Wiley (2009), Lynton (1992), Diamond (1993b) and many others discuss the need for a professional portfolio of faculty work that consists of a broad range of documentation, including a descriptive and reflective essay about the individual faculty's activities, to be prepared and submitted by the faculty for review and evaluation. Diamond (1993b) writes:

> The portfolio plan provides an opportunity for faculty to represent their work so as to differentiate exceptional and innovative teaching, software and curriculum development, and significant research from the more commonplace activities that all faculty perform (p. 11).

Lynton (1992) adds: "if each scholarly activity is, in some sense, a voyage of exploration and discovery, it can be fully appreciated and evaluated only if once can follow the scholar on that journey (p. 30). Diamond (2002) recommends that the professional portfolio:

> …stress two dimensions: 1) the quality of the work, and 2) the significance of the work. In many instances, faculty provide promotion and tenure committees with detailed information as to the quality and quantity of their effort; however, they do not present a case for the value of their work, describing the impact or emphasizing in what ways and for whom the work has significance (p. 25).

Diamond (1993b) also recommends that the faculty write a descriptive and reflective essay that includes:

> …specifics of the situation and the context of for the activity; the objective of the activity; the choice of the specific content and methodology; the results of reflection-in-action in terms of unique and unexpected features encountered, adaptations made, inferences drawn, and lessons learned by the scholar, and the outcomes in terms of learning by the audience (p. 11).

In contrast, there are faculty scholars who question the need or purpose that requires a faculty in film and digital media to write without motivation about their creative work. One professor wrote:

> Thus, the filmmaking scholar is in a kind of 'double jeopardy.' He might have to make the film, then present or explain it in some venue. Most are not opposed to that (what artist doesn't love to talk about his own work?), but a publishing scholar would not be expected to write a book and to make a presentation on the process of printing it. Indeed, it's silly to imagine writing an article, then writing a second article about the act of authoring the first. The requirements of promotion in the world of theory are fulfilled by project alone, sans apologia (Respondent #4).

e) The range of work in development and pre-production

During development and pre-production, the film is designed and planned. The development and pre-production stage is when the story is identified, perhaps emerging from original research; or a book, play, another film, a true story, original idea, newspaper story, or other. A synopsis, grant proposal, film treatment, multiple versions of the script, and various other documents will emerge during development and pre-production. During development and pre-production contracts will be negotiated, money will be raised, and collaboration plans will be formulated. A screenwriter may rewrite the script several times to improve dramatization, clarity, structure, characters, dialogue, and overall style---or to adapt to ever-changing circumstances that affect the production of the film. A distributor of the completed work may be contacted at an early stage to assess the likely market and potential financial success of the film. Once all parties have met and the deal has been set, the film may proceed further into the pre-production period. By this stage, the film should have a clearly defined marketing strategy and target audience.

The rigorous processes of work during pre-production including research and its several different forms of writing, pre-visualization design that is required as the foundation for the completion of scholarly filmmaking, and many other aspects are oftentimes overlooked, not recognized, underestimated or not allowable for submission in many institutions. However, it is clear that scholarly filmmaking is a form of creative scholarship where Boyer's four domains converge and form a fertile convergence of discovery, application, integration and teaching. For example, to develop and write a script for a 30 minute documentary program that is intended for television broadcast would require extensive research, perhaps employing a range of methods and approaches to develop the program's content (discovery); a thorough review of previously produced written and media-based works on the same or similar topics (discovery and integration); an organized plan of action for the meaningful collaboration of technical experts and creative individuals for excellence in filming on-camera processes, interactions and interviews (integration and application); creative choices made that determine the stylistic approach and treatment of the completed work (application); and the myriad of ways that the completed work will reach its target audiences and general public (teaching, outreach).

Unlike conventional scholarly work that probably has a very narrowly defined intended audience that is reached solely through the reading and publication of highly-specialized peer-reviewed professional journal articles, film and media arts have a very different, equally valuable, purpose as the work finally reaches its intended audience. The big difference is that film work might have an audience of millions of people in a variety of contexts; conventional research might only reach an elite few. Faculty for evaluation should remember to include in the dossier some or all of the following:

- A copy of the grant proposal (if available) that was successfully evaluated for project funding. Grant funding applications can be very comprehensive documents and should be given equivalent value as a journal-paper.
- A treatment and script (if possible) of the completed work. The program script is a well-research and pre-visualized document that should be given equivalent value as a journal-paper.
- A narrative document about the process of developing and producing the creative work, including precise descriptive information about the faculty member's role on the production. What was your role? What did you do on this project? If the creative work was produced by an auteur, a sole filmmaker in isolation who did all the technical and creative work, then it is important to identify this fact, and describe the scope and nature of the work.
- It might be useful to include an itemized budget and a general list of the kinds of technical equipment used to produce the creative work. This information will contextualize the scale, limits, and other practical factors that frame the creative work.

f) Broadcast, sales and distribution of film and digital media

> Further complicating the judging of a scholarly filmmaker is the fact that he often makes money in the exercise of his discipline…Films perceived as 'purely entertaining' are suspect, for they may appear to be motivated by profit rather than inquiry (Respondent #4).

Broadcast, sales and distribution are the final stages in the process of film and digital

media production; making the completed project/program available (or for the filmmaker to independently distribute/broadcast the work in a large variety of ways) to a distributor that markets the completed program to a variety of markets---educational, commercial, broadcast, regional, others---on DVD, Blu-ray disc, VHS tape and other exhibition formats; or to service provider that offers a direct download of the completed work(s). The completed work is duplicated as required for distribution, sales and broadcast. Press kits, posters, and other advertising materials are published and the film is advertised. Distribution companies might release a large budget film with a launch party, press releases, interviews with the press, press preview screenings, and film festival screenings. Today, many films have their own website. A feature film might be distributed/exhibited at selected cinemas with the DVD typically being released a few months later; while other projects, documentaries and short films, might be distributed directly to DVD markets. The distribution rights for the film and DVD are sold for specific markets as indicated in a contractual agreement between the distributor and the filmmaker---for example, broadcast television in a specific regional market (i.e. drive-in theaters in the southern states of the USA, etc), library distribution, cable TV broadcast, public television broadcast, foreign market broadcast, educational markets, or worldwide distribution. The distributor and the production company share profits according to a pre-agreed percentage---usually with the filmmaker getting the short end of the deal---for example, a 60%-40% split would be considered a good deal by many filmmakers (with their share being the 40%). Most distributors consider factors such as film genre, the target audience, the historical success of similar films, the actors who might appear in the film, and the track record of the director and other key personnel. Not all films make a profit from the theatrical release alone, so film companies take DVD sales and worldwide distribution rights into account.

g) Film festivals, competitions, special events

An important and significant means for reaching the general public, aside from commercial television broadcast or theatrical distribution, is through exhibition at film festivals or special events. Festivals and special events vary in scope and nature, but many are international in scope while others are national, regional or local. A majority of festivals are accepting and inviting creative work only after rigorous peer-evaluation based by a special panel of peer-experts, with acceptance being based on the festival's special theme or exemplary achievement in various categories of specialization. Sometimes the events are competitive with cash or in-kind prizes being awarded, and oftentimes the opportunities that arise afterwards from successful participation are numerous for the dossier of the filmmaker and for potentially broadening the scope of distribution of the film work itself. Festivals are excellent opportunities for peer-review, from the selection process to media promotion and publication. A faculty member who has work that has been selected in a local, regional or international film festival should be recognized for this achievement. Each film festival is separate and distinguishable from other festivals. Selection of the same work to multiple festivals should not be considered redundant. Instead, this is clear evidence that the creative work is being more broadly disseminated, thus, the work should be rewarded more greatly if selected on multiple occasions to participate in different festivals.

Information about the contest or festival should be submitted with the faculty member's dossier. Information such as the description of event, its inception date and location, number of entries (if known) that were included in the event, the number and kinds of works that were selected for prizes or in the same category as the faculty member's work(s), venues where work

was screened, etc. Evidence can be in the form of brochures, flyers, website pages, and other pertinent forms. Some suggestions for consideration and inclusion in the faculty's application file for promotion:

- Examples of the selection criteria used for the festival (if possible); was it a blind-peer review process or other kind of process?
- All reviews, particularly unsolicited reviews, about the creative work that is being submitted in an effort to demonstrate the value of the work
- A high-quality copy of the work that was exhibited in the festival or contest
- Evidence that the creative work that was selected for inclusion in a film festival or competition was included in a permanent collection by the organization that is sponsoring the festival. This is an example of continued public access to the creative work. The cost of acquisition is approximately equivalent to the purchase of a book or journal subscription by a library, and demonstrates the interest of an organization in owning the creative work for its permanent collection.

Theme 6: Post evaluation considerations

Franke (2001) writes: "When an institution denies tenure, honesty is the best policy. Otherwise, everyone may end up in court" (p. 1). Franke (2000) argues that evaluation processes should be "thoughtful and just" and "like hiring decisions, tenure and promotion decisions should be handled in a fair, equitable and timely fashion (p. 1). Courts tend to grant higher education institutions a great deal of deference in their academic decision-making, but data shows that courts will rule against colleges and universities where there is evidence of discrimination, arbitrary decision making, or failure to follow established institutional

procedures. Courts typically also order the disclosure of materials from other tenure reviews for comparative purposes. Franke (2001) writes:

> During the 1980s, federal judges resolved most tenure-denial cases. Common wisdom among lawyers at the time was that judges would tend to credit the testimony of university administrators, since both the judges and administrators were highly educated white males and most of the plain-tiffs were women, minorities, or both. Congress changed the legal landscape rather dramatically in 1991, putting employment-discrimination cases in federal court into the hands of juries. The number of employment-discrimination cases has subsequently skyrocketed, from 8,400 in 1990 to 23,700 in 1998 (the most recent year for which figures are available). Although precise numbers for tenure-denial cases are unavailable, they, too, have increased significantly. The common wisdom today holds that jurors are suspicious of institutions and tend to favor the 'little guy.' The confluence of these developments has given rise to very participatory tenure processes, an active litigation docket, full disclosure of tenure-review evidence, and decisions made by juries. The mixture is potent (p. 2).

Several aspects of the tenure-evaluation process become important in tenure-denial lawsuits. Franke (2001) recognizes the importance of treating unsuccessful candidates as a "professional colleague" and not one "airbrushed out of a Kremlin photograph" (p. 24). Franke (2001) recognizes the responsibility of the institution:

> …to take many steps to help the individual with what may be a difficult transition. If the institution provides assistance and expressions of concern, it may reduce the anger and

> desire for revenge that some unsuccessful candidates feel. Caring for unsuccessful candidates is a humane and decent thing to do. It is a good way to prevent some lawsuits (p. 20).

Franke (2001) provides a range of good advice for how institutions can handle unsuccessful post-evaluation situations:

- Deliver the bad news with compassion. Franke (2001) asks institutions to consider *how* candidates are notified with bad news, asking "how would you feel if you received this letter" (p. 20)?

- Encourage colleagues to interact professionally with the unsuccessful candidate after the denial of tenure. Franke (2001) writes: "social isolation can exacerbate the unsuccessful tenure candidate's sense of failure" (p. 21).

- Finally, Franke (2000) advises that after the institution has denied tenure to a candidate, help the individual move on with his or her career.

  Franke (2000) writes:

  > Some faculty members who have been denied tenure report that, after the decision, colleagues ostracized them. Others say they had the opposite experience, that colleagues expressed outrage about the injustice and strongly encouraged them to challenge the outcome. Most often, an approach of supporting the candidate in moving along with his or her career best serves everyone's interests (p.5).

  Franke (2000) adds:

> In shunning a candidate, colleagues may increase the individual's sense of hurt and failure. Common courtesies can reduce some of the sting of the experience. Assistance with locating another position also goes a long way toward helping the individual move beyond the tenure denial. On the other hand, encouraging someone to challenge the outcome may lure him or her into the expensive and protracted form of martyrdom known as civil litigation. Advice from the AAUP staff may give useful perspective to candidates who have been denied tenure (p. 5).

Franke (2001) has developed a checklist on caring for unsuccessful candidates that is included in this dissertation as Appendix M.

Part 3: Other Considerations

Scholars of an alternative ilk, such as those faculty in the field of film and digital media, will likely ask, will my work have an *emotional* or *intellectual* impact (Richardson, 1995; 2000)? Intrinsic interest and impact that may be generated upon experiencing a personalized, artistic, creative or scholarly work in film or digital media constitutes an important value that should not be arbitrarily dismissed by an evaluator, although from the perspective of convention the values of interest or impact are not generally prioritized. In the making of a film or digital media work there is a symbiotic and constant interplay between theory and practice (praxis). Taking a camera system and an audio recording system into a location, and mastering the use of these equipment systems for the purposes of creative expression, meaningful observation, and other purposes relating to scholarship and professional work, requires a myriad of intellectual,

practical, aesthetic, culturally- and critically-based choices to be made, just as in traditional research methodology there are a myriad of conscious and sub-conscious choices that are continuously made. Technique, aesthetics, budget, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation levels on individual and group levels, creativity and problem solving on many levels, and complex systems of self- and team-leadership are all converging simultaneously in a collaborative creative environment when a film is being made. Just as conventional research can be defined and described as more than discovery (Boyer, 1990), the making and completion of film and digital media works are more than simply recording (discovering?) what occurs before the camera or within range of the microphone.

Filmmaking is a technical craft, but it is also a business activity with ramifications in most other areas of knowledge--for example, law, social relations, technology, cultural and political history, and with a very deep connection to creativity and creative thinking. Films and media productions vary in duration, style, treatment and approach, story structure, purpose, budget limits, equipment limits, diverse cultural contexts, aesthetic sensibilities, dissemination plans and opportunities, and other ways. While published articles that are intended for a specific discipline and for a narrowly defined readership audience might (or might not) have standardized expectations in regard to length, presentation, and purpose, the same cannot be said for creative works. Each film will vary in the ways listed above and more, depending on the purpose, budget and other factors that surround the filmmaker and his/her story. Conventions, aesthetics, and limitations are always changing, hugely diverse, and certainly not homogenous. It is essential that the assessment of creative work be performed by colleagues and experts who have at least some awareness of such subjective points related to filmmaking such as originality, innovation, application of aesthetic principles and technical skills and processes.

In some cases, one person works alone, independently from other technical or creative collaborators (Collins, 2003). The rigorous challenge of working on all aspects of a film or media production work, including the technical, creative, business and legal aspects, should be acknowledged as an integrated whole that would otherwise be accomplished by several persons working in collaboration. Rather than to perceive the *auteur* approach as less-than-professional, small-scale and limited, the filmmaker working in isolation should be recognized as at the height of discovery, integration and application. The isolated filmmaker was perhaps working in a remote location with minimal support for logistics and scant resources, without the benefit of consultant interactions or other help. (Collins, 2003). In this case, the evaluator must develop distinct and unique sets of criteria that acknowledge the massive effort and challenge that faces the auteur filmmaker (Bukalski, 2000)

In other cases, a filmmaker will be collaborating with others, perhaps highly specialized professionals, or students or persons from a wide spectrum of social strata, on the development, production and postproduction of the film or media production. The various key roles on a film require the productive collaboration of a team of others. The roles of Executive Producer, Producer, Director, Cinematographer, or Editor on an independent medium-scale or relatively large-scale film or media production would be analogous to a researcher in traditional scholarly research who leads of team of assistants on a project. Leadership, motivation, communication and many practical issues converge in the effort to manage a team that is working together on a creative work in film or media production. It is important that evaluators have a clear understanding of the precise role(s) that the faculty member contributed in the creative work being evaluated, and assess the work on the basis of the role(s) performed as demonstrated in the completed work.

Part 4: Summary

The credibility of a performance evaluation system rests on its ability to produce sound evaluations that are relevant to the unique characteristics of the work being reviewed. A sound process for recognizing and evaluating faculty work and performance also leads to the fairest and most defensible outcomes. At the level of supervisors and administrators, reflection and constructive dialogue with all concerned parties about potential weaknesses in faculty-evaluation systems may facilitate improvement that strengthens process of deliberation, and increase the likelihood of avoiding, or prevailing in, litigation over the denial in problematic cases. At the level of the faculty member, awareness and diligence in making one's self aware of the expectations and priorities of faculty work at the particular institution, plus keeping vigilant about gaps and predictable problems that can emerge at any point in the process are important will be helpful self-protective measures; in addition to doing the best one can in all aspects of performance in teaching, research, and service under the specific circumstances one finds in the workplace where one is located.