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ABSTRACT

Artistic, scholarly and professional works by individuals in the academic field of film and digital media in institutions of higher learning are not being adequately recognized or rewarded as scholarship activity during performance evaluation. Conventional systems for evaluating work by faculty in the field of film and digital are derived from an irrelevant paradigm that prioritizes the values of scientism with rigid compliance with norms; and is one that pits individual faculty members and their creative works against an irrelevant model that precludes a priori the possibility that fair and sound judgment can be applied. My research supports these claims, explores appropriate alternatives, and advocates for change; relying upon quantitative and qualitative methods of inquiry, and auto/ethnographic and personalized writing, in the search for greater understanding and effective solutions.

This research proffers theoretically grounded recommendations that facilitate the recognition and evaluation of faculty work; but it is not intended to be the final word on this topic. My research does not intend to advocate a singular or ultimate measure of artistic, scholarly or professional works, nor has it discovered a workable one in data. Instead, it intends to carefully raise and outline the range of factors and issues of fundamental concern that have emerged in data, substantially increasing the likelihood that results of research will be of enduring and practical value as a catalyst for institutional change—challenging traditional meritocratic practices in institutions of higher learning that are used to determine internal mobility.

This study concludes that the existing conventions for evaluating faculty scholarship are problematic and not suited for the intended purpose. I argue that faculty scholarship in all fields should be recognized and evaluated on the basis of the unique and specific approach of work, not just upon the artifacts that are considered in isolation from approach; and that the process of performance evaluation should be designed and conducted from start to finish by informed, sensitized and relevantly experienced colleagues who possess a deep understanding of the
complex and distinct range of knowledge and skill that informs a creative or alternative approach to research inquiry.
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Chapter 1 consists of five main parts.

Part 1: Description of project
Part 2: Scholarship and Faculty Work
Part 3: Pondering “C” Words---Creativity, collaboration and change
Part 4: A new template for work in the field of film and digital media
Part 5: Summary

Chapter 1 provides a broad description of the scope and nature of my approach to this dissertation research topic, including the problem, question, methods, objective and goals, and definitions that have framed my inquiry.

Part 1: Description of project

Part 1 consists of five sections:

1) Overview
2) Research problem and its four underlying issues
3) Research question: The fundamental lines of inquiry
4) Research methods
5) Central objective and goals

1) Overview

This study is dedicated to all those who, like myself, have suffered the sometimes painful, demotivating, and unforgettable effects of performance evaluations in organizations (La Pelle, 1998, p. xiii).

The need for a relevant and coherent approach for recognizing and evaluating individual faculty work in the field of film and digital media is an underlying issue examined in this
chapter, and throughout this dissertation. Initially, I was inspired to examine this topic as I entered a process of faculty performance evaluation for the purposes of promotion of rank at my workplace. From the outset I noticed that my workplace had no written criteria that pertained to the recognition of artistic, scholarly or professional work in the field of film and digital media. In response, I have attempted to develop a theoretical and practical basis for change in the systems of performance evaluation in higher education settings; with the intention of facilitating greater institutional rewards for artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

At the outset of my inquiry, I was relatively uninformed about notions of what constitutes academic scholarship, and I was unaware of the complex and problematic nature of performance evaluations as important issues for critical study. My encounter with real experience and the literature related to this topic was not mapped, pre-planned, systematic and orderly, and in fact much of my learning has been the result of persistent curiosity, hard work and luck that culminates in the making of systemic connections as I have proceeded in building my understanding. Ultimately, necessity has enabled me to formulate the research question and research problem that are posed in this dissertation.

My initial intention was to conform, reasonably yet loosely, to conventional expectations about the structure and general purpose of a doctoral research and dissertation writing. As a genre of writing, dissertations have traditionally been considered to be a product and site of learning, a new representation of long-held cultural and epistemological conventions about knowledge and the making of meaning(s). A dissertation is commonly perceived to be a unitary and singular product, emerging from a meaning system that strives to be consistent with the ideals of logic and deduction. The conventional expectation is for an organized presentation of
ideas, analytic discourse, and clear argumentation; culminating with recommendations and a conclusion. The requirement for a conclusion represents a realist’s expectation for closure, resolution and finality. As I mentioned, I intended to reasonably conform to the traditions and conventions of dissertation writing. However, such reliance could possibly be construed as meaning that I too have intended to make a claim of closure on this subject, but this is not the case. The expectation for closure and finality subsumes knowledge to be verifiable, replicable and certain; but these paradigmatic ideals are contrary to my intentions and inconsistent with the expressive, personalized approach that is common in the arts, in auto/ethnographic research writing, and in many other forms of creative, qualitative, scholarly research writing.

A conventional reading might expect the author to remain malleable, invisible and passive throughout scholarly discourse; and would recoil in horror whenever the author makes use of the *self* as a voice and perspective, concluding prematurely that a personal perspective and locus constitute a breach of canon. Additionally, a conventional assumption would be that human understanding is best served when the intellect transcends the physical and the material, when the mind, with its intellectual tools, operates independently of the body (Hanrahan, 2003). The focus upon *self* in scholarly writing is perceived by conventional expectations as a diversion or digression from the central core of theoretical issues, one that allows for open-ended, ambiguous, and uncertain results, instead of reaching the goal of closure. Finality is not necessarily the ultimate goal nor is it an attribute of my research and approach. I do not intend that my work is perceived to be authoritative in a conventional sense.

I am not moving my work toward the elusive sense of finality because such an expectation is illusory. If, however, a reader is unable (or unwilling) to straightforwardly access the meaning of my work because of this chosen method or approach, then that reader might
question the authority of my work and remain disinterested in the issues being raised---and this unfortunate possibility is response I seek to avoid. I ask readers to approach my work with an open mind and a sense that this is a beginning step in a process of change, not an ending.

I confidently acknowledge the risks posed by taking an alternative approach and I accept the responsibility of any consequences. I hold a belief in multiple ways of knowing---a finding that has resulted from my work throughout my doctoral research. I borrow from the philosophical and critical approach of auto/ethnographic writing---particularly the idea that no text is ever perfect, no interpretation is ever complete, the explication of meaning is never final, and no insight is beyond challenge. I am an individual struggling for a sense of meaning and self-identity within the faceless monolith of institutional and organizational structures and systems; and I am using a scholarly and personalized voice in my writing as strive to heard.

Auto/ethnography offers a creative, personal opportunity to explore and reflect upon one’s experiences through narrative stories, memories, and other narrative accounts in a scholarly context; in addition to being an opportunity to integrate learning that has emerged from the study of the ideas of others. I consider this approach to be an important, creative, systematic, reliable, and disciplined method for discovering new ways of looking at my self in social, intellectual and personal contexts---an explorative struggle for the expression of knowledge through lived experiences. During the process of my auto/ethnographic inquiry I have also encountered the nuanced difference in language used by many writers in their various texts. New questions and new understandings have emerged from a range of sources, and narrative responses have been gleaned from participant interviewees, in written form and from conversations. In response to each of these sources of data I have engaged in analysis, interpretation, and synthesis for the making of meaning relevant to the phenomenon being
Therefore, this dissertation does arguably resemble a conventional approach with a beginning, middle and an end, with the end being in the form of a conclusion---but my journey is personalized and auto/ethnographic, in tandem with other qualitative and quantitative forms of inquiry, and in no way represents the end of the story. What I have written will hopefully serve as a beginning, a catalyst for change. I also hope that my research and dissertation will be perceived as a theoretical and practical starting point that facilitates greater understanding and positive action that benefits other academic fields and disciplines, for example, for the recognition and evaluation of a wide range of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the performing arts, fine arts, social sciences and humanities.
The research problem of this dissertation project is: artistic, scholarly and professional work by individual faculty in the field of film and digital media is not being adequately recognized or rewarded as scholarship in educational institutions. Challenges posed by the research problem are significant and substantial, and the stakes are high. Inherent to the problem are four underlying issues that frame the scope and nature of this chapter:

**a) Scholarship and Faculty Work**

What is scholarship? What is faculty work? This section explores conventional and alternative perspectives about scholarly work by faculty.

**b) At the boundaries of contemporary scholarship**

Important and essential aspects of artistic and other faculty work remain under-rewarded or unrecognized because (some):

- Evaluation systems arbitrarily compel paradigms from scientism and the approach of scientific research over all other paradigms and approaches;
- Evaluation systems lack appropriate expertise with specific and unique aspects of scholarship activity in the field of film and digital media;
- Evaluation systems rely upon irrelevant criteria to protect the conventional status quo for evaluation scholarly work in the field of film and digital media;
- Evaluation systems for recognizing faculty performance in many academic institutions of
higher education are too narrowly focused.

This dissertation intends to develop a useful model that fulfills an unmet need for paradigmatic change.

c) Pondering “C” Words: Change, Collaboration and Creativity

In higher education, at institutional and departmental levels, there is observable resistance for fully acknowledging or recognizing that artistic, scholarly and professional work by individual faculty in film and digital media can meaningfully co-exist alongside conventional text-based research publications in the pantheon of what constitutes faculty scholarship; and that the comparatively unique and specific qualities of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media do constitute forms of scholarly activity. The emergence of change at institutions of higher learning for recognizing and rewarding creative and collaborative scholarship has been slow. The emergence of real change at deeper levels within the institution will be slower. Paradigmatic change in systems of evaluation calls for a new ontology to re-define scholarship and scholarly work by faculty (Boyer, 1990). The ontological framework and change advocated in this dissertation recognizes that artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media should not narrowly emphasize the results of a work in isolation from process and approach (Diamond and Adam, 2000 p 6-7).

This section discusses an evolving understanding of what constitutes scholarship and what are the characteristics that describe the faculty reward system, supported by a range of ideas that advocate and acknowledge difference and disciplinary uniqueness, reinforcing and giving value to the notion of individual faculty paths (Diamond and Adam 2000, p 1). This section also explores a notion of change that occurs when an institutional climate is conducive to change is established, and when those affected by the changes---faculty, chairs, and deans---are inclusively
involved in the change process (Diamond, 1993c).

d) Recognizing and Evaluating Faculty Work in Film and Digital Media

Although it is important and useful in previous sections of this dissertation to build a larger and more expansive meaning of what constitutes scholarship and scholarly activity by faculty, the real issue that is explored in this section focuses upon finding fair and meaningful ways to evaluate, assess, and ultimately find ways to reward new, alternative and innovative forms of scholarship and scholarly work.

3) Research question: The fundamental lines of inquiry

The research question that frames this inquiry is posed in response to the research situation and problem. The research question is: What work and activities by faculty in film and digital media should be recognized and rewarded as scholarship during a performance evaluation in an academic setting? The research question represents a guiding core in my inquiry. Three fundamental lines of inquiry have emerged from the research question, and from my reading of secondary literature, relating to performance evaluation and alternative forms of scholarship by faculty, including:

• What constitutes faculty scholarship and scholarly work by faculty in the academic field of film and digital media?

• What are the essential attributes of a performance evaluation and reward system for faculty scholarship in the field of film and digital media?

• What explains institutional resistance to change in the practice of performance evaluation in academic institutions?
4) Research methods

The research methods for this inquiry are intended to explore the nature, meaning, prevalence and impact of problem(s) facing faculty in the field of film and digital media, and to facilitate practical solutions, including the development of a useful model that can be used for recognizing and evaluating artistic, creative and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. As further detailed in Chapter 3, my use of research methods includes:

- Auto-ethnographic inquiry and reflection upon my experience---as a faculty member and professional filmmaker---contextualized by a comprehensive review of literature.
- Quantitative and qualitative inquiry using an open approach to many sources of data, including a survey and interviews with a number of faculty members in the field of film and digital media, exploring individual/personalized experiences and theoretical analyses concerning the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media.

5) Central objective and goals

The central objective of this dissertation is to provide practical and theoretical help and support for the benefit of administrators and committee members, facilitating a more fair process of recognition and evaluation of the spectrum of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media; yet also with applicability to faculty work in many other creative, artistic and professional fields. Through critical inquiry, this dissertation seeks to build a nuanced body of knowledge that facilitates paradigmatic change at institutions of higher learning. This dissertation aims to challenge long-standing conventions, conceptions and expectations about academic faculty research practice and output; then advocates alternative, sometimes opposing values and systems
of thought that re-frame the scope and nature of what constitutes academic scholarship by faculty, particularly for those in the field of film and digital media.

The goals of this dissertation, as I have engaged in research, have been five-fold:

- To use auto/ethnographic, qualitative and quantitative methods to explore the scope and nature of the research problem and question, and to search for effective solutions;
- To explain the scope and nature of artistic, scholarly and professional work in the field of film and digital media;
- To understand what has undermined the process of change in systems performance evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media;
- To identify the attributes of useful performance evaluation systems of faculty work in the field of film and digital media (this also may be applicable to other creative fields); and
- To synthesize the data and then create relevant and useful theoretical and practical groundwork that facilitates change in systems for recognizing and evaluating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

As detailed in Chapter 3, a range of data gathering and interpretive approaches have been employed for the purpose of discerning a broad range of perspectives, and for building a deeper understanding of the research problem and question that underpin this dissertation. The following section provides a more complete description about each goal:

- The use auto/ethnographic writing, and appropriate qualitative and quantitative methods has facilitated an exploration of the scope and nature of the research problem, and to search for effective solutions

Auto/ethnography, a form of personalized writing and inquiry in the methodological category of qualitative research, explores, interprets and expresses knowledge from a first-person
perspective. Auto/ethnography is a form of personalized writing for scholarly inquiry that is less reliant upon the hegemony of conventional expectations in scholarly writing. Also of great benefit to this research is the fact that some faculty who participated in the survey were willing to share their account of personal experiences and problems that emerged during the process of recognition and evaluation of their work. This quantitative and qualitative data reveals much about the scope and nature of the problems that face many faculty in the field of film and digital media, and across many other disciplines, at many institutions of higher education that seek recognition and rewards for a broad range of their own professional and scholarly activities.

- To explain the scope and nature of artistic, scholarly and professional work in the field of film and digital media.

I have chosen to use a combined qualitative and an auto/ethnographic approach to write about the process of filmmaking, from technical, creative and professional practice perspectives. My goal in describing the processes of work in filmmaking is to identify, understand, and explain the complex scope and nature of its artistic, scholarly and professional dimensions—its unique methodological and stylistic approaches, its specific work-related activities, and its range of intended outcomes—forming an integrated whole that should be recognized and rewarded as scholarly work during the evaluation in the field of film and digital media. I have relied upon my own experience and voice, upon in-depth interviews with project participants, and upon an open approach to literary and other data sources. In this way, the dissertation builds a new paradigm for faculty performance evaluation with specific recommendations that pertain to creative scholarship and professional work in film and electronic/digital media, enabling faculty performance to be more fully and fairly recognized for institutional rewards.

- To understand what has undermined the process of change in systems for recognizing and
evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media.

Freed from notions that describe and explain individual and group behavior as historically inevitable, predictable or the result of instinct, and empowered by the knowledge that man’s behavior and social systems are learned and not genetically inherited, I explore ways to negate and denounce the accepted limits that are maintained in the status quo, particularly the traditional template for performance evaluation in higher education, through an awakening of my critical consciousness and expression of my discontent.

- To identify the attributes of systems in higher education settings for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media (this also may be applicable to other creative fields).

I have gathered and analyzed a range of written, established criteria that exemplify what can be considered as the best practices and procedures for recognizing scholarship in other academic fields and domains, then compared those with (non-) existing practices and procedures pertaining to the recognition and evaluation of scholarly and artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. I have sought to understand phenomena relating to the recognition and evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional work by gathering and analyzing the philosophical underpinnings of performance evaluation and the recognition of scholarly work in notions of scientism, through analysis of primary and secondary textual writings, and analysis of data feedback collected from a survey of project participants (Appendix C Survey)---in addition to my producing my own personalized, auto/ethnographic account.

- To synthesize the data in all its forms and then create specific, relevant, and useful guidelines for performance evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.
Data demonstrates that faculty performance in scholarly research, with application in teaching and service as well, should be evaluated on its own terms, by informed colleagues that share an understanding of the unique and distinct theoretical underpinnings of practice in the field of film and digital media. This dissertation advocates for the implementation of written, reasonable, and specific criteria that will enable administrators and performance evaluation committee members, those who may lead and set policy in a university setting, to more effectively recognize, assess and reward the broad range of artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work(s) by faculty in the field of film and digital media (this model may also be applicable to other creative fields).
Part 2: Scholarship and Faculty Work

Part 2 is divided into three sections:

1) Being scholarly: The trilogy and traditional template
2) Concerns, questions and debate
3) The need for a new model

The three sections of Part 2 examine the scope and nature of the historical context for establishing that work in the field of film and digital media can be recognized, evaluated and rewarded as a unique and specific form of scholarship and scholarly activity.

1) Being scholarly: The trilogy and traditional template

Traditionally, for more than a century at most academic institutions of higher learning, faculty members have been expected to perform a “trilogy” of activities---teaching, research and service---for the benefit of students, the academy, the community, the nation and the world (Boyer, 1990, p. 15-16). At a majority of institutions of higher learning, the trilogy of expectations remains strongly intact and singularly prioritized, but “a wide gap now exists between the myth and the reality of academic life. Almost all colleges pay lip service to the trilogy of teaching, research and service, but when it comes to making judgments about professional performance, the three rarely are assigned equal merit” (Boyer, 1990, p. 15.16).

Today, the most heavily weighted and rewarded forms of faculty activity are in the categories of discovery-based scientific research and the publication of peer-reviewed scholarly texts (Boyer, 1990). In the conventional setting, scientific research and the publication of text-based findings are what count if the faculty member has any hope of career advancement. While notable exceptions do exist, with some institutions prioritizing teaching over research or service, and others that are recognizing and rewarding creative forms of faculty work; a vast majority of
institutions continue to require that faculty engage in scientific research and publish their findings in specialized professional journals, with lesser or nil emphasis upon teaching or service (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997).

Most institutions of higher learning follow a traditional template to evaluate and assess the performance of full time faculty members, based upon the trilogy of teaching, research and service (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2007); intertwined with indirect, vague, shifting, unwritten, and potentially insidious notions of collegiality (Connell and Savage, 2001). The traditional template is a set of criteria that are used at institutions of higher learning to prioritize, evaluate and judge academic scholarship and faculty performance. The traditional template has become skewed and weighted toward scientific research, away from teaching and service, emerging from an ontology that prioritizes scientism, prevailing by consensus rather than by reason and logic. The trilogy of expectations and the hierarchical nature of the traditional template form the prevailing paradigm in contemporary higher education---used to explicitly determine the nature of faculty work, the allocation of faculty time, and the trajectory of faculty career.

In most academic workplaces, including universities and other settings for higher education, faculty members aspire for job security and career advancement through the awarding of tenure, promotion, contractual renewal and other rewards---based upon their record of performance in teaching, research and service, as measured by the traditional template. Performance reviews are conducted periodically to support and encourage standards of excellence by recognizing, evaluating, and rewarding outstanding academic performance; to provide guidance to faculty members regarding professional improvement and development; and to obtain information relevant to contract renewal/extension, promotion, termination, or merit
pay decisions. Most faculty members perceive that by striving for promotion of rank, tenure and other institutional rewards they are taking necessary and positive steps to advance their professional careers. Security and successful advancement are positive indications that an individual faculty member has been accepted, respected, valuable, and valued by his/her institution. Promotion of academic rank, the awarding of tenure, or the achievement of any other institutional reward are usually accompanied by a pay raise, greater job security, a personal sense of accomplishment and achievement; and the assignment of greater responsibility in the workplace, greater respect by collegial peers, and other special, both explicit and implicit, benefits.

The implications of results from a performance evaluation are broad and serious, serving as the primary measure of a faculty member’s on the job productivity; a key factor for accessing institutional grant funds and roles of power, an indicator that plots the linear nature of a faculty career, and the basis for defining other priorities that may be relevant to successfully sustaining employment as a faculty member throughout one’s academic career. The locus of control for determining success or failure in the faculty evaluation process can be attributed internally or externally---to ability, effort, task difficulty, committee bias, collegial relations with administrators, good/bad luck, and so on---but the results of faculty performance evaluation directly and ultimately affect all aspects of the creative faculty member’s professional career in higher education---advancement, tenure, hiring/firing, and other important benefits and rewards of the academic workplace.

Although it is the undisputed right and obligation of any employer to evaluate the quality of an employee’s performance on the job, it is difficult to imagine that any person enjoys, likes, or thrives on the experience of being judged. Data in chapter 4 shows that problems do emerge
when important, specific and unique aspects of work by faculty in the academic field of film and
digital media are not recognized during performance review and evaluation. Faculty in the field
of film and digital media who attempt works of synthesis, explore interdisciplinary territory, or
speak to non-specialists, are still at a disadvantage in comparison with faculty scholars who
follow the conventional path (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997). Evaluation
systems for recognizing faculty performance in many academic institutions of higher education
are too narrowly focused, and data revealed in chapter 4 facilitates the development of a useful
recommendations in chapter 5 that are intended to meet an unmet need. Individual faculty in the
field of film and digital media require a unique and relevant model that can be used at the
departmental, college and university levels for recognizing and evaluating their artistic, scholarly
and professional work. Boyer (1990) wrote:

…according to the dominant view, to be a scholar is to be a researcher---and publication
is the primary yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured…(instead) all
dimensions of academic work, not just research, should be valued by the academy (p. 2).

Data in chapter 4 supports the argument that artistic, scholarly and professional work by
faculty in the field of film and digital media is not fairly or fully recognized because performance
evaluation systems are too narrowly focused upon the priority of text-based publication and
scientific research; and many performance evaluations are being framed by vague, unwritten or
improvised criteria. In the words of one professor:

At our university, everyone is expected to do conventional research. I’m in the arts and
not only is there no money for research, but the entire process seems oddly out-of-phase
with how quality is my field is and should be measured (Boyer, 1990, p. 33-34).
Data in chapter 4 illustrates that work in the field of film and digital media can be motivated, developed and produced for intrinsic and extrinsic reasons, and is unique and distinct from conventional forms and expectations of research output in many ways.

2) Concerns, questions and debate

The trilogy and the template for evaluating faculty work have been thoughtfully questioned and vigorously debated for many years, yet this narrow paradigm seems to prevail, and in some corners is vigorously defended (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2007; Richlin, 2001). Wait and Hope (2009) list a number of questions that have been debated, including:

• What evidence can be provided that the world of higher education (including the field of film and digital media) is structured, operates or is organized conceptually in ways that makes the conventional proposed approach more effective than an alternative?

• How can it be proven that putting results in a measurable form will lead to improvement in student learning, or to advancement and innovation in a particular field?

• What proof is there that all quality in every dimension of life can be engineered through the application of large-scale assessment systems, or that the larger and more centralized the assessment system, the higher the quality will become?

• How is it possible to call for a deeply integrated system of standardization so that results can be compared, and at the same time call for innovation or a climate of innovation (p. 17-19)?

Further, in the context of this research, can it be proven that if a program is fashioned to support the unique and specific aspects of work in the field of film and digital media that the institution and the credibility of its programs of study will fall behind or be compromised in some way?
Unfortunately, in practical terms, faculty seldom are permitted an opportunity to ask such questions, especially not to proponents of large, centralized institutional systems.

The trilogy and the traditional template have been criticized for being too dependent upon the axioms of positivism, and for an explicit expectation that scholarly work should only appear as text-based publications and dissemination to specialist readers (Boyer, 1990; Diamond, 1993). The positivism of the traditional template has been explicitly criticized for marginalizing alternative or unconventional scholarship approaches and activities, and implicitly disallowing recognition of faculty work output in a wide range of academic fields, including film and digital media (Boyer, 1990; Jacobs, 2008; Bukalski, 2000).

Barthes (1977) described positivism as “the epitome and culmination of capitalist ideology” (p. 143), and Diamond (1993) observes that the institutional prioritization of published, scientific research output, and its reliance upon the traditional template has meant “service, teaching, and creativity are risky priorities for faculty members seeking promotion or tenure at many institutions” (Diamond, 1993, pp. 6-7). Diamond (2002) observes that the faculty performance review process is “no easy task” (p. xiii), while Diamond and Adam (2000) observe that “faculty, department chairs, academic deans, and administrators perceive existing promotion and tenure practices as problematic,” and have referred to the systems for performance evaluation and rewards as a “gauntlet to be negotiated” by faculty (Diamond and Adam, 2000 p. 1). With assessment criteria in flux from institution to institution or even department to department, an faculty member must insecurely feel around for the way forward, working intuitively through the maze-like system for reward and advancement in an academic institution—with no real guarantee or ultimate promise of success.

Concerns about the traditional template and its focus upon scientism are not discipline-
specific in the university setting. Controversy extends throughout a wide range of domains and contexts, and each discipline has its own specific concerns and problems (Diamond, 1993b; Diamond and Adam, 2000). Essentially, there are very few institutions of higher learning that are ready to abandon the entrenched status quo to look for better alternatives (La Pelle, 1997). Debate and dissatisfaction are evidenced even in the private sector of business, where numerous studies have shown:

…both employees and managers are dissatisfied with performance evaluation systems that are in place at this time, that they generally do not improve performance, and that new systems designed to fix the problems with the systems they are replacing do little to improve matters (La Pelle, 1997, p. 2).

As illustrated in chapter 4, data shows that research findings about performance appraisal systems, work that examines what practices have positive outcomes and what practices have negative outcomes, have not found their way into practice. In other words, research has not informed an improved practice (La Pelle, 1997). The conventional body of literature about performance appraisal pays little attention to Deming’s (1986) claim that “many performance evaluation processes in use cannot work to improve motivation, performance, and teamwork, that are sometimes harmful, and often de-motivate even high-performing individuals” (La Pelle, 1997 p. 4). Today, the ontology of the trilogy and its template is enforced and sustained by uncompromisingly normative expectations and rigid administrative policies; giving way to ever narrowing and less predictable standards that are meant more to limit access than to ensure accomplishment (Euben, 2005).
3) The need for a new model

Boyer (1990) argues that faculty scholarship is a complete range of possibilities and intellectual activities, allowing for discovery, integration, application and the sharing of knowledge through teaching to coalesce into action; and that faculty should be recognized for the full range of their activities and performance. Boyer (1990) is not arguing for greater balance between teaching and research in the faculty reward structure, but “his argument calls for ascribing scholarly legitimacy to the full range of academic work---work defined by application, discovery, integration and teaching” (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 1997, p. 13). Boyer (1990) proposed that scholarship consists of four domains---discovery, application, integration and the sharing of knowledge through teaching. Boyer (1990) wrote:

Surely, scholarship means engaging in original research. But the work of the scholar also means stepping back from one’s investigation, looking for connections, building bridges between theory and practice, and communicating one’s knowledge effectively.

Specifically, we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be thought of as having four separate, yet overlapping, functions. There are: the scholarship of discovery; the scholarship of integration; the scholarship of application; and the scholarship of teaching (p. 16).

If all faculty members were willing to be uncritical subjects to the trilogy of faculty work that is narrowly skewed toward scientific research and text publication, and were compliant in accepting the conventional-yet-unevenly-balanced traditional template for evaluating faculty performance, then the research problem and research question that are posed by this dissertation would be without meaning and would be irrelevant for further inquiry. However, literature
demonstrates that some fellow-members of the community of faculty scholars at institutions of higher learning are compelled to resist the status quo---and not content, willing or suited to be continually marginalized. Data in chapter 4 shows that faculty members are not content to follow and subject themselves to the expectations of the traditional template as it currently stands. Chapter 4 demonstrates and chapter 5 argues that the time has come to reconsider the scope, nature and meaning of constitutes scholarship and scholarly work by faculty; building a more inclusive and broadly-conceived model, and considering ways by which the faculty reward system can be significantly improved (Boyer, 1990).
Part 3: Pondering “C” Words---Creativity, collaboration and change

Part 3 is divided into four main sections:

1) Creativity and self in scholarly work
2) Collaboration, self-leadership and systems theory in film and digital media
3) Change and the resistance to change
4) The possibility of change: A matter of approach

Faculty members in the field of film and digital media are stymied by a difficult dilemma that necessitates change to the status quo for determining faculty priorities, institutional expectations and performance achievements. Part 3 examines scientism as an ontology perpetuating the status quo in performance evaluation and peer review systems, and observes that non-creative aspects of work are being prioritized; although the scope of work in film and digital necessarily relies largely upon creativity and a stylistic approach or voice that is personal and individual. Part 3 also suggests that the process of work in film and digital is collaborative, yet a collaborative approach to work (and creativity) is misconstrued and rarely valued in academic performance evaluation settings. Finally, Part 3 demonstrates the broad scope of resistance to change, but that change is inherently possible in higher education because its systems are learned; and that resistance to change in recognizing and evaluating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media is not inevitable, fixed, unchanging or unchangeable in nature or character.

1) Creativity and self in scholarly work

An erroneous perception prevails in higher education about the scope and nature of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media; and about the ways that such work is to be evaluated. Perception is the process of setting up and using recognized patterns, and an erroneous perception would be a belief that is held in error.
Everyone naturally engages in the practice of pattern recognition—in situations, ideas or things—based upon prior experiences and knowledge, but recognition or analysis of perceived information will not necessarily yield new ideas or solutions.

The brain is the framework in which incoming information is organized into sequences of activity. In time, the perceived sequences become familiar and form a preferred path or pattern. Once established, the patterned sequences are recognized, based upon previous experiences. The patterns that are formed are not necessarily symmetrical or easily changed. The brain can only see what it is prepared to see or sense, formed into existence as patterns. When we analyze data patterns we are mostly selecting, consciously or subconsciously, the ideas, symbols, codes and patterns that are familiar and known beforehand. In this sense, the brain is a maker of patterns that operates in a way that is contrary to creativity. The lack of symmetry justifies a logical need for human creativity in an effort to find new solutions, responses and alternatives (De Bono, 1992). Creativity, and its counterpart—originality—rely upon that which is new; while pattern making and pattern recognition relies upon what is registered in the brain as familiar, or what can be construed to resemble what is familiar. The systematic operation of the brain operates in a way that is antithetical to conventional notions of originality and creativity, and has heretofore facilitated a rigidified continuation of the status quo that has determined faculty priorities, institutional expectations and performance templates in institutional settings.

The older scientific understanding of the brain, particularly an aging brain, portrayed it as rigid with no potential for growth after a certain chronological age and peak. All the neurons, in that view, are established in a human being by age two, and from there it descends along a downhill slope. According to that view, neurons are never to be regenerated again and are dying off at an alarming rates, especially after the age of fifty. While it was believed that dying cells in
other organs such as the liver, pancreas, and skin could be replaced, the brain cells, it was believed, once lost, were gone forever according to an older understanding. A newer model of the brain and its functioning shows that while the total numbers of neurons and the volume of available neurotransmitters may decrease with age, some functional parts of the brain have the capacity to grow in later life (Barnes, 2003). The potentiality of the brain as an organ that grows and improves with age, from a personal perspective, gives great hope to me as I grow older, and this also instills hope in the idea that an educational institution, like a human brain, can grow and learn and presumably improve myself with age.

Illustrating that the brain is merely a conduit wherein a process of learning and change occur, Capra (1996) wrote:

the relationship between mind and brain is simple and clear…Mind is not a thing but a process---the process of cognition, which is identified with the process of life. The brain is a specific structure through which this process operates. The relationship between mind and brain, therefore, is one between process and structure (p. 175).

Capra (1996) reminds us that the mind is a process of cognition, and by implication, a facilitator of creativity. It relies on more than a synthesis of the organism’s brain---and is more than the sum of activity by the nervous system, immune system, endocrine system, mind, matter, life, and the stability of structure. Creativity and problem solving rely upon the fluidity of change, and this ideal that can also apply to institutions of higher learning (Capra, 1996; De Bono, 1992). The notion of biological growth and learning over time is analogous to the possibility for institutional change. Institutions, like the brain or other bodily system, are the locus or things where change is made possible.

To more fully understand what constitutes faculty work in film and digital media it is
necessary to clarify the scope and nature of the term, creativity. Definitions of creativity abound in a broad range of literature, with richly layered possibilities for the making of epistemological connections and interrelationships. To *create*, a verb in the infinitive form is commonly defined as--to cause something new to come into being, as something unique. The traditional definition of creativity includes two parts: originality and functionality. Ambiguity, contradiction and semantic confusion are also possible and inherent, and there are broad ranges of applications for using the term, creativity. Work by faculty in the field of film and digital media relies upon the convergence of skills and knowledge---continuously reframed by the level of *creativity* generated by the practitioner. Sometimes, creativity and art are considered synonymously, but creativity is not merely limited in its application to artistic expression. As discussed above, the brain is a maker of patterns from what is familiar or known, while creativity and originality involve the making of new and unforeseen patterns.

Originality often pertains to the discovery, expression and/or production of something new and unique, something that nobody has done or said before; while functionality pertains to the utility, workability, efficacy, application, merit and value of the product or object has emerged. The concept of originality is inextricably and synonymously linked with creativity, genius, dynamism (personal and in content), divergent thinking, freshness, newness (in form, insight or knowledge), innovation, courageousness, heroism, or crossing a sacred firewall---to name a few. For the sake of comparison and enhanced understanding of originality in the context of creativity, terms such as plagiarism, mimesis, orthodoxy, convention, borrowing, forgery, reproduction, derivative/derived works, lack of X (i.e., ambition, energy, etc), or imitation come to mind as antonyms.

A conceptual process creates a product, an object, a thing, in the first place, and creativity
involves the changing of concepts and perceptions. The product (the film, the auto/ethnographic essay, the painting, or whatever the final outcome might be) did not exist before it was created---and it might be original, unique and novel. It might not be directly imitative of previous patterns, despite its possible similarity with a previous example of work (Sawyer, 2006; De Bono, 1990; 1992; Csikszentmihaly, 1975; 1990; 1997). In the sciences, originality can be described as a fundamental goal of research scholarship, with the notions of functionality and creativity probably not being as highly prioritized. The most commonly held understanding of originality has philosophical affinity with a Newtonian worldview that requires that a work of scholarship, including any work of artistic or scholarly expression, to occupy a specific existential space and serve a specific function that is independent of and adjacent to other works, spaces and functions. But, it must be asked, how can real originality be achieved if the new work is expected to demonstrate this separateness and a symbiotic relationship with previous work(s) by others?

Scientists and artists are rewarded for making original contributions in relation to what existed beforehand, but there also must be irrefutable functionality in their work or ideas. The assumption in the sciences is that originality, in greater or smaller increments, facilitates the possibility that knowledge can be advanced (Merton, 1957, 1973; Lamont et al, 2007). In modern times, particularly in western societies for the past few centuries, originality has also been seen as a priority in the creative and artistic processes, and the ultimate criteria for determining the aesthetic value and inherent creativity of products, art works, and expressive innovations. Simply, there has been great value placed upon originality in modern society (at least from non-indigenous, western civilization perspectives)---and academic institutions of higher education are no exception. However, determinations that attempt to measure originality in academic settings, such as a faculty performance evaluation in institutions of higher learning,
can be questioned.

The co-existence of originality in scholarship and compliance with academic norms and measures makes for strange bedfellows. How can original scholarship be evaluated or judged if, by definition, originality means something that is new? If conventional practice in performance evaluation intends to measure and confirm continuity with norms, then how can it be relatively compared, quantified or assessed with that which is new? How can a film, an auto/ethnographic writing, or any form of scholarship for that matter (in its most broad context including creative output in addition to more conventional forms), be deemed as original work if it must be anchored with pre-existing sources, be contextualized by predetermined methods, and be consistent with conventional forms of output---to the exclusion of more creative forms (such as film, creative writing and other forms of scholarly output)? Even in the case of scholarly writings and other forms of conventional output--how can truly new and original work be expected to strictly adhere to APA and other external standards for the presentation of scholarship, if for some reason the author is seeking a different, original approach? How can originality be nurtured and sustained when deviations from norms, standards and other conventions are disallowed, not recognized, and not rewarded? These are fundamental issues and questions that are considered throughout this dissertation.

2) Collaboration, self-leadership and systems theory in film and digital media

You gotta walk that lonesome highway (or valley)
You gotta walk it all by yourself
No, nobody's gonna walk it for you
You gotta walk it by yourself (American Folk Song).

The notion of collaboration in filmmaking is fundamental, yet also illusory and short-lived. The real demand is for self-reliance. Faculty work in film and digital media---as in dance,
musicianship, surgical procedures, writing a book, deep-sea fishing, or even in digging a ditch—is done by one person with full responsibility over one’s self, no matter if the person is a specialist or a generalist. The hole doesn’t get dug because the boss wills the shovel to dig; the surgeon doesn’t make the precisely correct cut because a scrutinizing team dictates how to slice the skin; the line doesn’t get cast and the big catch reeled in through the actions of a committee of fisherfolk; the personalized use of language can not be choreographed with another person’s fingers and mind; and the violinist doesn’t play in tune or in rhythm as the relative result of group consensus. Collaboration is the result of an individual’s intrinsic motivation and expertise in skill, emerging in a collective environment from a sense of personal leadership and informed autonomy.

Personal leadership, the autonomy of self, is a unique and specific attribute in the collaborative practice of work in the field of film and digital media. Filmmakers can work collaboratively under the direction of a client, producer, or other sole person with creative, technical or financial powers or control—but the final responsibility for the realization of any detail in work throughout the process rests with each individual autonomously doing a particular task to the best of that individual’s ability. There is a connection that can be made between self-leadership and the experience of being a filmmaker with alternative theories of leadership.

Gemmill and Oakley (2001) wrote:

While leadership is viewed as having a positive connotation, we suggest that contrariwise it is a serious sign of social pathology, that it is a special case of an iatrogenic (as in a disease that is induced by the treatment) social myth that induces massive learned helplessness among members of a social system. As social despair and helplessness deepen, the search and wish for a messiah (leader) or magical rescue
(leadership) also begins to accelerate. We argue that the current popular writings and theories of leadership clearly reflect this social trend (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001 p. 273). Gemmill and Oakley (2001) affirm that whenever empowerment and autonomy are not prioritized, then self-reliance is replaced by a pervasive sense of helplessness. Gemmill and Oakley (2001) remind me that filmmaking is a lonesome highway where the buck stops with the self; and of the connection between pain and learning. As I try to define collaboration in the process of making a film or digital media work, there emerges a clear, distinct, practical and theoretical relationship between notions of personal responsibility, personal leadership and self-empowerment. A good team member in a film crew is one who is self-confident and competent as an individual with skills and knowledge, but this self-reliant conceptualization about collaboration is not widely understood recognized. As Gemmill and Oakley (2001) write:

When pain is coupled with an inordinate, widespread, and pervasive sense of helplessness, social myths about the need emerges for great leaders and magical leadership, from the primarily unconscious collective feeling that it would take a miracle or messiah to alleviate or ameliorate this painful form of existence (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001, p. 273).

Based upon Gemmill and Oakley (2001), the need for a messiah, in the form of leaders, is a kind of social pathology, a fiction that has been introjected or assimilated without awareness, through cultural programming (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001).

The idea that a need for leadership is a form of social pathology has remained untouchable and threatening in everyday life, but is directly relevant to my analysis of artistic, scholarly, and professional work by faculty in film and digital media (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001; Gemmill and Oakley, 1992). Filmmakers will oftentimes work in a collaborative environment, or they may
work alone without overt logistical support from others, but in all cases the work in film and
digital media requires self-leadership, self-motivation, self-reflection and a confident sense of
self. Artists, scholars and professional practitioners in the field of film and digital media must be
self-reliant and they must also work harmoniously and symbiotically with others. An
understanding of the interrelationship of self-reliance and collaboration is a core issue in systems
thinking, related to the idea that no one and no thing exists in a vacuum without some
relationship to everything else.

Narrow specialization is a problem in many fields, particularly in sciences, and this may
also be true in the field of film and digital media. Self-reliance, autonomy and the pathological
nature of leadership should not provide an excuse for narrow specialization and isolation from
the whole. An art director that myopically focuses upon art direction, an actor who cares nothing
about the microphone or editing, or a cinematographer who is not cognizant of other aspects of
the work such as sound or budget, can be considered to be examples of narrow specialization.
Von Bertanaffly (1969) advocates the need for generalists in sciences, and this is related to the
notion of praxis in the field of film and digital media production, with its requirement for the
convergence of knowledge and skill---in optics, the physics of light and sound and the physics of
digital and analog technologies, and reaching infinitely outwards to include poetry, music,
commerce, budgetary accounting, interpersonal psychology, interpersonal skills, psychology and
so many more aspects. Von Bertanaffly (1969) argues that professional practice in film and
digital media requires the fullest range of technical, creative, legal and business matters; and
Boyer (1990) argues for a holistic approach to research that includes discovery, application,
integration and sharing of knowledge. The unique and specific attributes of scholarship and
professional work in film and digital media constitute a convergence of interrelated systems,
performed by individuals in a collaborative environment.

Based upon the theoretical work of von Bertanaffly (1969), it is clear that institutions of higher learning would benefit by integrating a systems view of scholarship and professional work by faculty, replacing the older paradigm of research that is solely based upon scientism, replacing it with a view that is integrative, in a way that is more consistent with Boyer (1990)---as recommended in Chapter 5. The systems view is relevant and adapted to the true scope and nature of scholarship and professional work by a significant range of faculty members, including those who work in the field of film and digital media. As an analogy, rather than delegating the fields of physics, biology, education, social sciences, art and design, linguistics, and everything else to separate domains, with ever-increasing numbers of specialist sub-domains that emerge and separate into even smaller sub-domains, a process that endlessly repeats itself until each specialty is reduced to microscopic smallness, detached, disconnected and distinct from its neighboring fields and domains of knowledge and practice, rather, systems theory and systems thinking facilitate and emphasize inter-disciplinarity and commonality in basic principles, leading to synthesis, integration, and communication. Von Bertanaffly (1969) uses the example of a community of ants and termites to illustrate the ideal of a whole; and his example can apply to human society and the current state of narrowness in universities and their administrative policies:

…a community of ants or termites, governed by inherited instinct and controlled by the law of the super-ordinate whole, is based upon the achievements of the individual and is doomed if the individual is made a cog in the social machine…the Leviathan of organization must not swallow the individual without sealing its own inevitable doom (Von Bertanaffly, 1969, p. 52).
As argued in chapter 5, institutional paradigms about the individual and collaborative nature of work in the field of film and digital media should not emerge from and be rooted in the hegemony of scientism or its counterpart of narrow specialization. As argued in Chapter 5, the unique and specific attributes of individual and collaborative work in film and digital media should be wholly recognized and evaluated upon its own merits, by practitioners within the field, guided by a new paradigm that defines scholarship more broadly and inclusively.
3) Change and the resistance to change

Why are academic institutions so resistant to embrace and prioritize the notion of change? Why do old ideas continue to dominate at institutions of higher learning in the context of faculty rewards and research? Academic faculty members are living in an era of unprecedented change, compounded by a reality of conflicting pressures, demands, and priorities. Like other fields and domains of knowledge that incorporate emergent and evolving technological systems, the academic field of film and digital media is undergoing rapid and constant change. The base of our knowledge is becoming increasingly differentiated, diversified, and inter-dependent; complicated simultaneously by many conflicting external factors---institutional budgetary limits and constraints, demands for instant and multiple results from all concerned parties, influences from monopolistic commercial manufacturing interests, and ever-present resistance from adherents of the status quo in higher education, only to mention a few. As this base of knowledge expands, the inter-disciplinary nature of scholarship and faculty work has “blurred boundaries within and across disciplines. In some fields, as much difference exists within the boundaries of the discipline as between the discipline and others” (Diamond and Adam, 2000, p. 1).

Attempts to advocate or implement change in the expectations of the status quo are commonly and fiercely met with resistance---but what is the cause of such fierce resistance to change? Diamond (1993b) argues that by striving for a “framework for change” one faces many difficulties, across academic areas, including resistance from certain faculty itself (p. 19). Diamond and Adam (2000) observe: “Faculty and disciplines most comfortable with traditional definitions of scholarship are most apt to resist changes in faculty roles and rewards” (p. 5). Diamond (1993b) and Gray, Froh and Diamond (1992) demonstrate that faculty groups in the
sciences, engineering, and some of the social sciences tend to be most comfortable with the status quo, and therefore these groups are the most resistant to paradigmatic change; and presumably the most unwilling to yield their advantage, position and access that exists in the forms of social capital. Social capital refers to the value of who one knows and who is known; and cultural capital refers essentially to the social value of what one knows (McNamee and Miller, 2004). The result is the privilege of acceptance and access to those in the highest circles of power, including those with the greatest authority to allocate available relatively scarce resources.

The walls and pockets of power that resist change in higher education, in the context of systems for recognizing, evaluating and rewarding faculty work, can also be sustained by administrative inaction, and by an endless litany of doubts about alternative or unconventional forms of research being able to exemplify long-accepted standards of scholarship, about whether or not a change will satisfy the demands for rigor and depth that are expected of qualitative research. The result is a marginalization of some approaches in qualitative research that deviate from the mainstream in form or content; and the prioritization of scientism and scientifically based research over all others. The status quo that resists change is exemplified by the expectation that research can only be discovery-oriented scientific research, published as text in a peer-reviewed journal or book, and that it must be replicable, applicable and transferable in other settings.

Change implies the possibility of difference---in the distribution and access to power and authority and the rewards that can be bestowed by those with power and authority. Power is “the ability of individuals or groups to realize their will even if others are opposed” (Smith and Deemer, 2000, p. 412). Authority, power, and politics are sustaining the status quo, and this
truth can never be extricated from the judgments that emerge from a process of informal or formal evaluation, where the value and merit of artistic, creative or professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media is reviewed for recognition and reward. Social interactions determine and confirm the epistemology of an institution’s evaluation criteria, sustain the process for determining how the criteria will be put into practice, and are a legitimizing factor in the formation of all subsequent decisions about faculty performance and faculty work. As with all social interactions, individuals and groups will work to further their own interests, both legitimately and illegitimately, to accomplish their intended end. Even those judgments about what is legitimate versus what is illegitimate “are socially determined, and these conditions make the process of determining criteria for performance evaluation of faculty work, in any field, and how the criteria are to be applied, is unavoidably contestable, and hence, political” (Smith and Deemer, 2000, p. 412). These judgments are the result of social activity carried out in a social context that is imbued with power and authority, and thereby are socio-political in nature.

The socio-political nature of institutional power and authority, when faced with the prospect of change, is fierce and entrenched in resistance. Although there might be nothing wrong with power and politics and the exercise of power per se in performance evaluations of faculty work, there are pertinent questions to be asked about the operational processes of the performance evaluation---how is power being exercised by those with authority to guard the status quo, and what are the goals of all concerned parties in the process of decision-making and the seeking of institutional rewards? Politics can be defined in a conventional sense “as the process of allocating scarce resources” (Smith and Deemer, 2000, p. 412). Any desired resource that is not totally abundant---money, social prestige or recognition, promotion to a higher academic rank, the competitive awarding of research grant support, or whatever else---must be
divided up through a political process with some people getting more and others getting less of whatever is desired. Any judgment about artistic, creative and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media during performance evaluation is political and social in nature, exemplifying a process of allocating scarce resources to faculty. The prospect of change poses a challenge to the controlling systems that have authority to allocate scarce resources, and threatens paradigmatic notions of what can considered as allowably different; and such attempts at change have rarely been tolerated in institutions or organizations of higher learning.

Resistance to change has also been explained by Capra (1992) and Wheatley (1992), as they describe a notion of equilibrium in the context of open systems and closed systems. An open system purposely maintains a state of non-equilibrium, continuously pushing toward change. There is engagement with the environment, continuing evolution and growth. Wheatley (1992) writes that open systems do not seek equilibrium but, rather, “continuously import free energy from the environment and export…entropy” (Wheatley, 1992, p. 78). Conversely, a closed system is not open to external influences and pulls away from change (Capra, 1992; Wheatley, 1992; Rodriguez, 2001). Religious institutions could be an example of a closed system where resistance and slowness to change are the long-standing norm. Educational institutions with conventional notions about the top-down hierarchy---administrators reigning above teachers, staff, and students; sustained by long-held notions about the conveyance or dissemination of knowledge as a commodity, unilateral teacher-centric models of learning, and an elitist, detached and narrow concept of pedagogy---are examples of closed systems. Military organizations can be viewed as both open and closed---the hierarchical structure of a military organization can be described as closed, but the organizational response to disorder or disaster is necessarily open---in the case of unanticipated threat or danger might require instantaneous
change, adaptation and sudden openness to change. Professional sports teams, experimental improvisatory theater or musical ensembles, and profit-focused business enterprises are possibly on the other side of the ledger, necessarily willing to respond by perpetually changing, in lieu of repercussions from the dire consequences of inaction or non-adaptation to change in organizations and institutions of higher learning has created a “hostile political environment” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 11).

An analogy about resistance by insiders toward outsiders when faced with the prospect of change is characterized in the behavior rats, as described by Lorenz (1966), who wrote:

…man's social organization is very similar to that of rats which, like humans, are social and peaceful beings within their clans, but veritable devils towards all fellow-members of their species not belonging to their own community (Lorenz, 1966, p. 229).

Lorenz (1966) argues that an instinctive, pre-determined, and biological cause permanently explains resistance to change in the form of aggression and aggressive behaviors, including the “militant enthusiasm” that is observed in rats (p. 272). Lorenz (1966) argued that the aggressive behavior of a particular group of rats toward another group that are perceived to be non-members of that particular group would be biologically predictable, natural and instinctual. As Lorenz (1966) describes in his reference to the aggressive behavior of rats, when outsider members of the same species are treated with antagonistic militant enthusiasm by insiders, an analogy can made to the problems that face faculty and their work when they are deemed by their peers to be located outside of the boundaries of tradition, convention and prioritized norms in higher education.

The argument that aggression toward change is natural and unavoidable, with implicit relation to territorialism, exclusion, and other divisive behaviors, is appealing to many “for that
explains everything. But what explains everything in fact explains nothing” (Montagu, 1968, p. xi-xii). In response to Lorenz (1966), Montagu et al (1968) countered with a significant body of behavioral science research that directly rejects the “wholly erroneous interpretation of human behavior,” refuting the argument that instincts have control over behavior, thereby corroborating the argument that “human behavior is dominated by learned responses” (p. 16). Friere (1998) writes that learned behavior can be considered to be a form of conditioning, with possible negative implications from unchecked conditioned behavior:

We are conditioned beings but not determined beings. It is impossible to understand history as possibility (in comparison with determinism) if we do not recognize human beings as beings who make free decisions. Without this form of exercise it is not worth speaking about ethics (p. 37).

When human groups impose or reach the nadir point of dehumanization, meaning “a state of oppression that thrives in the absence of ethics,” although a concrete historical fact, it “is not a given destiny but the result of an unjust order that engenders violence in the form of oppressors, which in turn dehumanizes the oppressed” (Friere, 1998, p. 25-26). Any situation wherein person X objectively exploits person Y, with person X hindering person Y’s pursuit of self-affirmation as a responsible person, is an example of oppression. It “in itself constitutes violence, even when sweetened by false generosity, because it interferes with the individual’s ontological and historical vocation to be more fully human” (Friere, 1998, p. 37). There would be no oppressed class or condition of oppression had there been no prior situation of violence to establish the subjugation, and a significant portion of the present situation can be explained by what has happened previously. Administrative systems in higher education, for better or worse,
are learned systems that have emerged over time---yet have evolved to become intractable, rigid, and oppressive in the eyes of some outsider-members of faculty.

Montagu (1968) explains that the militant enthusiasm of humans toward their own kind is learned behavior, and not instinctive. Because such behavior is learned it is logical to question whether it can also be un-learned. But, as insider-members of the faculty clan continue to prioritize their ontology of scientism, their trilogy of expectations and the traditional template as the sole measures of inclusion in the group and as the sole measure of successful performance, then a prejudiced, antagonistic and oppressive view is implied---one that marginalizes and compels some fellow-members of faculty, particularly those in the field of film and digital media, to remain as outsiders---deemed as unworthy of membership in the community of insiders.

I have referred to Lorenz (1966) and the example of rats to illustrate the existence of aggression that resists change in higher education, an abhorrence to change, and aggression by insiders (adherents of the status quo in academe) toward those perceived to be outsiders of the group (faculty in the field of film and digital media)---contextualized by the philosophic humanism of Montagu (1968) and Friere (1998). Power and administrative systems in higher education are reifications of what is known and what has been learned from the past. Faculty members, including administrators, learn their aggressive and territorial behaviors, and exhibit their resistance to change toward difference, based upon historical, cultural and social precedents. Admittedly, the situation within academic systems may have become intolerably oppressive or illogical in many cases, but these are systems that have been learned over time and not biologically derived, and on that basis, are changeable.

The status quo of expectations in all disciplines is that faculty (fellow-members of a
community?) will write and publish any of the following—articles in refereed journals, book chapters, scholarly books or monographs; with the subsequent expectation that completed work will be assessed or evaluated by peers (fellow-members of their community?) according to a template that strictly measures compliance with norms. Journals and other conventional scholarly publications are intended to target specialist professionals in a particular field with very narrow deviation. Some publications target practitioners in a field, some allow a mix of theory and practice as content, and some remain primarily as research oriented. For example, the editorial policy of a journal in sociology states: “Research methodologies may be quantitative or qualitative and may used data gathered through historical analysis, surveys, field work, action research, participant observation, content analysis, simulations, or experiments” (Holt, 2003 p. 2). Another publication aims to “facilitate research that enriches (the discipline) and disseminate findings to professionals and the public” (Holt, 2003 p. 2). The status quo is maintained, determined and controlled by insiders with access to the reins of power, by those with no incentive to support paradigmatic change and plenty of incentive to preserve and maintain the status quo. The requirement to publish (or perish) can also include a process of repeated rejection and re-submission, over and over, until success is achieved (or not). There are nuanced variations from one to another, but the requirement to publish (or perish) is constant and unwavering in institutions that prioritize research over service and teaching. A typical university faculty handbook will have a statement such as:

Excellence in scholarly activities typically reveals itself as continuing scholarly work documented primarily in publications appearing in the relevant journals, in the form of books published by companies respected in the professional community.
Jamison (2004) provides a theoretical perspective that clarifies how individuals within a system might subconsciously or overtly block change, thwarting the personal development and growth of a colleague (or an organization), perhaps reinforcing a systemic status quo or injustice without even knowing it. Jamison (2004) explores the nature of self-diminishing behaviors and teaches us how to identify ways in which we nibble on ourselves and upon others, and how others do the same to us (Jamison, 2004). Jamison (2004) presents a deceptively simple work that evokes a child-like innocence, but it is, in fact, a deeply meaningful and transformative work, relevant to the reality of daily life’s human interactions. Jamison (2004) writes about words, actions and beliefs that inhibit one’s ability to grow into the best person one can be. Sometimes those diminishing behaviors come innocently from others who are unable or not ready to grow themselves, thus they say and do things that stifle or quash personal growth. Other times, nibbles come from within yourself, and are directed at yourself and others. This happens when you are not ready to accept your own unique strengths. In response, you behave in ways that keep you and others from growing (Jamison, 2004).

Jamison (2004) suggests ways to change those behaviors into positive actions and statements as a starting point. From a personal perspective, Jamison (2004) has provided a catalyst for my journey within a dysfunctional institution for higher learning, one that has culminated with an infused sense of hope and a dash of impatient disdain. Jamison (2004) has helped me to find “my own kernel of power, the central part of myself that is my source of joy and serenity, balance and respect, competence and stability, and most of all, power” (Jamison, 2004, p. 50). Jamison (2004) writes about nibbling as a deterrent to change, and an action that happens every day, in emails or in official administrative memos or in passing conversations at the drinking fountain. People in a workplace, colleagues and bosses, nibble each other, directly
and indirectly, to one’s face and behind one’s back. The challenge in the context of the faculty’s quest for acknowledgement, respect and equity in their pursuit of successful evaluation of performance output, is to understand when nibbling is happening, and when it does happen to step away and not become the bait, appetizer or main course of the nibbler (Jamison, 2004).

Another example of resistance to change is the prevailing view that faculty and individual departments or colleges should not be able to determine their own fate, and that a paradigm for evaluation should be centrally determined by administration. Faculty who work in creative domains and fields such as film and digital media production have little or no role in determining what kinds of creative research scholarship will or will not be rewarded, or what performance criteria will be used to evaluate their work. The marginalization of faculty stakeholders from the process of performance evaluation conjures impressions of Group Think theory (Janis, 1972; Janis, 1982), where change is determined by self-proclaimed insiders that exclude ideas that are not perceived as emerged from the inner circles of power.

The status quo that resists change in an institution of higher learning can also be maintained through incompetence of administrators, as uninformed and inconsistent decisions are made. For example, a supervisor (dean, chair) has been promoted beyond his/her real capabilities to understand the job requirements or beyond his/her ability to knowledgeably assess the skills and on-the-job performance of a supervisee (faculty member) in a particular area of specialization (educational institution). This circumstance, particularly when it results in an unfavorable or insufficiently comprehensive evaluation, is highly de-motivating, and it is unfair to the supervisee (faculty). Details that are pertinent to the scope and nature of work and performance, yet beyond the understanding of the unknowledgeable supervisor, would go unnoticed or undervalued, and it would be nearly impossible to receive meaningful direction or
feedback about ways to improve performance if the supervisor is not keenly aware of the scope and nature of the complex and specialized work being performed. The intention of the supervisee to enter programs of study for the development of new skills might be dismissed by an unknowledgeable supervisor, further exacerbating a growing feeling of disappointment and de-motivation. This kind of situation is not uncommon, and in fact can be made much worse when the supervisor (Chair or Dean) has the backing of an upper management person or insular group that is also not directly aware or knowledgeable about the specialized and meaningful contribution of a faculty member. In this way, the supervisor’s evaluation is taken on face value as correct (Peter and Hull, 2009). In these ways, conventional institutionalized systems do effectively yet counter-productively de-motivate workers (faculty) who have been previously highly motivated---an unfortunate situation that is not uncommon (La Pelle, 1997).

The status quo, its hierarchical power structure, and the resistance to ontological change is also sustained by doubts about the trustworthiness and verifiability of self as a source of data (Holt, 2003), and allegations that unconventional and alternative perspectives are only for “academic lightweights” (Diamond, 1993c, p. 20). Even van Maanen (1988), a pioneer and staunch supporter of an alternative approach, ethnographic writing, specifically, has expressed:

ethnographies, as quasi-formal documents based upon fieldwork, are full of persuasive, yet questionable, rhetorical appeals…This is unavoidable. I can only notify readers in advance of the self-indulgent, involuted, circular, ironic, and slightly iconoclastic aspects” that are found in personalized, alternative forms of writing, research and scholarly work (p. xv).

It is common to find artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media that relies upon self-criticism, self-reflection and self as the primary source of data,
but it would be arrogantly shortsighted to categorize such work as lightweight. A perspective that emphasizes self might be viewed as quixotic from a conventional standpoint, yet the subjectivity of the researcher is most highly valued in artistic and other personalized forms of faculty work. An emphasis upon self can also be seen as a valuable resource for generating a deeper and unique understanding the problematic world under investigation, as something to capitalize on rather than to exorcise (Holt, 2003 pp. 6-7; Glesne and Peshkin, 1992). Other doubts and problems oftentimes mentioned in critiques about an alternative approach or form of scholarly work might mention the work’s lack of demonstrated theoretical relationships and conceptual patterns, an inherent incompleteness of first-person narratives that lack sufficient kinds and numbers of references to other sources, and a possible insufficiency in “holding the phenomenon up to serious inspection” (Holt, 2003 p. 3). A predictable progression of argumentation follows such critique---that if standards for qualitative research are not met, then the writing is nothing more than journalism (or art) with a smattering of theory (Holt, 2003 p 3). To define scholarly work narrowly has benefited some individuals and groups, but not others---to the detriment of all.

Despite my idealized post-humanist and post-materialist rhetoric, I perceive an implicit (sometimes explicit) X versus Y obsession for reductive oppositions and dichotomous contradictions throughout the systems and processes of higher education. The tendency toward dichotomous thinking, denoting the dialectical conflict between opposing social forces, is manifested in processes for the recognition and evaluation of faculty scholarship and work---for example, conventional versus alternative, us versus them, teaching versus research, scientific versus artistic, creative versus empirical, hard science versus soft science, physical versus mental, quantitative versus qualitative, I versus we, we versus they, soul versus body (or body
versus mind), intellect versus senses, superior versus inferior, and so on. However, in the conventions of scientism that thrives in systems of higher education, a dualistic separation of conceptual terms is more aptly described as monistic because the binary contrast focuses only upon one pole while dismissing or disregarding the other pole (Hanrahan, 2003). Wertheim (1998) has written: “It is a complete misnomer to call the modern scientific world picture dualistic---it is monistic, admitting the reality only of physical phenomena” (p. 153).

Dualistic oppositions imply a contradiction that is not resolved by merely seeing the other half of the dichotomy as the other side of one coin. The other half of the binary opposition is a reality that denies or ignores the relevance of discourse and the making of connections. In fact, from the perspective of systems thinking, it can be that both sides of the coin combine to form a composite systemic whole, with both sides mutually dependent upon each other, with neither being able to be defined effectively in isolation from the other. In actuality, there are no sides at all, there is only one whole. Knowledge that emerges from the approach of dichotomous modeling triggers an experiential chain of memories, emotions and other behavioral responses that are rooted in history and present circumstances, differing from individual to individual---an interaction of terms---not a one-way street (Friere, 2004; Hanrahan, 2003).

Defining faculty work according to dichotomies---sometimes as contradictions but always oppositional---generates dualist models that thwart change---becoming self-defeating; pitting one side against another side, denying the integrative nature of academic and life systems. Oppositional dichotomies emphatically underscore systemic conflicts in higher education---and demonstrate the inherently closed nature of a structure that marginalizes faculty members in the field of film and digital media who strive for successful careers in the academy. In the context of performance evaluation, it must be asked, why is the territory of scientism so aggressively
defended as the best and only way, and what is preventing a more open and inclusive approach to the definition, recognition, evaluation and rewarding of scholarly work by faculty in higher education?

There is no surprise in stating that alternative, qualitative forms of inquiry and output have remained doubted, mistrusted, highly scrutinized, marginalized and misunderstood in the hierarchical settings of academia. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) write:

Politicians and ‘hard scientists’ sometimes call qualitative researchers journalists or soft scientists. The work of qualitative scholars is termed unscientific, or only exploratory or subjective. It is called criticism rather than theory or science, or it is interpreted politically, as a disguised version of Marxism or secular humanism (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p 10).

Marchese (1992) wrote that system, not the individual, “dictates what faculty do, and that deflates morale. From the trenches, it’s a system of contradictory messages from above…it’s a system that demands more as it gives less and frustrates best intentions time after time” (p. 4). The challenge is to define the possibilities for faculty work with a creative and innovative view that enriches, rather than restricts, the quality of the educational experience enjoyed by students; and one that recognizes the talents and great diversity of scholarly activities performed by faculty. As Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) wrote: “Without a better balance among professional priorities, gaps will widen between fields of knowledge, between faculty and students, and between campus and the larger society. Members of the community of scholars will drift farther apart” (p. ix). The result has been proliferation of what has been called “establishment research” (Diamond, 1993b, p. 8).

Greater weight continues to be placed on traditional research and publication “than
seems appropriate given changes to institutional priorities and disciplinary epistemology and model modes of inquiry” (Diamond and Adam, 2000, p. 1). Gray, Froh, and Diamond (1992) show that change is essential because the nearly-exclusive emphasis upon published research has had a detrimental impact on the quality of teaching and the scope of research being conducted, on students’ attitudes toward the science disciplines, and consequently, on the numbers of students selecting science and engineering as careers. “Colleges and universities must change, and in order for change to occur those of us in higher education must modify what we do” (Diamond, 1993c, p. 21). But, what do those of us in higher education actually do that needs to be changed, who determines what is being done and in need of change, and how is the status quo ever going to be changed? As a wise but now-deceased friend once told me that---with attribution to Gandhi---change is possible, but change can be slow, and real change is slower (O’Brien, 1987). Change and learning share a symbiotic relationship. It takes time to learn, and even more time to un-learn and then learn again something that is new.

Power and decision-making at institutions of higher learning are implemented have been sustained in a top-down manner, power-pyramid style, with a Board of Directors and a Chancellor at the apex, alone and all-powerful, situated above a cluster of vice chancellors, deans and chairs, all of whom are positioned above the faculty who are located somewhere near the bottom of the organizational chart. Academic decision-makers isolate themselves at the top tier of power. It is difficult to imagine occurrences of change in ways that power is distributed or in the decision-making processes at institutions of higher learning. Protectors, guardians and gatekeepers of the status quo in higher education are inclined to filter out, restrict or banish ideas and influences that are perceived as new, different or not compatible with existing ways, cleansing the status quo of any threats that threaten or potentially disrupt the existing hierarchy
of power in which they reside. Old ideas and bad habits die slowly, even in the face of new, convincing and meaningful possibilities—and the resistance to ontological change in institutions of higher learning concerning the scope and nature of what constitutes academic scholarship is reinforced by a hierarchical authority that values and sustains a status quo that benefits some, but not others. This dissertation demonstrates that structures and systems in higher education for the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media are sorely lacking and in need of change, particularly so in light of changes that are emerging in society, the cultural milieu, and in the world that is embodied within the academy (Diamond, 1993a).
4) The Possibility of Change: A Matter of Approach

*If you do not change direction, you may end up where you are heading.*

Lao Tzu.

Faculty members in the field of film and digital media seek structures and systems for performance evaluation where the self-determined, intrinsic and extrinsic pursuit of success through rewards, competency, and self-esteem is a realistic and attainable goal. Faculty colleagues in the field of film and digital media seek a professional environment and educational workplace that is replete with optimal challenges, one with rich sources of intellectual and creative stimulation, one that operates in a context that prioritizes autonomy and self-determination. Knowing that change is possible, the challenge is to determine how and/or if such change occur for the benefit of faculty in higher education, and specifically those in the field of film and digital media while recognizing the resistance from guardians of the status quo.

Montagu (1968) and Friere (1998) have freed me from the hegemony of biological determinism that has been illustrated by Lorenz (1966) who argued that human individual and group behavior as an inevitable result of instinct. I am empowered by the knowledge that behavior and social systems can be changed because they are learned and not genetically inherited (Montagu, 1968; Friere 1998). This gives me confidence to express, negate and denounce the rigidly accepted limits that sustain the status quo in higher education. The possibility of change awakens my critical consciousness and frees the expression of my discontent. This dissertation presents a possibility for change, calling for a new ontology that re-defines scholarship and scholarly work by faculty in all fields and domains, including the academic field of film and digital media. Ontology refers to a socially shared understanding with its own vocabulary of terms and specifications about definitions, meanings, and
interrelationships, a conceptual model or a meta-model that defines or represents the collective knowledge of a domain, whether or not it is explicitly stated (Allert, Markkanen, and Richter, 2005; Jasper and Uschold, 1999). Ontological change, according to an alternative view and as advocated in this dissertation, infers that institutional rewards and faculty advancement in academic settings must become more accessible to all concerned parties—including those who pursue unconventional priorities by making films and electronic/digital media projects as part of their artistic, scholarly or professional practice, research and work.

Change can occur when an institutional climate is conducive to change, and when those affected by the changes—faculty, chairs, and deans—are involved in the change process (Diamond, 1993c). Institutions of higher learning, just like all other professional organizations, demand and possess the right to assess the professional performance of colleagues, (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007), and the final decision of a faculty evaluation is usually made at the higher levels of administrative hierarchies. Conversely, faculty scholarship in the field of film and digital media should have equal significance with scholarship in other fields and disciplines, and all faculty should be free to pursue whatever new forms are most appropriate for personal, professional, artistic and technological growth, both for themselves and for their students (Davis, Gollifer, MacLeod, Rhabyt, Rubin, and Weintraub, 2007). All motivational factors, including the merits that emerge from intrinsic motivation, should be recognized during the process of evaluation (Diamond, 1993a, Deci and Ryan, 1985). Theoretical perspectives suggest that if faculty are not encouraged or rewarded for doing their intrinsically motivated work, perhaps the result of unresolved and conflicting priorities, then it is likely that de-motivation will follow (Deci and Ryan, 1985; La Pelle, 1998).

Change, including a resolve to change, will follow a tangible, first step in action, without
regard to what seems to be an insignificant, tiny, or basic the first step. One may never know what will come of a particular action, but if one does nothing in the first place it is unlikely that result the change that is desired will emerge. Paradigmatic change in the faculty reward system is unlikely to occur through inaction, or by mere rhetoric, argumentation or poorly targeted action. The difficulty and arduous process of change involves issues of interpersonal social and political relationships, in a unique and specific sense of identity, and changes in deeply held beliefs—all of which are difficult to change and which might be resisted to varying degrees. Requiring much more than logical thinking and consensus by a majority, ontological change requires conscious assent and effort, and subconscious processes of thought and feeling that facilitated an awareness of the problem in the first place.

In a hierarchical power structure, such as that found in educational institutions, change that is based upon a new idea can be sustained and successful only when faculty are equally involved with administrators, with both sides sharing an active role, from planning through implementation---in the process of setting priorities, establishing criteria, and determining how the entire process will be developed and assessed (Diamond, 1993c). The conservative perspective does not advocate a complete upheaval of the pyramid structure of power in higher education, but much of the literature affirms that leadership (i.e., the boss or bosses), and the values, mindset, attitudes and inclinations of the boss at educational institutions, are key change agents if any possible shift is to occur (Colbeck, 2006; Bukalski, 1990; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007). Short of a revolutionary restructuring of the power pyramid in higher education, it must at least be acknowledged by those on top (i.e. administrators) that their privileged roles and positions of power would not be unreasonably compromised or jeopardized if participation is inclusive, involving the entire community of faculty and administrators,
sharing the responsibility for systemic change in the ways that faculty work is recognized, evaluated and rewarded in the field of film and digital media.

**Part 4: A new template for work in the field of film and digital media**

*Judge no man until you've walked a mile in his moccasins.*

Unknown.

As with traditional research methods, the intellectual foundation of *discovery* in conventional research, as described by Boyer (1990), is also fundamental to artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media. Part 4 affirms the importance and usefulness of building a larger and more inclusive meaning of scholarship and scholarly activity by faculty, but argues that the unmet issue revolves around finding ways to fairly and meaningfully evaluate, assess, and ultimately find ways to reward new, alternative and innovative forms of scholarship and scholarly work.

In most institutions of higher learning there are four major occasions when the review and evaluation of scholarly activity occurs: tenure, post-tenure, promotion and contractual renewal (Diamond, 2002). Review and evaluation of faculty work can also be related to accreditation processes, merit salary increases, the awarding of grant funds, and other extrinsic rewards. The expectations and priorities for each type of review can widely vary, but the scope and nature of the questions asked about the faculty dossier and the data under evaluation are fairly consistent, as are the range of extrinsic rewards (Diamond, 2002).

Differences among educational institutions of higher learning have been described as “remarkable” (Bukalski, 2000, p. 1). Some departments and institutions have developed and implemented clear and relevant criteria that define expectations and for faculty work, and criteria
for recognizing and evaluating faculty work, yet some do not have clear and relevant criteria, particularly in the field of film and digital media. On the other hand, some departments and institutions of higher learning have established written criteria that allow for the formal consideration and recognition of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in creative fields, including the field of film and digital media. Some institutions prioritize scientific research as the principal focus of scholarly activity by faculty, while others fully prioritize teaching—yet data demonstrates that many are not considering teaching to be scholarly activity (Boyer, 1990). Very few institutions, if any, place more than token value upon community or institutional service in any form (Boyer, 1990; Lynton, 1995). Most institutions prioritize conventional methods of quantitative or qualitative research that lead to text-based outcomes for faculty research, albeit confined within narrowly defined parameters, while some other institutions are more open to post-structural and post-modern sensibilities, including the recognition of creative and artistic work, interdisciplinary work, teaching as a form of scholarly practice, the application of expertise as community service as important forms of scholarship and scholarly activity by faculty (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Boyer, 1990). Data research in Chapter 4 demonstrates that in many institutions it is common to find that evaluation practices will place at least a 60% or more weighting upon the research component, in tandem with a 20%-40% value for teaching and 10%-20% value for community and university service. Comparatively, in Chapter 4 it is also shown that institutions that prioritize teaching will allocate as much as 70% weighting to the category of teaching, with the remaining 30% split between service and research. In this light, one professor wrote:

Our university does not grant tenure; instead, contracts have to be renewed at intervals between 2-8 years, depending upon education level and how many previous contracts one
has completed. Our application for contract renewal is based on 70% teaching, 15% scholarship, and 15% service to the University and community. I have had one part-time contract renewed for 2 years and just had a 2-year full-time contract renewed for 3 years (Respondent #1).

Generally, despite the disparity in weight, allocation and percentages that pertain to expectations that determine faculty load and time, the conventional expectation is for scholarly work by faculty to be framed by the trilogy of teaching, research and service; and to be reflective of the traditional template’s narrow set of standards that define academic scholarship, with few exceptions—despite the fact that data shows the traditional template to be not appropriate or useful for recognizing and evaluating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

In a conventional process for reviewing faculty scholarship, emphasis is placed upon evaluative checks to verify that the methods and results of work are trustworthy, free of error, valid, rigorously achieved, testable and reliably replicable, applicable and transferable for another purpose, and so on. There is an explicit requirement that impersonalized results of the research be conveyed and dispassionately interpreted and expressed in a third-person voice (Holt, 2003). But, as demonstrated in much of the literature about (for and against) auto/ethnographic writing, there is a mistrust of self as a research vehicle, and an explicit demand for empirical data as the only form of evidence indicative of proper scholarship (Holt, 2003). There appears to be an unmet need for a greater understanding and more inclusive mindset that recognizes and considers the approach of faculty work, not narrowly and solely evaluating the artifacts of work.

Creative work, such as the artistic, scholarly, and professional work done by faculty in
the field of film and digital media, is “intellectually demanding in similar ways to that of traditional research, including the collection of data, analysis, and synthesis of data and content, and with its inherently intellectual foundations in discovery, application and integration” (Williams-Rautiola, 2001, p. 2). Faculty work in the field of film and digital media (referred to in a variety of ways such as time based media, moving image arts, cinematic arts, multimedia arts and design, and many others) has reticulated and grown over the past few decades to a great extent, such that it now emerges in a wide range of stylistic contexts---narrative, documentary, industrial, commercial, and experimental, to name a few.

The academic and professional field of film and digital media also naturally involves learning and practice in business, legal, technical and creative domains; and highly rigorous expectations for a wide range of technical and practical skills enhanced by theoretical knowledge---and all of which are necessary for producing work in film, digital video and mixed formats---writing, directing, camera/lighting, audio recording, and editing, to name a few. Just within the creative and technical domains, the set of skills can extend to traditional and/or computer-based 2-dimensional and 3-dimensional animation, animated motion graphics and special effects of limitless variety; the design of web-based blogging and other interactive multimedia; game design and mobile media applications and other works intended for desktop interactivity; graphic and time-based multimedia design, website design, and internet art; digital installation and performance; audio recording and audio installations; sculptural works that rely upon a mix of media elements; digital kiosks, robotics, biological and DNA art, hypermedia art and other networked activities---plus specialized areas such as scriptwriting, grant writing, and other forms of critical, reflective or informational writing, storyboard artistry, audio design and so many, many more. The list continues to grow longer and longer, with stylistic and
disciplinary sub-specializations galore.

Faculty members that pursue alternative forms of scholarly activity, such as the work of faculty in the field of film and digital media, necessarily prioritize a process and outcomes of work that are different from conventional approaches to research inquiry. Work that emerges from an alternative approach, including faculty work in the field of film and digital media, is commonly allocated to the “boundaries” of disciplinary practices (Sparkes, 2000, p. 21). The basic question that emerges is whether or not it is possible to develop criteria and procedures for measuring, assessing or evaluating the scholarly work of faculty in the field of film and digital media that have credibility not only at the departmental level on an individual campus, but across campus lines as well (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997)?

A one-size-fits-all scheme that attempts to standardize and homogenize under a singular umbrella---a list of external expectations and results of all faculty research output---is demonstrated in Chapter 4 to be inappropriate, ineffective, and unfair in many cases. Data in Chapter 4, including participant surveys-interviews and a range of sources of scholarly literature, demonstrate that arbitrary, disparate, non-existent, and irrelevant criteria for performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media are common to many institutions, and this fact poses a no-win situation for faculty and their students---posing a risk and compromise to student learning while simultaneously undermining, dissipating or destroying a faculty career (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997).

A reductionist view of the filmmaking process prioritizes a list of isolated processes of work that is performed by particular elite leaders of the production team, while all other follower members of the team are contentedly toiling as followers in technical-task isolation. In this ideal model, the whole team works in tandem, united in the end by common purpose. The team’s
leader would be either the director or producer, or both---yet leadership positions are the only ones recognized during a conventional performance evaluation---if at all. As the administrative systems in institutions of higher learning are designed according to a reductionist model, so are the policies and approaches that guide the evaluation of faculty work. Artistic, creative, scholarly and/or professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media is diverse and unique oftentimes done by a team of many expert practitioners (or one auteur who wears many hats). According to many scholars and as argued in Chapter 5, the recognition and rewarding of work should not merely emphasize only the key leadership roles such as producer or director (Tomasulo 2009), and evaluations should not only be based upon cumulative results that are held in isolation from the process or approach undertaken while doing the work (Diamond and Adam, 2000 p 6-7).

Reframing our understanding about scholarship and the faculty reward system must coincide with an acknowledgement of disciplinary uniqueness and differences, and support the notion of individual faculty paths (Diamond and Adam 2000, p 1). Ontological change that leads to institutional recognition of artistic, creative, scholarly and/or professional practice and work for faculty rewards encourages a plethora of enhancements and further changes---such as interdisciplinary collaboration, and dissemination and accessibility of knowledge and information from the university to a wider audience including the general public---yielding direct and indirect benefits to the institution, to faculty, to students, and to society. In contrast to the traditional template that emphasizes scientific discovery and specialized text-based publication, faculty work in film and digital media is uniquely linked to the ideas of creative and artistic expression, and to commercial, industrial or other professional contexts. Artistic, creative, scholarly, and professional work in the field of film and digital media is a distinct area of
knowledge and practice where theory and practice can be uniquely interdisciplinary, collaborative, and relevant to all four of the domains of scholarship (Boyer, 1990); yet arguably it is also emergent through similar and comparable methods that are employed in scientific and humanities research practice.
Part 5: Summary

Faculty work in the field of film and digital media, auto/ethnographic writing, and many other alternative, expressive and creative forms of scholarship activities represent a significant deviation from traditional expectations because each emanates from the unique, specific, and personal perspective of self. Data, including personal observation, confirms an under-appreciation of self as an important alternative approach in research inquiry, and under-appreciation negates the need to identify the barriers that impede a fuller understanding. The research situation and research data confirm a need to develop strategies and solutions that can be utilized for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media. I am not content or interested to merely discover or prove the existence of barriers, or to blame the pattern making nature of the brain as cause for the insufferable nature of the status quo, but I do hope that the old barriers will not be able to remain as monolithic and impenetrable after my analysis is read and understood. I can see, feel, taste, hear and touch the barriers, so on the basis of clear empirical evidence and personal experience I am applying appropriate methods to facilitate a greater understanding of the problem, the intellectual and practical groundwork that leads to action, problem solving, and change.

The prioritization of scientism and text-based publication in specialized journals has served to undermine or compromise interdisciplinary collaboration, professional development, and the application of expert knowledge in social contexts. In response, in chapter 5 of this dissertation a new understanding about faculty priorities is illustrated and supported by relevant and clearly written criteria that is specific to the unique requirements for recognizing and evaluating the wide range of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media. Any notion that assumes institutions of higher learning to be unified in consensus
about change and consistent in practice would be naïve, superficial and simplistic. There are polarized conflicts and contradictions beneath the surface and between the lines of any institutional practice or policy decision. I do not expect or intend that my dissertation to be the absolute final word on the matter, but I do view it as part of a continuous process of personal journeying for greater understanding that (in the case of this project) leads to a process of institutional change and individual growth.

This dissertation primarily focuses upon the need for recognizing and rewarding artistic, scholarly and professional work forms of scholarship activity by faculty in the field of film and digital media. The scope and nature of this dissertation research is probably relevant and applicable to other academic disciplinary domains and fields that seek to improve local processes for evaluating faculty work that does not prioritize the narrow strictures of the traditional template---and this matter is recommended as an important and unmet area for further study. It is implicit and explicit in this dissertation that recognition of the unique and specific faculty work the field of film and digital media, appearing in all of its many creative forms, is necessary and possible, and that evaluation and rewards should include the broadest range of service activities and the sharing of knowledge through teaching (Boyer, 1990).

This dissertation aims to build a useful resource that emerges from methodological rigor, is expressed through self-reflective and self-critical writing, and conveys personal and collective knowledge and thoughts about the recognition and evaluation of creative scholarly work by faculty in the field of film and digital media other disciplines; generating a model for recognizing and evaluating artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media. It is implicit, likely and welcomed that the arguments and model that emerge in this dissertation will resonate and find relevance for many faculty who are practicing in the field of film and digital media, and
in related fields such as photographic arts, fine arts (painting, printmaking, sculpture and others), many forms of design, theater and musical arts, and other creative areas of study and practice—and in many others where film and electronic/digital media are occurring that relate to anthropology, humanities, social sciences, natural and medical sciences.

I have built knowledge by reflecting upon the theoretical writings of others, and by written reflection upon my own first hand experiences with the processes and problems as an applicant for promotion of faculty rank on the basis of creative scholarship and professional work in film and digital media. Perhaps as the result of influences from schools of thought such as critical and postmodern theory, perhaps on the basis of common sense and logic, the research I have done for this dissertation has enabled me to reject positivist and post-positivist criteria as the sole measures for evaluating artistic, creative and professional work in the field of film and digital media. This dissertation demonstrates that performance evaluation can be designed to yield important information with great formative value when it is done for the purpose of improving, informing and appraising a faculty member’s skills and self-awareness, but the process can also be conceived and designed so poorly that it is perceived as frightful, threatening and de-motivating (La Pelle, 1998). Unfortunately, chapter 4 of this dissertation also provides significant evidence that the latter is the more of a norm than not, demonstrating that the traditional template for performance evaluation of scholarship that is relied upon at many institutions of higher learning does not reflect an accurate understanding of the breadth of activities that are inherent to artistic, scholarly and professional work in the field of film or digital media.

Although I am not arguing for the abandonment or replacement of historical values and practices that serve to underpin the craft of conventional academic research in the Western
tradition, I do intend to advocate change and improvement to existing practices and notions that frame faculty performance evaluation in academic settings. Much successful work in the arts relies on inspiration born partially from vast reservoirs of knowledge, skill, and experience. The rationalized study, findings, and recommendations presented do not intend to replace intuition and inspiration with procedure, but rather to provide a better basis for recognizing alternative forms of work by faculty. Although this dissertation research project is not intended to be a study of organizational change, nor is it intending to be an analysis of organizational culture per se, it does intend to explore ways and possibilities for change to long-held ideas in academe about research and the output of research, including about the evaluation of research practices and subsequent research output. I do not arrogantly demand that a new orthodoxy for evaluation of scholarship be immediately embraced in all situations, but I do aim to make it significantly more difficult to hold onto the old ways. I do find personal difficulty in mustering the patience to accept the glacial slowness of change in institutional settings of higher education, and I am intolerant in the face of goose-stepping resistance to change, particularly when logic dictates an urgent need for change. Nonetheless, I am advocating for change, despite its difficulties.
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Chapter 2 is divided into six main parts:

1) The purpose of a literature review
   a) Overview: Reading between the lines
   b) The use of literature
   c) Sources of literature: An open approach

2) Academic scholarship and performance evaluation of faculty work
   a) Overview: Reading between the lines
   b) The use of literature
   c) Sources of literature: An open approach

3) Characteristics of a performance evaluation system in higher education
4) Recognition of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media
5) Change in institutions of higher learning: challenges and obstacles
6) Summary

Part 1/The purpose of a literature review is divided into three sections:

a) Overview: Reading between the lines

The traditional template for defining, recognizing, and evaluating faculty work reveals many layers of submerged and unacknowledged meaning. By reading between the lines I see a landscape of implicit values that exist underneath the surface. I see that both the trilogy and the template emphasize scientism in higher education, a value system that prevails without conscious awareness of its implications. In literature that intends to explain or justify the status quo of performance evaluation I understand what has been expressed, but I also discern what has not been expressed---gaps within the main body of ideas. Critical inquiry facilitates and provokes a deeper understanding of the multiple layers of meaning that are found as I have openly questioned the terminologies and implicit values of the trilogy and the traditional template.

b) The use of literature

What is a literature review and what is its purpose? A conventional literature review is a detailed discussion of what has been published in a given area of study. It is intended to justify the approach of an inquiry and its selection of methods in relation to the research problem and
the research questions, and to demonstrate that the research will be a contribution to the body of knowledge in a given area of study (Hart, 1998; Levy and Ellis, 2006). It serves, in part, to affirm the credibility of both the dissertation and the writer (Gall, Borg and Gall, 1996). The quality of a literature review should demonstrate “appropriate breadth and depth, rigor and consistency, clarity and brevity, and effective analysis and synthesis” (Hart, 1998, p. 1). Levy and Ellis (2006) propose that:

an effective literature review should do the following: a) methodologically analyze and synthesize quality literature, b) provide a firm foundation to a research topic, c) provide a firm foundation to the selection of research methodology, and d) demonstrate that the proposed research contributes something new to the overall body of knowledge or advances the research field’s knowledge base (p. 2).

A literature review that is informed by an understanding of systems theory and systems thinking will focus attention upon the whole, rather than upon the parts, facilitating an understanding that things, ideas, people and groups of people are systems within ever-larger systems, ad infinitum. An “open” approach in the use of literature can be characterized as purposeful and continuous sensitivity to the emergence of observable systemic relationships through broad based reading and other data collection; conversely, a “closed” approach limits the scope of input and inhibits the making of systemic connections, reducing the potential that decisions will yield benefits, change and action that solves a problem (Schockley-Zalabak, 1999, p. 43). I consider my approach to the literature as open. Chapter 3 describes further my open approach and method of inquiry with literature and other sources of data that have informed this dissertation research.
From a perspective rooted in systems theory, a literature review should also demonstrate that inquiry was a *process of learning*, a sequence of steps or activities (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Levy and Ellis (2006) recommend a three-step process for developing a “sound and effective literature review…1) inputs 2) processing and 3) outputs” (p. 2). An effective literature review that follows this three-stage process will be able to demonstrate a thorough and systematic examination of the existing body of knowledge from literature (Levy and Ellis, 2006).

Borrowing from systems theory and Levy and Ellis (2006), I am taking in new information by reading and gathering a range of data (inputs), transforming the incoming information with my own understanding (processing), and then giving back and sharing new information in the form of this dissertation and its embedded layers of ideas (outputs) (Levy and Ellis, 2006; Bloom, 1956). This is a continuous process and descriptive of my approach to the literature, and to my method of research inquiry.

A postmodernist approach justifies, compels and encourages the inclusion and consideration of readings and sources of data that do not necessarily reflect mainstream perceptions or expectations about the particular topic of this dissertation. From a postmodern and post-positivist perspective, “reality can never be apprehended, only approximated,” and this idea allows the de-centralization of source(s) that inform the research and the use of methods for inquiry, placing great value upon a juxtaposition of perspectives, contexts, and methods as a way of capturing as much of reality as possible (Guba, 1990, p. 2). It places great value upon the emergence of ambiguities, discrepancies and alternatives, rejecting traditional, artificial and imposed frames of order such as conventional expectations of structure and literary style (Guba, 1990; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). I have prioritized some sources that reject, sharply criticize, or deconstruct the status quo in many contexts; and have integrated some theoretical writings that
emphasize self, honoring the first-person voice as a source of data. Postmodernism permits the crossing of boundaries that define the breadth and nature of everything that is presumed to be knowable—including reality, existence, culture, power, authority, meaning, causation, knowledge, ethics and more. Borrowing from postmodernism and with reference to grounded theory, I have taken the liberty to read and consider everything as data, then to determine afterwards how it fits, or not (Barthes, 1977; Glaser, 1976).

Lippman (1989) coined the term granularity in relation to interactivity in new media to define the point at which the interaction with a new media text (e.g., a word, a page, a video or audio segment, a part of computer game) can be interrupted by a reader (Voithofer, 2005). In planning a study, researchers determine the data granularity that they require to answer research questions, as well as determining, with dissemination editors, the depth to which the reader should be allowed to enter into the data (Voithofer, 2005). A simple example can be the use of a digital camera to capture visual documentation from a school. A digital camera is capable of recording more detail than is generally offered through a graphic on a website or a photograph in a book or journal article. Often this means reducing the size and resolution of a digital image or cropping it to better fit it on a Web page or printed page. These processes remove visual information that the reader may find useful. Through selection the researcher decides what data are relevant to a study based on the research questions, theoretical framework, and available research resources, including time, materials, funds, and researcher training. The increasing capacity and lower cost of the computer to store large amounts of information can tempt a researcher to capture large quantities of data. Data oversaturation can be prevalent in the process of studying online learning environments or in the learning that occurs on the computer where screen movement, typing, and time on computer tasks can generate large amounts of detailed
information. A way to approach the design and selection of new media data is through theorizing data granularity (Voithofer, 2005).

Knowing when to quit gathering, organizing and analyzing of incoming research data, including the reading of literature, is a skill developed through experience, and this important aspect of the research process is implied in a literature review. According to many theorists, the literature review continues until the study is completed; throughout the course of input-processing-output (Levy and Ellis, 2006; Glaser, 1976). The usual processes of research inquiry, including the input-processing-output of research data from literature, involves changes in methodology, addition of new constructs, and the reconciliation of conflicting data from literature that requires further research. Borrowing from the method of grounded theory, the general rule is to gather data until each category is saturated and develops properties of the conceptual categories (Glaser, 1976). As a category reaches a point of theoretical saturation, the researcher moves on to other categories. In this way, the literature review is an organic system that is constantly growing and changing as the study develops (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Therefore, I consider the literature review as a process, and it was not completed until all the research associated with the study was completed.

This chapter intends to be consistent with the intentions and expectations of a conventional literature review---yet is inclined toward the openness of a postmodern approach---illustrating the scope and nature of literature relevant to the area of study, demonstrating important gaps in knowledge for further inquiry, and convincing the reader how this research makes a contribution to the body of knowledge for the purpose of solving the problem. The literature cited in this chapter emerges from my construal of what is related to the research problem and the range of questions that frame the inquiry of this dissertation; and has influenced
my personalized writing approach and method—all of which serve in some way to inform my proposed solution to the problem. This chapter also provides a framework for Chapter 5 where I relate my ideas and findings that have emerged from inquiry with previously established data.

c) Sources of literature: An open approach

The literature review reflects an aspect of the process of learning that I personally experienced, as a participant, and that I observed, as a scholar. An important aspect of this research has been informed through analysis of a broad range of qualitative data found in literature. This has facilitated the emergence and intersection of pertinent themes that have informed the research problem and research question(s). The process has included:

• Comparative analysis of traditional and alternative notions of what constitutes scholarship and academic research as an activity by faculty members;

• Comparative analysis of performance evaluation practices in the field of film and digital media with academic disciplines outside the field of film and digital media;

• Analysis of court records and legal writings about issues raised by faculty members in courts of law pertaining to perceived injustices in connection with negative performance evaluations in colleges and universities;

• Analysis of text-based statements, briefing papers, monographs and other pertinent documents generated by national and international organizations, educational institutions, agencies and specialized professional associations that provide detailed analysis and recommendations for standards relevant to the evaluating academic performance practices and theoretical underpinnings from diverse disciplinary perspectives;
• Analysis of scholarly, historical and theoretical writings about emergent and relevant themes that have included ethics, creativity, power, leadership and change;
• Integration of theoretical and practical notions about auto/ethnography as a form of scholarly research writing.

My open approach to the literature has addressed the scope and nature of the emergent themes from a variety of perspectives and media. Through reading and analysis this study has reached out to films, books, articles and on line sources that provide practical, theoretical, legal and historical perspectives, published in the proceedings of professional organizations; scholarly journals in the field of education, law and other scholarly areas; trade publications; and a variety of online documents---in addition to my own self-reflective writing and survey query of interviewees (Methods are discussed in Chapters 3).

Certain scholars have emerged as key experts that have substantially informed my inquiry from various perspectives, including: Boyer (1988, 1990), Diamond (1993; 1999), Braxton, Luckey and Helland, (2002); Braxton, (2006); Diamond and Adam (2000), Bukalski (2000), Friere (1998; 2000), Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997), La Pelle (1997), Four Arrows (2008), and Denzin and Lincoln (2000); but there are many other scholarly writings (described in this Chapter) that I have studied (input-processed-output); and each source has contributed greatly to the building of this dissertation. I am very grateful for each work and each scholar that has shared knowledge that has informed my inquiry, but I feel obliged to specifically highlight the above-listed scholars as they have had the greatest influence and impact upon my ability to think and frame the complexity of ideas as I have developed this dissertation. To them I am very grateful as they opened doors for me as I searched for new ideas and possible solutions to a big (yet specific) problem that faces faculty in the field of film and digital media.
Specific mention should also be made about the literature that has been published and disseminated by professional associations such as the University Film and Video Association (UFVA), National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD), College Arts Association (CAA), and others. A wide range of publications by these organizations have been helpful for defining new and old institutional and traditional priorities, and also have been helpful in determining what gaps and omissions exist in current practices for performance evaluation in higher education, particularly in the context of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Faculty priorities are strongly influenced by the statements and agendas of professional disciplinary associations, at national and international levels, because:

…faculty tend to identify themselves, first, as members of the community with whom they share scholarly interests. In the competitive marketplace of higher education, the statements and agendas of professional disciplinary associations articulate the current climate and relevant concerns affecting faculty in higher education, and provide critical perspectives about promotion and tenure guidelines (Diamond, 1993c, p. 15).

A broad list of organizations, institutions, agencies and associations that have published papers relevant to the question of what is constituted as research activity by faculty include:

American Association of University Professors (AAUP; USA)
American Association for Higher Education (AAHE; USA)
National Association of School of Art and Design (NASAD; USA)
NASAD Working Group on the Arts in Higher Education (NASAD; USA)
University Film and Video Association (UFVA; USA)
Broadcast Education Association (BEA; USA)
American Anthropological Association (AAA; USA)
Council for Arts Accrediting Associations (CAAA; UK)

College Art Association (CAA; USA)

Policy statements that have been published by each of these organizations have facilitated an understanding of the implications inherent to the traditional template as it continues to be used to measure and define scholarly work, despite significant evidence in data of its irrelevance in many contexts. Organizational statements have been useful for contextualizing my own experience as a participant in this research, and the phenomenological writing of project interviewees to this project, serving as a starting point that affirms and solves the problem that has been posed in this dissertation.
Part 2: Academic scholarship and performance evaluation of faculty work

Part 2 is divided into two main sections:

a) Terminologies for faculty work and its evaluation

b) Historical and contemporary perspective about faculty work

Part 2 discusses literature that was used to explore the historical, theoretical and conceptual roots for what constitutes scholarship by academic faculty in institutions of higher learning. The purpose is to locate artistic, scholarly, and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media within the broad spectrum of what is constituted as scholarship and scholarly activity.

1) Terminologies about faculty work and its evaluation

What does it mean to be a scholar? What constitutes scholarly work by faculty, according to traditional and contemporary perspectives? I look at this complex question from multiple perspectives---historical, critical, and alternative---advocating for those of us at the borders.

Today, according to Boyer (1990), “being scholarly” is synonymous with academic rank at a college or university, and with the performance of scientific research that results in publication (p. 15). According to the “dominant view, to be a scholar has primarily come to me being a researcher---and publication is the primary yardstick by which scholarly productivity is measured” (Boyer, 1990, p. 2). Scholars are perceived to be academics, conducting research and publishing papers, and then perhaps conveying their knowledge by sharing their knowledge with
students through teaching or by applying it in other social, clinical, commercial or other contexts (Boyer, 1990).

The category of research reflects only a portion of what constitutes the scholarly work performed and prioritized by faculty; so the term proposed by Boyer (1990), scholarship, is more indicative of the broad range of faculty activities. Boyer (1990) wrote: “we conclude that the work of the professoriate might be though of as having four separate, yet overlapping functions. These are: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application and the scholarship of teaching” (p. 16). Therefore, Boyer (1990) has clarified that research is included in the scholarly activities and priorities of faculty, but faculty priorities and activities are not limited to research. Further, Denzin and Lincoln (2000) have contextualized the powerful, negative political significance of the term, “research,” implicating it with the exploitive and hegemonic legacy of colonialism and imperialism (p. 1; Smith, 1999). Therefore, as appropriate, I have opted for the terms, scholarship, faculty work and/or faculty scholarship, rather than relying on the narrower and problematic term, research.

Concerning the output of faculty work, the result of research, scholarly work, or other form of scholarship activity, Koch (1998) uses the term, “research product” (p. 1183), and I believe this term is suited to broadly include the diverse forms of output from scholarly work that emerge in film and digital media. In this dissertation I interchangeably and synonymously use the terms: scholarship, faculty work, research product, or output to signify the result of scholarship activity by faculty.

Is it better to consider the process as an assessment rather than an evaluation, or vice versa? An etymological and epistemological quagmire, a potpourri of connotations and denotations, bubbles to the surface when one inquires about the words, assessment, evaluation,
review and their many cousins. There terms are used interchangeably, but the terms are not synonymous. Using many dictionaries, online and traditional, a composite definition of assessment is: *an estimation* of the *worth, value, or quality* of a person or thing. An evaluation is: *to ascertain or fix* the *value or worth of; to examine and judge carefully; to appraise.* Assessments are intended to estimate, while evaluations ascertain, fix, examine, appraise and judge carefully. Value and worth are consistent with assessment and evaluation, but any determination about quality has disappeared as we move from assessment to evaluation. As appraisal enters the fray, by way of evaluation, there is a nearly synonymous definition with assessment---the classification of someone or something with respect to its worth. *Worth* emerges singularly as the term that reaches across the terrain of performance evaluation terminology. Evaluations and assessments are searching to determine *worth.* If performance evaluations are also assessments or appraisals, or vice versa, the one term and concept that is consistent in all cases is that each process is a test to determine worth.

Is the process of evaluation or assessment similar to a test?---perhaps the whole process can borrow its meaning from the sciences and be called an acid test, which means a decisive or critical test for worth or quality; a rigorous and conclusive test to establish worth or value. Arguably, the performance evaluation is actually an acid test to determine worth, but some other terms illustrate ethical and philosophical concerns that could emerge during the gauntlet of any acid test in the field of film and digital media:

- Overvaluation - too high a value or price assigned to something, in comparison with something else
- Undervaluation- too low a value or price assigned to something, in comparison with something else
- Pricing - the evaluation of something in terms of its potentially-fluctuating market value
- Re-evaluation - the evaluation of something a second time (or more)

Defining the performance evaluation process as an acid test that intends to determine worth would be reasonably accurate and valid in the context higher education settings as it is currently and commonly being practiced, but there will certainly be some who might not accept such direct verbiage, so I might as well revert to the terms most commonly used---performance evaluation, performance assessment, or both---because they share the purpose of determining the worth of the work being considered.

Guskey (2000) shows that the concept of evaluation is subtly distinct from assessment, yet these two terms are commonly and interchangeably used without regard to nuanced distinctions. Guskey (2000) writes, “Evaluation is the systematic investigation of worth and merit,” implying a process that is “thoughtful, intentional and purposeful,” done for clear reasons (p. 41-42). Merit and worth imply appraisal of value and judgment about achievement, and evaluations, unlike assessments, are intended to determine the value and/or merit of something, according to standards of quality (Guskey, 2000). Guskey (2000) suggests that faculty evaluations should be designed to consider both evaluation and assessment, being based upon merit and value (Guskey, 2000).

Guskey (2000) argues that merit and value are not usually considered inherent in the conventional definition of assessment, and states, “no evaluation can be completely objective, the process is not based on opinion or conjecture…Instead, it (should be) based on the acquisition of specific, relevant and valid evidence examined through appropriate methods and techniques” (Guskey, 2000 p. 42). On the other hand, assessment is any of a variety of procedures used to obtain information, is impartial and does not involve any judgment about the
merit or worth (Linn and Gronlund, 1995, Guskey, 2000). This etymological detail might seem microscopic in scale, but terminological disregard represents a basic level of ignorance that seeps into the process of evaluating faculty scholarship. Assessment is not an evaluation, and vice versa. Further, are the standards being used for evaluation of faculty research relative or absolute? Are the standards and results of evaluation simply best estimates of value or merit as determined by peers, perhaps peers who share no common knowledge base with the work and subject area under review? Guskey (2000) also posits a view that research and evaluation have a great deal in common because “both involve systematic inquiry in order to gain new knowledge, and both terms infer quantitative and qualitative methodologies to address specific questions” (Guskey, 2000, p. 44).

It is not useful to use the terms quality, achievement or any other important terms in the abstract. To conduct meaningful analyses and make practical decisions, it is necessary to talk about achievement and quality in terms of something. Vague, ill-defined terms that underpin the application of irrelevant and narrowly conceived criteria are counter-productive and exacerbate many problems that threaten faculty careers and the institutional workplace environment. The use of accurate and relevant terms to define, describe and guide the process of review, assessment, or evaluation of the scope and nature of faculty work in film and digital media is a first step in the right direction. As discussed in this section, there are nuanced and significant etymological and epistemological differences in several key terms. This is a first problem that I discovered through reading and analysis of pertinent literature---deciding and understanding what are the best terms that most accurately the task and process of work being performed by faculty and evaluated in institutional settings---using terms that most closely and consistently describe the historical and philosophical vision and mission of my inquiry.
The word, work, is used in title and text because it provides an umbrella for the different types of faculty activities essential to the arts in higher education. This umbrella is necessary because definitions of such terms as creative activity, research, scholarship, teaching, and service can be either narrow or broad. For example, when broadly defined, research can include the process of making a work of art: a search for the new is involved. When more narrow definitions based on science or humanities methodologies are applied, making art is not research, although research of scientific or humanistic types may be involved in the total art-making process. The word, work, enables respect and use of both narrow and broad definitions as institutions, organizations, and individuals may determine in specific circumstances. Whether broad or narrow, my use of the term, work, always indicates an intense merging of thought, skill, and emotion.

2) Historical and contemporary perspectives about faculty work

How does an historical overview relate to a literature review and to my overall inquiry? I have relied upon scholarly literature to facilitate my understanding of what is constituted as conventional research and other forms of academic scholarship, and to critically examine the nature of performance evaluation of faculty research and scholarship from historical and contemporary perspectives. My intention is to understand what have been the historical priorities that have defined faculty work in higher education.

As described in Chapter 1, faculty members in higher education are expected to perform a trilogy of work---teaching, research and service. Research, whether qualitative or quantitative, is a very important area of responsibility and accountability for faculty in higher education. From an historical perspective, traditional and conventional expectations in research have
prioritized verifiability, discovery, measurability and a hierarchy of experts and facts. However, hegemony and primacy of traditional and conventional approaches to research are being challenged by the emergence of alternative methods and new forms of outcomes from scholarly work (Four Arrows, 2008). The challenges and possibilities posed by a critical reading of literature from historical and contemporary perspectives about scholarly work have informed and enabled my advocacy for the recognition of alternative methods and outcomes---as I have sought to address the research problem and research problem of this dissertation.

Boyer (1990) and many others have raised and debated some of the most important questions and issues that affect faculty careers in institutions of higher learning today. About twenty years have passed since Boyer (1990) and Rice (1990) developed groundbreaking theories that advocate change in faculty priorities and reform in educational institutions, but the challenges and questions they posed remain unresolved. Boyer (1990) proposed that faculty work consists of four distinct yet interrelated domains

- The scholarship of discovery
- The scholarship of application
- The scholarship of integration
- The scholarship of teaching through the sharing of knowledge

Rice (1991), like Boyer (1990), divides scholarly work into four components:

- The advantage of knowledge: original research
- The integration of knowledge: synthesizing and reintegrating knowledge, revealing new patterns of meaning, and new relationship between the parts and the whole.
- The application of knowledge: professional practice directly related to an individual’s scholarly specialization.
• The transformation of knowledge through teaching: including pedagogical content knowledge and discipline-specific educational theory.

Throughout this dissertation, the question of what is constituted as faculty work in the field of film and digital media is considered to inform a response to the subsequent question of recognizing and evaluating such work in a performance evaluation. These questions compel a review of Rice (1991) and Boyer (1990) as starting points, followed by study of the works of several other key scholars (Diamond, 1993, 1999; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002; Braxton, 2006; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997). Ultimately, my purpose is to discern a historical context while expressing the unique and diverse characteristics of faculty work in film and digital media, and to mold a conceptual model that reflects the values and language of this particular field.

In the past few years, in a few university settings, reforms have been envisioned and implemented, moving gradually toward acknowledgement of the breadth and diversity of faculty work in creative fields (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997; Diamond, 1993; Diamond, 1999). Data reflects such a change, and an implicit resistance to change, in the publications of academic institutions, for example, in faculty handbooks, university by-laws, mission statements, and other official institutional statements. It is not uncommon these days to find that a typical university faculty handbook will state a gumbo of expectations that implicitly draw from the four-part model of Boyer (1990) and/or Rice (1991), making statements that addresses the trilogy of expectations for teaching, research and service: for example…the University defines the term scholarly activity as: scholarship directed toward new discovery, investigations resulting in creative and artistic expressions, the evolution of
novel and more effective teaching methodologies and materials, and the integration and application of new methodologies in the profession. In Chapter 4 it is demonstrated that most faculty in the field of film and digital have no awareness at all of the new model of faculty scholarship that has been proposed by Boyer (1990), nor do they seem to have awareness of other theoretical bases for ontological change pertaining to performance evaluation of faculty work---despite their nearly unanimous recognition of the research problem in their institutional workplace.

A body of literature has emerged in response to Boyer (1990) and Rice (1991) that has critically examined issues relating to the research problem and the research question from historical and theoretical perspectives (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002; Braxton, 2006; Diamond, 1993; Diamond and Adam, 2000). This literature has facilitated contextualization and depth of understanding about contemporary issues that converge in the research problem and research question---the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media during performance evaluation.

The priorities and social issues confronting the academy in contemporary times, such as the problems and questions about the recognition and evaluation of faculty work as examined in this dissertation, are profoundly different than matters faced by the academy in the previous times. In earlier times, being scholarly and notions of “scholarship…referred to a variety of creative work carried on in various places, and its integrity was measured by the ability to think, communicate and learn” (Boyer, 1990, p. 15). Over the past few hundred years of higher education in the United States, research as a faculty activity “remained the exception rather than the rule. The principal mission at most of the nation’s colleges and universities continued to be
the education of undergraduates” (Boyer, 1990, p. 18-19). Boyer (1990) argues that the hegemony of the today’s prevailing paradigm, including the prioritization of scientific research methods and text-based publications, has not always been de rigueur for faculty scholarship.

From the late 1940s onward, knowledge in educational institutions came to be defined according to the values and conventions of a modernist, rational approach to science based on logical positivism and empiricism. As the twentieth century saw the development of visual culture through a succession of representational technologies—photography, narrative and documentary film, medical and scientific imaging, television, video, virtual realities, and so forth—“visuality” developed as a way to describe how seeing is culturally framed in technologies, communities, and institutions. Visuality is formed at the intersections of visual media, sensory perception, and power. Images are an important channel through which ideologies are remediated and onto which ideologies are projected (Sturken and Cartwright, 2001. p. 21). In the modernist perspective, knowledge is thought to consist of theoretically organized constructs and propositions, logically derived and empirically tested, that can explain and predict phenomena. Such knowledge is stable, cumulative, decontextualized, and generalizable. Throughout the post-WWII period and up to the present day, as discussed in Chapter 1, faculty members have been expected to successfully perform a traditional trilogy of work—scholarly research, teaching and in providing services to their school and community—and the trilogy of work continues strongly intact and prioritized at a majority of institutions of higher learning.

Moving through distinct and various historical “moments” in the era since World War II, the expectations of faculty work have skewed away from teaching and service, and moved toward the advancement of scientific research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 27; Boyer, 1990).
According to Boyer (1990) and others, scientific research and the publication of research papers have become prominent and prioritized in the current climate of higher education, and this has significantly influenced how faculty members allocate their time (Diamond, 1993). Success for a faculty member is largely based upon one’s productivity in scientific research and text-based publications, with a much smaller percentage of weight being allocated to performance in teaching and service (Boyer, 1990). Since World War II, as science and technology increasingly have become identified with progress and national interest(s), supported by massive and expanding grant funds from governmental and private sources, scientific research as a model for faculty work began:

- to spread exponentially and to colonize the academy as a whole…teaching became less well rewarded, and service---which had been once a proud tradition of extending knowledge beyond the campus---came to mean little more than being a good citizen, lending a hand when committee work need to be done (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997, p. viii, p. 7).

During this time period the prime focus of faculty in higher education changed from teaching and service to basic scientific research, and “from student to professor, from the general to the specialized, and from loyalty to campus to fealty to profession” (Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997, p. 8). Therefore, it continues to be important to ask, what is the meaning of research and how do institutions of higher learning define what constitutes research inquiry?

The conventional notion of research connotes an endeavor in which scholars “intentionally set out to enhance their understanding of a phenomenon and expect to communicate what they discover” (Leedy and Ormrod, 2005, p. 4). The traditional and conventional understanding is that “research must a) enhance the scientific community’s
understanding of a phenomenon, or contribute to the body of knowledge, and b) research must communicate what was discovered in the new study to the scientific community” (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Research and research inquiry---in both qualitative and in quantitative contexts---have long been focused upon positivism and the discovery of empirical truth. Truth has been defined, according to this empiricist-positivist epistemological perspective, as “the accurate representation of an independently existing reality” (Smith and Hodkinson, 2000, p. 412-413). Empiricism, drawing upon an Aristotelian philosophical perspective, is a theory of knowledge that claims its representations to be true, objective and accurate. Empiricism suggests that “objects and phenomena have essence or identity: they are things in their own right…also, essential phenomena are free from contradiction---they are either one thing or another” (Bleakley, 2004). The search for empirical truth is accomplished through the application of proper (recognized and accepted) procedural methods that presumably enable the knower to accurately and objectively convey a description of reality.

Positivism, as evidenced in quantitative and qualitative scientific research, perceives “a reality out there to be studied, captured and understood,” and is an approach that prioritizes the isolation, measurement and quantification of phenomenon, to allow for the verification and generalization of findings (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000 p. 14). From the positivist-empiricist perspective, the senses are mere conduits that allow for the entry of knowledge and ideas. As discussed in Chapter 4, aspects of positivistic-empirical methods of inquiry are consistent with the approach, scope and nature of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media. However, when compared with the “creative and interpretive” approach of qualitative research methods, including artistic and other creative works, the priorities and approach of positivist-empiricist, scientific, and quantitative research methods seem remote and
inferential, with the potential of silencing important voices that struggle to be heard (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p 16). Positivist values in qualitative research explicitly discourage ambiguity in the likeness of truth, and discourage any expressions of emotionality, personal responsibility; and de-emphasize an ethic of caring, praxis, multi-voiced perspectives, and creative dialogues (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 34). In academia, generally, scientism, positivism-empiricism and realist representations remain as the prevailing and dominant ontology, while the use of the personal/self as the primary source of data is skeptically considered to be (at best) a marginal alternative (Holt, 2003; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000).

Following Boyer (1990) in defining scholarship more broadly than the traditional view that emphasizes only discovery-based research inquiry, Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002) describe the parameters of scholarship as a continuum (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007, p. 90). One end of the continuum can be characterized by the traditional template, with the prioritization of scientific research, appearing in the form of publications in formal, peer-reviewed journals that are judged favorably or unfavorably as proper scholarship (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2007; Richin, 2001). On the opposite end of the continuum, far away from the expectations of the traditional template, Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2007) place unspecified “scholarly activities”, work that is performed by faculty members on a day-to-day basis, including activity that does not necessarily appear in text or other conventional forms at all (p. 90). Such work, action or performance “may be judged as scholarly if disciplinary knowledge and skill are used in performing this activity” (Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2007, p. 90).

The two extremes of the continuum as established by Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002), with the traditional template on one side and its comparable opposite, an alternative
view, on the other side, prompts a subsequent question: What is in the middle? Defining and describing the middle ground provides a useful referential context for deeper understanding of both extremes of the continuum. Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) suggest that:

Schulman and Hutching’s view (1998) on the essential characteristics of scholarship hold middle ground on this continuum. They outline three such characteristics: the work must be public, amenable to peer review, and in a form that allows for exchange and use by members of the academic community (p. 90).

Braxton, Luckey, and Helland (2002) further suggest that “unpublished publicly observable outcomes of scholarly activity within the four domains of scholarship, if in an appropriate form for exchange and peer review,” would meet the threshold for what constitutes the middle group of scholarship, but leave open the question of whether or not art and creative works, such as film and digital media productions, should be placed on the same continuum as conventional research scholarship. Most literature about faculty performance evaluation in higher education implicitly infers or implies that faculty scholars do not, should not or would not choose to deviate very far from expectations of the traditional and the conventional hierarchy in higher educational settings, and thereby makes implicitly discourages faculty scholars from the pursuit of artistic or other creative work as a form of scholarly work.

Advocacy for a more broad view of scholarship has been raised by many scholars, asserting the theoretical possibility that creative and alternative research output, including that which emerges in film and digital media, could possibly be more comprehensive in scope than conventional scholarship output, as it reaches beyond the domain of discovery to the domains of application, integration and/or public outreach/teaching (Boyer, 1990; Williams-Rautiola, 2001, Colbeck, 2006; Bukalski, 2000). Work in film and digital media can overtly demonstrate the
domains of application, teaching and integration---in addition to discovery. The idea that faculty work can discover, apply and/or integrate knowledge, ideally moving toward engagement with the public (audience), and that such research and output should be valued on its own particular and unique merits, not just on its adherence or resemblance to dominant, conventional requirements can be supported by Boyer and others (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1988; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997; NASAD, 1997; Bukalski, 1990). The idea that the sharing of knowledge through teaching, one of Boyer’s four domains, including scholarly teaching and the scholarship of teaching, can be inherently creative activities has been supported by many others (Postman, 1971; Friere, 1997; Friere, 1998; Palmer, 2007; Cajete, 1994; Jacobs, 2008).

Consistent with Boyer (1990), and opposed to the conventional view that the trilogy of categories factory work are separated and distinct activities, Diamond (1993c) describes the nature of faculty work, with resonance and particular relevance to the work of faculty in the field of film and digital media, as a process of “interrelated efforts” and “interrelated activities” that involve aspects of discovery, application, integration and the sharing of knowledge through teaching (p. 2). However, it is possible that interpretive preconceptions, biases, and other skewed attitudinal perceptions about the scholar’s or artist’s work, personal values, approach, qualities and other characteristics can become ambiguously merged with the evaluator’s expectations and judgments about faculty work and its degree of creativity, originality and scholarship---possibly explaining in part why faculty work in the field of film and digital media, and in many other fields and disciplines, can remain unrecognized as scholarly work, or least (or at best?) not allowed to pass without some controversy, debate or other form of resistance (Holt, 2003).
A critical approach to the reading of historical and theoretical literature has deepened my awareness of the significant shift in faculty and institutional priorities over time until the present day, characterized by a singular emphasis upon scientific research that is discontinuous with the trajectory of history in American higher education (Boyer, 1990; Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Further, I recognize that the approach of qualitative research inquiry has historical, antecedent origins, not formed without precedent or in isolation from other approaches (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Vidich and Lyman, 2000). Establishing an historical framework about research inquiry, scholarly work, scholarship and other related ways of knowing and doing by faculty is assuring and helpful as I move to define what should be recognized during a review of faculty performance; and as I try to build a broad and relevant body of knowledge that facilitates my ability to position myself and my scholarly efforts as I write in a scholarly and personalized way.
Part 3: Characteristics of a performance evaluation system in higher education

Part 3 is divided into four sections:

1) Determining the worth and merit of faculty work
2) Comparing the process of evaluation in student work and faculty work
3) Intrinsic motivation and the process of evaluation
4) A qualified committee

1) Determining the worth and merit of faculty work

It has been important and useful in previous sections of this chapter and throughout this dissertation to build a more inclusive meaning and informed understanding of what has constituted scholarship and scholarly activity by faculty over time; but the real issue ultimately revolves around how to fairly and meaningfully evaluate, assess, and reward new, alternative and innovative forms of scholarship and scholarly work in the future. The fractured history of qualitative and quantitative research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000), a legacy of conflicting priorities, paradigms, strategies, and methods has reified into a narrow, problematic, irrelevant and ambiguous set of criteria—a traditional template—that has little relevance to the research products that emerge from faculty work in the field of film and digital media (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). By narrowly defining and evaluating the scope and nature of research and its output under one umbrella, a one size fits all paradigm that has become skewed toward scientism and away from self, only serves to perpetuate the marginalization of alternative qualitative approaches to research inquiry such as the work by faculty in film and digital media, auto/ethnographic writing, and other approaches and works in fine arts—to mention only a few of us at the borders.

The argument that the products of faculty scholarship in teaching, research and service can emerge from more than positivist, quantitative, and discovery-based ontology that prioritizes
science and the scientific method, and can appear in different forms than just published monographs or refereed articles that report on discovery-based inquiries, has been advanced by Boyer and others (Boyer, 1990; Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff, 1997; Bukalski, 1990; Braxton, Luckey, and Helland, 2002; Collins, 2007; Four Arrows, 2008; Diamond, 1993, 1995; 1999). As described in the previous section, Boyer (1990) has been of significant help in broadening perceptions of scholarship and research, advocating for reasonable and relevant criteria to be used in assessing faculty scholarship in the field of film and digital media. Boyer (1990) wrote: “The time has come…to step back and reflect on the variety of functions academics are expected to perform” (p. 2). Boyer (1997) wrote: “the scope of scholarship should, I feel, be expanded, but the real problem we face is assessment,” within any of the domains other than discovery and in forms that are different from those mandated by the traditional template (p. 3). Boyer (1990) observes: “Good teaching is assumed, not rewarded…good teaching is expected, but it is often inadequately assessed. And the category of ‘service,’ while given token recognition by most colleges, is consistently underrated, too” (p. 28, 33).

Matusov and Hampel (2008) recognize that faculty colleagues will differ sharply about the processes, expectations and priorities of scholarship and its evaluation. Faculty might agree on the importance of high quality work, but they disagree on how to determine whether high quality has been achieved. The procedural model of Matusov and Hampel (2008) attempts to measure the caliber of scholarship by a set of specific criteria. Matusov and Hampel (2008) wrote: “some faculty members prefer what we call a ‘procedural model,’ others a judgment model” (p. 1), but they add and important observation:

…it is impossible to evaluate most colleagues’ work…too many specializations for any individual to determine accurately strong, weak, or mediocre research in the cases of all
candidates. We might hazard an opinion, but when a colleague’s future is on the line, everyone wants to set forth more than a guess. Is it not better to entrust the judgment of the quality of the candidate’s scholarship to external reviewers who are experts in the field (p. 2)?

Matusov and Hampel (2008) assert that committee members do not need to decide on their own whether a candidate’s work meets the official criteria and what these criteria mean for particular cases because well-crafted policies will do that. By prioritizing types of publications (for example, peer reviewed over non-peer reviewed), rating scholarly journals (for example, lower acceptance rates over higher rates), asking external reviewers to vote for or against promotion (and to justify the vote), and using other predetermined criteria to gauge the merits of the candidate’s scholarship, the faculty committee avoids the need to decide for itself if the work is good enough to merit promotion (Matusov and Hampel, 2008). Faculty meetings with discussion of the pros and cons of the dossier “are unnecessary because the criteria are elaborated in clear and detailed language, the promotion and tenure process is objective, fair, impersonal, and readily defended should anyone grieve or sue” (Matusov and Hampel, 2008, p. 1).

The judgment model of Matusov and Hampel (2008), in stark contrast to their procedural model, obligates the faculty to discuss and evaluate the quality of the scholarship under review. Even if a promotion and tenure committee prepares a recommendation, each faculty member independently confirms or refutes the prior appraisal. Although external reviewers can provide very good assessments of the scholarship’s quality and thus inform the department’s decision, their judgments alone are not enough (Matusov and Hampel, 2008). Matusov and Hampel (2008) indicate there are several well-known reasons for caution, warning that some external reviewers
are too generous in their assessments in order to nurture their own field, especially when that field is small; and some external reviewers are too tough because they want to guard a field that is very competitive. Moreover, many candidates can nominate external reviewers who they know will send glowing letters (Matusov and Hampel, 2008).

Matusov and Hampel (2008) indicate their preference for the judgment model, but the two models, procedural and judgment, represent two positions or approaches to evaluation that differ significantly, but sharing important points of overlap. In the procedural model, the exercise of individual judgment is considered a flaw in the process of promotion and tenure practice, inviting arbitrariness; while in the judgment model such exercise is welcomed as constructive. In the procedural model, judgment is subordinated to rules, even if judgment was required in the past to create the procedures; in the judgment model, rules exist only to facilitate judgment. Matusov and Hampel (2008) add:

Procedures, rules, and standards can work very well to evaluate recursive, well-defined, and stable cases and events. However, evaluating out-of-the-ordinary, ill-defined, and nonrecursive cases and events requires judgment. We argue that scholarship demanding originality, creativity, and innovation is exactly this kind of out-of-the-ordinary case (p. 3).

Chapter 5 concludes whether the judgment or the procedural model, or a combination of both, would be most effective for the evaluation of work in the field of film and digital media.

Echoing the judgment model of Matusov and Hampel (2008) and prioritizing inclusion of faculty members in the process of recognition and evaluation, the AAUP recommends that faculty members be given the opportunity to comment and respond to evaluations that emerge from the process, opening the healthy yet potentially thorny possibility for an appeals procedure.
by which faculty may challenge decisions from the process of evaluation (Euben, 2005). To achieve the goal of an appeals process, and presumably to mitigate the risk of inherently inappropriate processes, Euben (2005) suggests that post-tenure-review policies should be developed and implemented by faculty members, and resources should be allocated to support the professional development of faculty under such policies. Euben (2005) also suggests and reminds that successful post-tenure-review policies should also reaffirm an institution’s commitment to academic freedom, tenure, and due process and serves to educate participants, including department chairs and deans. Chapter 5 provides a conclusion about the recognition and evaluation of faculty work based upon a theoretical and ethical model that prioritizes inclusion of faculty in all aspects of the process of performance review, and a coherent process of appeal in the case of negative decisions.

There is no consensus view in the literature that exists on the procedural or the judgment model (Matusov and Hampel, 2008), or any other aspect of this topic. Conventional expectations for the output of faculty work in text form require that output (manuscripts) adhere to the guidelines for ethics and content of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2001). But, the APA (2001) criteria for evaluating the ethics and content of manuscripts are oriented toward quantitative and very conservative notions of qualitative research (Holt, 2003). For example, guidelines include: “Is the research question significant, and is the work original and important? Does the research design fully and unambiguously test the hypothesis? Is the research at an advanced enough stage to make the publication of results meaningful” (APA, 2001, p 9)? Advice and direction for evaluating qualitative output extends to assessment of the quality of analyses, trustworthiness, and evidence about the saturation of data. In other words, there are very detailed and thorough criteria that are explicitly expected to be satisfied when a
faculty scholar produces conventional forms of scholarship for evaluation in academic settings, but are these kinds of criteria appropriate or relevant for evaluating creative scholarship, such as faculty work in film and digital media?

Much of the literature about performance evaluation, prior to the 1980s, is quantitative in method and positivist in approach---searching for empirical truth, with a central focus on developing psychometrically accurate rating scales that quantify input-feedback data. This kind of research does not contribute significantly to remediation of the problems under review, nor does resonate with my personal sense and perception about the complex nature of faculty performance evaluation practices that are in use today in higher education. The quantitative data from the 1980s certainly does not console my aching sense that something has been going terribly wrong in the evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media. La Pelle (1997) writes: “Many studies on performance evaluation look only at the immediate effects…participants’ satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and perceptions of objectivity rather than at its longer impact on performance, motivation, and development” (p. 4).

Quantitative measures of faculty work might eliminate much of the subjectivity that could creep into the actual process of evaluation---but it must be asked if the use of hard, cold quantitative solutions exacerbates ethical and practical concerns? Worthen and Sanders (1989) suggest that the success of a performance evaluation system entirely depends on a workplace climate that is ethical, conducive and supportive of self-determination, one that honors competence in individual performance within the group setting. Quantitative or not, what matters to Worthen and Sanders (1989) are the ethical concerns that underpin the workplace and process of evaluation. Worthen and Sanders (1989) have delineated the ethical and practical aspects relating to the role of evaluators in the performance evaluation process, and observe that
an ethical framework should guide the evaluator during an evaluation process. Worthen and Sanders (1989) list twelve areas of concern:

- Evaluators are interested in solving practical problems.
- Evaluation typically leads to decisions.
- Evaluation describes a particular thing in a unique context.
- Evaluation seeks to determine merit or worth.
- Evaluation is generally undertaken at the request of a client (question: who is the client, the university administration or faculty applicant?)
- Evaluation attempts to assess the value of a thing.
- Evaluation focuses on phenomena that are specific to that time, place and context.
- Evaluation is judged by its accuracy, credibility, utility, feasibility and propriety (i.e. it is done legally and ethically, protecting the rights of the individuals involved).
- Evaluation is generally conducted for a well-defined audience or client group (university administration and a faculty applicant).
- Evaluation is typically time-bound, with specific times established up front for start-up, duration and completion.
- Evaluation, on the other hand, requires the use of a wide range of inquiry perspectives and techniques in order to answer specific questions or to address particular problems.
- Evaluators require an interdisciplinary education in order to be sensitive to the wide range of phenomena to which they must attend.

Additional ethical concerns about the performance evaluation process are discussed in Chapter 4, emerging from data collected through surveys and interviews with project participants.
Departing from the two-part model of Matusov and Hampel (2008), and as discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, Diamond (1993) provides a generalized structural framework for implementation in institutional tenure and reward systems, with four basic and essential attributes, aiming to facilitate fair and informed evaluation of faculty work:

- The first attribute of an assessment system for tenure and promotion is for it to correspond, be aligned and be compatible with the mission statement of the college or university (Diamond, 1993a; 1999). Diamond (1993a; 1999) advocates for the importance of a mission statement at departmental, college and university levels. Subsequently, a body of literature has been published that advocates for the importance of mission statements (Meacham, 2008; Diamond and Adam, 2000; Berger, 2008; Douglas and George, 2008).

- Assessment systems for tenure and promotion must be sensitive to the differences among academic disciplines (Diamond, 1993a; 1999). As discussed in Chapter 4 I have collected data about perceptions by faculty at colleges and universities in relation to the institutional sensitivity and response to differences in research output among different academic disciplines, on the basis of their submitted creative work(s) in film or digital media production. In this context, Diamond (1993a; 1999) recommends that each academic unit (department, college), not only the centralized upper administrative authority, should establish their own specific criteria for tenure and promotion, and the range of activities judged to be relevant and appropriate for rewards. Related to this issue, Diamond (1993a; 1999) argues that it is not appropriate for committee members from disparate disciplines to apply criteria and scholarship assessment procedures used in
their academic discipline to faculty candidates for tenure and promotion from other academic disciplines.

- Assessment systems must be perceived as appropriate, fair and workable (Diamond, 1993a; 1999).
- The assessment system must be sensitive to standards established by regional, state and disciplinary accreditation associations (Diamond, 1993a; 1999). Diamond (1993b) argues that a proactive approach by accreditation agencies to provide guidelines for the development of evaluation criteria is “a positive force in relating individual efforts to institutional priorities” (p.10-11).

Diamond (1993a; 1993b) argues that tenure and promotion systems have failed to exhibit the above-listed attributes. It is noteworthy that Diamond (1993b, 1995, 1999) has consistently used the term, assessment, rather than evaluation. By definition, as discussed in the opening pages of this section, these are two distinct terms, with worth, and to a lesser degree, merit, being the most common denominators. Chapter 4 illustrates the importance of a clear distinction and understanding being shared and known by all parties, in advance of the performance evaluation.

Beyond the prevailing trilogy and traditional template in higher education, several alternative models for the recognition and evaluation of scholarly work have been developed, although none are directly pertaining to the work of faculty in the field of film and digital media. Williams-Rautiola (2001) analyzes general yet important considerations for the evaluation process of creative work, all of which are relevant to the field of film and digital media, including blind peer-review, the value of dissemination, and suggestions for a candidate’s dossier for evaluation. Williams-Rautiola (2001) has facilitated greater understanding of the intellectual foundation of creative work, but her paper is not a full analysis of the problem; but her brief
paper provides a specific and noteworthy context that has helped to frame a significant aspect of my own research. Bukalski’s (2000) account, published and distributed by the University Film and Video Association (UFVA) is a useful overview that considers many important aspects that clarify the process of entire production process and what should be recognized and submitted as evidence of faculty scholarship in film and video, but his recommendations are not contextualized in terms of the historical resistance to change that is evidenced in conventional settings.

Casting my net a little wider net as I searched the literature, from a more general perspective, one not directly addressing the problem facing faculty in film and digital media but pertinent nonetheless, Diamond (1993) posits six criteria that relate specifically to the recognition of faculty work as scholarship that have been applied at institutions of higher learning in promotion and tenure evaluations:

- The faculty member’s work exhibits and high level of discipline-based expertise
- The faculty member’s work breaks new ground or is innovative
- The faculty member’s work can be reviewed by peers
- The faculty member’s work can be replicated or elaborated upon by others
- The faculty member’s work can be documented
- The faculty member’s work is significant or has impact

From another perspective, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) offer six common-sense criteria to be used for defining and assessing the quality of scholarship in the four domains:

- Goals. The faculty member’s research must demonstrate clear goals
- Preparation. The faculty member’s research must demonstrate adequate preparation
• Methods. The faculty member’s research must choose, apply and judiciously modify (when required) appropriate methods.

• Results. The faculty member’s research should be judged on the basis of its significant results.

• Presentation. The faculty member’s research is effective in its presentation.

• Critique. The faculty member’s research must involve reflective critique.

In contrast, Schulman and Hutching (1998) have developed a model for defining the scope and nature of scholarship activity by faculty:

• The work must be public.

• The work must be subject to peer review.

• The work must be in a form that allows for exchange and use by members of the academic community.

The essential characteristics of a performance evaluation process and system as articulated by Diamond (1993a; 1999); Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997); and Schulman and Hutching (1998) are applicable to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, as described in the findings of Chapter 4 and the conclusion in Chapter 5. Although Chapter 5 details the conclusions of this study, it is clear that faculty work in the field of film and digital media can emerge from traditional and conventional methods, all six criteria by Schulman and Hutching (1998), all six by Diamond (1993a;), and all six by Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997). Each of these models and the points therein are reasonably relevant and applicable for defining and evaluating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. However, the data from participants who were surveyed for this
project (Chapter 4) has clarified that the six criteria set forth by Schulman and Hutching (1998), Diamond (1993) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) might not be all-inclusive or entirely sufficient for the specific purposes of performance evaluation of artistic, creative scholarly, and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, and therefore might not the definitive indicators for achieving the ultimate purposes of this dissertation. There is great value and relevance in the criteria set forth by Diamond (1993), and in the criteria of Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997), particularly when placed in relation to creative research output in film and digital media, and I observe that some of the criteria by Diamond (1993) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) fit relatively well with Boyer’s (1990) domains of scholarship (discovery, application, integration and teaching). This literature provides a strong challenge to the traditional template’s mandate for only text-based publications. However, as described in Chapter 4, the data I have collected during my inquiry identifies important and additional points of concern and relevance that are particular to faculty scholarship in the field of film and digital media.

2) Comparing the process of evaluation in student work and faculty work

Consideration of literature pertaining to the evaluation by teachers of student work and learning facilitates my ability to compare connections that can be made with the evaluation of teacher work (and learning?) in higher education----why is faculty scholarship and professional work in higher education settings, specifically in the field of film and digital media, not given the same level of diligent consideration as is applied to student work(s)? Why is faculty work in film and digital media not evaluated or assessed with the same use of written, quantitative
measurement tools, and why is there an exclusive reliance upon subjective and unwritten criteria for this form of scholarship and professional work?

Analysis of literature pertaining to the evaluation of student work and learning by teachers has facilitated meaningful comparisons with evaluation of faculty performance and work in higher education. This literature sheds glaring light on the discrepancies in assessment or evaluation practices at K-12 and college student levels with standards applied in faculty performance evaluations (Airasian, 1979; Kubiszyn and Borich, 1993; Nitko, 1983). The discrepancy of student models in contrast to those models for performance evaluation of faculty highlights the ambiguous, unwritten or irrelevant criteria that are applied in higher education settings during the process of faculty performance evaluation. For example, outcomes based learning and assessment models are explicitly demanded in K-12 classes and in college classroom settings, yet outcomes-based assessment models are largely absent from performance evaluation criteria for faculty in film and digital media. Much effort is made to construct and use diagnostic tools for assessment of student learning and growth, yet the same level of effort is not made for the evaluation of faculty performance.

Drawing from literature about teaching and academic efficacy in the classroom, I find useful and comparable arguments for an effective, more useful and informed assessment process, where assessment involves a two-way communication system of feedback, and include alternative strategies such as observation, personal communication, and student performances, demonstrations and portfolios (Dorman, Fisher and Waldrip, 2006; Stiggins, 1994). Barksdale-Ladd and Thomas (2000) argue that the conceptualization of assessment is an important part of a student’s work, encouraging teachers to use more than a measuring stick to assess learning, ultimately ensuring that assessment informs instruction to help teachers to improve their own
practice and understanding, while also facilitating greater learning for students (Barksdale-Ladd and Thomas, 2000; Dorman, Fisher and Waldrip, 2006). Paradoxically, as teachers are being bombarded with information, theories, admonitions and decisions about best practices and what should be done in the classroom regarding assessment of student performance, an overwhelming majority of administrative systems in higher education do not apply the same ideals, theories, and innovative thinking to existing processes for faculty performance evaluation. What might be deemed as good for the teacher and the student in the classroom is apparently not good or relevant for the assessment or evaluation of teacher/faculty work? The contradiction is indicative of the problem of evaluation that is facing faculty members. Administrative systems for evaluating faculty performance remain inconsistent, prescriptive, and upheld against a backdrop that excludes faculty from the assessment/evaluation process and discourage self-reflection, professional development and creativity.

Some argue that the evaluation process is improved and simplified by a more straightforward approach, using bibliometric indicators, because the greater the variety of measures and qualitative processes used to evaluate research, the greater the likelihood that a composite measure offers a reliable understanding of the knowledge produced (Lim, 2006). But, should the evaluation process be reduced to the impartial itemized tabulation of results on a scorecard or checklist, with objectivity valued over subjectivity, quantity valued over quality? If so, then to what extent does the process of faculty evaluation relate to the improvement of faculty performance in any category, if at all (Seldin, 2006)?

Wait and Hope (2009) present a number of typical student achievement goals and provide the kind of indicators or evidence that are available to evaluate these goals. These come from an April 1990 briefing paper of the Council of Arts Accrediting Associations of which NASAD is a
member. It is useful for academic administrators and faculty to understand the notion of reciprocity---what is good for students should also be good for faculty---in the context of evaluation of work. I provide Wait and Hope’s (2009) list to illustrate what they have indicated that might be missing and/or useful in the process of performance evaluation of faculty work.

Student Achievement Goals – Indicators/ Evidence Analysis

Competence in basic arts techniques

• Entrance, continuation and graduation requirements
• Achievement tests
• Course evaluations
• Class or laboratory examinations

Basic understanding of the history of the art form in Western and other civilizations

• Course requirements
• Syllabus content
• Class examinations

Basic general education at the college level, including the ability to understand distinctions and commonalities regarding work in artistic, scientific, and humanistic domains

• Transcript analysis
• Curricular requirements
• Syllabus review
• Achievement tests
• Class and laboratory examinations

Entry-level competence in the major field of study
• Juried examinations

• Placement records

Ability to enter graduate study in the major field

• Graduate school acceptances

• Records of completion of graduate work

A coherent set of artistic/intellectual goals evident in each student’s work and the ability to achieve these goals as an independent professional

• Assessment of student projects

• Content of final projects

• Faculty and peer assessment of final projects

Ability to form and defend defined judgments

• Project assessments

• Master class evaluations

Ability to communicate in spoken and written language

• Syllabus review

• Project assessments

Ability to communicate ideas in a specific art form in professional circumstances

• Internship reports

• Employee ratings of performance

• Employment records

As I have analyzed the research problem and question, it becomes clear that much of much of the principles and goals that are in place for student evaluation are relevant to faculty performance.

The means to improve the quality evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional activity in all
specializations of the arts, including the field of film and digital media, are in place but in need of change and improvement.

3) Intrinsic motivation and the process of evaluation

Published statements from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) suggest that evaluation systems are best directed toward constructive measures for improvement (Euben, 2005), and that taking some basic steps can reduce the likelihood of litigation. Based upon an assumption that organizations would logically want to cultivate a climate that continually motivates high-performing employees, Deming (1986) advocated that conventional processes of performance evaluation in organizations should be eliminated and “replaced with group unit or plant-level performance evaluations and noncompetitive developmental coaching for individuals oriented to improving skills, performance, teamwork and motivation” (La Pelle, 1997, p. 2). Franke (2000), drawing from a joint report by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and United Educators 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. 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 (p. 5)

Franke (2000; 2001) suggests that after the institution has denied tenure to a candidate, help should be provided to assist the individual to move on with his or her career. Franke (2000) further recommends that the faculty member should seek advice from the AAUP staff who may give useful perspective to candidates that did not succeed in a performance evaluation for tenure, promotion, or other institutional benefit.

La Pelle (1997), in support of the work of Deming (1986), argues that “performance appraisal processes in organizations, rather than improving performance, teamwork, and motivation, sometimes have a harmful effect and serve to de-motivate high-performing and highly motivated individuals” (La Pelle, 1997, p. ii). La Pelle (1997) and Deming (1986) were relevant and inspirational at first reading, and in direct contrast to my decreasing levels of motivation and enthusiasm about my own job (as the promotion process turned into a quagmire of inconsistencies). Of particular relevance and interest to this dissertation is La Pelle’s (1997) advocacy for cultivating an environment in organizations that is “thriving on evaluation” (in contrast to one where one striving for evaluation) with the goal of achieving a process that continually motivates high-performing employees (La Pelle, 1997, p. ii). Performance evaluation is a complex and multi-faceted process, one of the most frequently studied topics in organizational sciences for years, but the majority of research writing on this topic, particularly in the field of education, has not reflected this multi-faceted nature (La Pelle, 1997).

According to La Pelle (1997) motivation in the workplace, consistent improvement in work performance, and consistent commitment to the workplace by highly motivated persons (in this case, employees of an organization) is more likely to be enhanced by performance evaluation when the following conditions exist:
• The organization is at the beginning to middle of its life cycle

• The organization’s purpose for evaluation approaches an ideal and the supervisor does not have any hidden agenda of his or her own

• The supervisor is perceived by the supervisee to be qualified to give specific behavioral feedback, has good communication and coaching skills, and is autonomy supportive

• The supervisor encourages collaborative work design and goal-setting

• The supervisor can adapt her or his supervision style to meet the situational needs of the supervisee

• The Supervisor provides ongoing, behaviorally specific evaluative feedback outside the context of a formal review process

• The performance evaluation is perceived to be an extension of ongoing feedback and a more personal time of reflection, celebration, career counseling, and discussion of new skill development and work challenges.

The second part of LaPelle’s theory (1997) (Striving with Performance Evaluation) suggests that work motivation, performance, and commitment are more likely to be decreased by performance evaluation for highly motivated individuals when:

• The organization is experiencing the need to restructure significantly

• The organization does not have a consistent and endorsed management system

• The supervisor is not perceived by the supervisee to be qualified to give specific behavioral feedback or is not really the decision-maker

• The supervisor sets up the work so that it is not autonomy supportive or has unclear or unachievable goals
• The supervisor does not provide ongoing, behaviorally specific, competency-enhancing evaluative feedback outside the context of a formal review process
• The formal evaluation is perceived as impersonal, critical, or content-free or as entirely driven by issues related to monetary rewards.

4) A qualified committee

Data in Chapter 4 addresses the issue of committee membership and the qualification of evaluators when tasked to consider faculty activities outside of their specialized knowledge. In the literature, Diamond (1993; 1995; 1999) has addressed this question and has articulated his concerns about the qualification and composition of performance evaluation committees who are tasked work that is outside of their areas of expertise. Diamond (1993) argues that performance evaluation committee members and administrators should be more adequately familiarized with the unique and specific scope and nature of the work in film and digital media under evaluation, and entirely set aside all preconceived, reductive, and deterministic notions about scholarly research, faculty priorities, and faculty performance that prejudicially disallow artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media from being considered, recognized and rewarded as forms of faculty scholarship (Bukalski, 2000; Diamond 1993, 1995, 1999).
Part 4: Recognition of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media

Part 4 is divided into four sections:

1) Faculty priorities within each domain are unique
2) Personal leadership
3) Creativity and faculty work in film and digital media
4) The non-teachable nature of creativity and art

As described in earlier sections of this chapter, there are a plethora of prescriptive and proscriptive solutions that address the question of evaluation in general terms, but scant few are directly addressing the specific problems that relate to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media. Those faculty who are doing artistic works in film and digital media, or those producing written works that are personalized or auto/ethnographic in approach, are guided by inherently different motivations and self-directed criteria than peers aligned with conventional and traditional methods, and therefore should be recognized and evaluated with criteria that are relevant to the specific nature of the work itself rather than generic, one size fits all terms (Diamond, 1993, Diamond and Adam, 2000). Chapters 3 and 4 describe the broad scope and nature of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, arguing that it can be considered as reasonably consistent and consonant in many ways with conventional and traditional forms of scholarly work; and Chapter 5 argues that faculty work in film and digital media is unmistakably distinct from conventional forms as delineated by the traditional template because of its inherently personalized and expressive nature, in comparison with traditional and conventional forms.
1) Faculty priorities within each domain are unique

*Remember that unique means ‘one’* (Jamison, 1984).

As I have proceeded over time to build a meaningful understanding of qualitative research and the panoramic range of scholarship activities by faculty members, I have been reminded that faculty priorities are unique within each disciplinary domain and field of knowledge (Diamond, 1993a; 1993b; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007). What is common and expected within one discipline cannot necessarily or interchangeably be expected in another. Conventional notions about what constitutes research inquiry or its products are not relevant or applicable to the work of many faculty members in various fields of scholarship, including those in the field of film and digital media.

Diamond (1993) and others have argued that research and professional practices vary greatly from discipline to discipline, and the recognition of differences in scholarship must be considered (Lim, 2000; Bukalski, 2000). Scholarship in the field of film and digital media progresses from thoughtful (self-) reflection to the systematic effort of building knowledge and skills, to the developmental process of visualizing and realizing the creative idea through cinematography, scriptwriting and other means; to the creative and technical processes of editing where the raw materials get formed into a cohesive whole that gets disseminated as a completed work; to raising money for the work to be realized and of benefit to audiences and in any number of ways to the academic discipline (Bukalski, 2000). Unfortunately, understanding and sensitivity of nuanced differences from discipline to discipline is not in evidence in practice when faculty performance is evaluated and judged according to the guidelines of the traditional template. One size fits all is the norm in most cases of scholarship evaluation. An understanding
of the similarities and differences of creative research with conventional research must be reconciled with an acceptance that change and a plan for fair and proper assessment must emerge and be implemented so that all dimensions of academic work, not just to conventional forms of research, should be recognized, valued and rewarded by the academy (Boyer, 1990; Colbeck, 2006).

The uniqueness of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media outweighs its similarities with conventional and traditional expectations of faculty work, and this justifies the development of particular and relevant criteria for its recognition and evaluation in higher education settings. Tomasulo (2008) describes measurable (quantifiable) outcomes and results in the evaluation of work in film and digital media, as well as “the means by which to evaluate artistic qualities such as talent; beauty; and good screenwriting, cinematography, directing, acting, editing, sound and set design” (p. 115). Ultimately, according to Tomasulo (2008, p.116), the entire film faculty at Florida State reached agreement upon a 22-point criteria for measuring and assessing student works in film, including:

- Originality of premise
- Clarity of narrative
- Character development
- Dialogue
- Storytelling technique
- Shot design
- Acting performances
- Pacing
- Tone
- Shot composition
- Lighting
- Focus
• Editing for geography and space
• Conveying information
• Production design scheme
• Wardrobe, hair and makeup
• Set design
• Special effects
• Sound design
• Dialogue recording
• Music
• Sound mix (dialogue, music, sound effects)

Tomasulo (2008) provides an additional list of 54 learning outcomes by discipline, created by the faculty of the Florida State University film school (Appendix x). FSU developed a 1.0-10.0 Likert scale that was used for evaluating each of the key areas of filmmaking, on the basis of the 22-point criteria above-listed (Tomasulo, 2008, p. 116). According to Tomasulo (2008), the benefits of establishing written criteria that are specific to work activities in film and digital media went beyond compliance with accreditation or other administrative concerns, and the use of quantitative data was found to be useful for students as they were given formative and summative feedback from the evaluation; plus quantitative data helped the department to identify, through low ratings, any deficient areas in need of improvement (or conversely, efficient areas through high ratings) within the departmental program such as teaching, facilities and others (Tomasulo, 2008).

On the negative side, Tomasulo (2008) acknowledges the risk of subjectivity in measuring works in film, and his ambivalence for “one size fits all measurements” such as the one adopted by his department (Tomasulo, 2008, p. 115). Aside from the obvious concern about
subjectivity as teacher-faculty evaluate and make a determination about grades based upon Tomosulo’s (2008) template, I am concerned that Tomosulo’s (2008) template for measuring student films seems to be solely applicable to narrative, dramatic filmmaking, with a possible lack of relevance to alternative approaches that faculty filmmakers might employ in documentary, ethnographic, artistic-experimental, industrial and other stylistic genres of creative scholarship and professional work.

For the sake of comparison, Richardson (2000, pp. 15-16) describes five factors that include analysis of both evaluative and constructive validity techniques that can be used when reviewing personal narrative papers, with relevance to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media. The five criteria are:

- **Substantive contribution.** Does the piece contribute to our understanding of social life?
- **Authentic merit.** Does the piece succeed aesthetically? Is the text artistically shaped, satisfyingly complex, and not boring?
- **Reflexivity.** How did the author come to write this text? How has the author’s subjectivity been both a producer and a productive of this text?
- **Impactfulness.** Does this piece affect me emotionally and/or intellectually? Does it generate new questions or move me to action?
- **Expresses a reality.** Does this text embody a fleshed out sense of live experience?

Richardson’s (2002) criteria provide constructive guidance to evaluators and feedback to the faculty scholar, and are a contextual starting point for building an evaluative framework to be used for performance evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media.
In the context of ethnographic writing, but relevant to the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, Van Maanen (1988, p xi) lists four central elements that can be used to form an initial framework for describing and recognizing (and evaluating) whether or not a personalized approach in scholarly inquiry can be considered as a form of scholarly work:

- Is there an assumed relationship between culture and behavior (the observed)?
- Is there a reflection of experiences by the fieldworker (the observer)?
- Is there a representational style of writing that joins the observer and the observed (the tale)?
- Is the role of the reader engaged in the active reconstruction of the tale (the audience)?

Van Maanen (1988) argues that conventional demands and standards for the reliability and validity of conventional ethnographies are overrated, unreliable, and misleading—and the same argument can be made in reference to work in the field of film and digital media. Although Van Maanen (1988) argues for the importance of theoretical and domain specialization of the sort that presupposes historical knowledge, linguistic competence, and deep personal experience, he also argues that significant priority should be focused upon jargon-free readability, authenticity, verisimilitude, and a very high level of cultural expertise and sophistication. The same argument can be made in reference to work in the field of film and digital media. Van Maanen (1988) justifies his argument(s) about readability, accessibility and the rest by writing: “since those who read ethnography for pleasure and general knowledge are as able to judge whether they (the combined goals of readability and specialized knowledge) are achieved as those who read for professional development” (p. 33). The same observation can apply in the field of film and
digital media because audience members who view, appreciate and perhaps evaluate a work in film or digital media may or may not be professional practitioners.

Bukalski (2000) introduces the problems of evaluating creative activity by faculty in film and digital media, but there are no theoretical connections that are established with Boyer (1990), nor with other theoretical arguments for institutional change. As described in Chapter 4, there is a large majority of faculty in the field of film and digital media that are not familiarized with the theoretical groundwork of Boyer (1990) and others (Rice, 1988), and this dissertation is an attempt to integrate their theoretical perspectives with the practical work of Bukalski (1990). Bukalski (1990) does provide a very useful framework for systematically understanding how a film is developed, produced and disseminated, and this approach has greatly influenced my in depth analysis in search of a theoretical solution to the problem posed in Chapter 4 and in the recommendations of Chapter 5 of this dissertation.

2) Personal leadership

Although the work of making a film or digital media project is collaborative, the notion of personal leadership is fundamental to filmmaking. In creative scholarship and professional work by filmmakers, as in action research, the work is collaborative, though it is important to realize that the action research of a group is achieved through the critically examined action of the individual group members (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1982). Filmmakers work in teams or crews, under the direction of a client, producer, or other sole person with creative, technical or financial powers or control; but the final responsibility for the realization of any detail of work throughout the process rests with the individual who is doing a particular task. Borrowing from
theoretical literature about leadership, and applying it to the experience of being a filmmaker, Gemmill and Oakley (2001) write:

While leadership is viewed as having a positive connotation, we suggest that contrariwise it is a serious sign of social pathology, that it is a special case of an iatrogenic (as in a disease that is induced by the treatment) social myth that induces massive learned helplessness among members of a social system. As social despair and helplessness deepen, the search and wish for a messiah (leader) or magical rescue (leadership) also begins to accelerate. We argue that the current popular writings and theories of leadership clearly reflect this social trend” (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001, p. 273).

Gemmill and Oakley (2001) remind me that the process of filmmaking is a lonesome highway where the buck stops with me (the filmmaker), and of the palpable connection between practice, pain and learning; a distinct practical and theoretical relationship between personal responsibility, personal leadership and self-empowerment. Gemmill and Oakley (2001) continue:

When pain is coupled with an inordinate, widespread, and pervasive sense of helplessness, social myths about the need emerges for great leaders and magical leadership, from the primarily unconscious collective feeling that it would take a miracle or messiah to alleviate or ameliorate this painful form of existence (Gemmill and Oakley, 2001, p. 273).

Chapter 4 provides a detailed discussion about the process of work in the field of film and digital media, demonstrating that the collaborative nature of the filmmaking practice is actually reliant upon a creative, technical, business and legal meeting of minds by self-reliant individuals.
Chapter 5 proposes a theoretical model for recognizing and evaluating the scope and nature of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, considering the approach, unique values and processes, and the results of the work.
3) Creativity and faculty work in film and digital media

As discussed in Chapter 1, creativity is an important thematic aspect that underpins a discussion of alternatives to the traditional and conventional paradigm of expectations about faculty work, and in characterizing faculty work in the field of film and digital media. An overview of the relevant literature and program activity pertaining to creativity consists, at least in the English-language, of at least the following sources:

- There are two major journals devoted exclusively to creativity research and theory (Creativity Research Journal and Journal of Creative Behavior).
- There are many other psychological and educational journals that provide reports about creativity research as a major component of each issue (e.g. Empirical Studies of the Arts; Imagination, Cognition, and Personality; Metaphor and Symbolic Activity; Gifted Child Quarterly; Roeper Review).
- Many journals not primarily devoted to creativity research frequently include reports of creativity research (e.g. Review of General Psychology; American Psychologist; Journal of Personality and Social Psychology).
- There is a division of the American Psychological Association devoted to creativity (Division 10, Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts) that also publishes a journal that features creativity research, the Bulletin of Psychology and the Arts.
- There are scores upon scores of books about creativity, including theoretical research about creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975; 1990; 1997), that are published in English each year, and in many other languages, from a multitude of perspectives---business, leadership, arts and design, personal development, psychology, education in the classroom, and many more.
• Creativity research is a major topic at many psychology and education conferences every year, and in professional development contexts for businesspersons, organizational leaders and other contexts.

An analysis of what is creativity and what is creative research, in contrast to conventional research and expectations, is another important aspect of this dissertation. There are many nuances and personal differences in the varied definitions and descriptions of creativity. Generally, there are two concepts that frame our common understanding about creativity (Sawyer, 2006), including:

• **Originality**, something (an idea or thing) that has not been done before. The creative idea or thing should not be an obvious extension of something that already exists.

• **Functionality**, something (an idea or thing) that “has to work, or be adaptive or be functional in some way or for some purpose…it has to meet some general criteria of usefulness” ([http://www.apa.org/monitor/nov03/creativity.html](http://www.apa.org/monitor/nov03/creativity.html)).

A range of literature about creativity emphasizes the importance of unique insight, relating or combining seemingly remote, contradictory or irrational ideas in recognizable and useful ways. The creative idea and its outcome must be different but also have value and be useful (Gorkin, 1985). In the USA, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD, 1997) has articulated its philosophy concerning art and design as a profession, indicating an integrative definition where utility and purpose, learning, practice and theory converge with individual giftedness: “Talent without skills, inspiration without knowledge, and creativity without technique can account for little but lost potential” (NASAD, 2010, p. 1). The
emphasis upon skills is a significant distinction that characterizes creative research in film, digital media production (and other forms of artistic practice too) in comparison with conventional scholarly research output that appears in text form.

Creativity is also commonly described as more than an incidental activity that is done on occasion (Sawyer, 2006). To create is a way of thinking, a mental, emotional and behavioral process that is a fundamental drive, forming shape and building to fruition in the heart and mind of the creative person (Durant, 1961). Some theorists have indicated that artistic expression is minimally or rarely creative at all because most artists are consistently working within a certain stylistic allegiances (Elkins, 2001), and for something to be literally considered creative it should not be imitative or replicating of what has been done before (de Bono, 1990). On the other hand, all one has to do is observe a painter while at work, doing each individual brush stroke in a specific and unique manner toward some end known only to the artist; or a composer selecting a sequence or cluster of notes to achieve a certain melody or harmony; an actor using Stanislavski’s (1936/1988; 1938/2008; 1961; 1963) teachings for sense memory in the moment of character portrayal; or a skilled cinematographer or director that frames the camera to create a shot from imagination, and one knows that something special is happening, and that special something is usually called creativity. Art and creativity have long been held as synonymous in common parlance because both are primarily concerned with the invention of something that is new and different, and each brush stroke, each musical note or chord, each contour of line has a uniqueness unto its own.

Art has been considered as an alternative avenue of knowing and learning, an integral part of natural philosophy and necessary context for receiving, remembering, and valuing everyday living. Creative writing, fiction or non-fiction, would not be recognized as scholarship
either, at least not according to this extreme position. Generating creativity and the impulse to make art of any kind starts as a way of thinking, a mental, emotional and behavioral process that emerges from a fundamental drive, perhaps primordial in origin, leading to action that forms, shapes and builds, bringing the creative and the artistic to fruition from the heart and mind of the creative person to the empirical domain. Durant (1961) writes:

Everything in the world is moved by an inner urge to become something greater than it is. From the perspective of Aristotelian objectivity, every thing has a form and that form has grown out from raw material called ‘matter.’ In time, the form that emerged from matter may in turn become the matter out of which still higher forms will grow (p. 80).

The transformation of matter to form is a constant process of actuality over potential. As matter can be formed and shaped into a work of art, so can filmmaking and the art of filmmaking be viewed as an expression of understanding. Art, in its broadest context, could signify all norms of creative expression, including film/video making, plus many other forms such as writing, painting, sculpture, musicianship, dance and movement, photography, calligraphy, and more, to name just a few well-recognized areas.

Fritz (1994) observed that the most important developments in civilization have come through the creative process, but ironically, most people have not been taught to be creative. While I must agree that the creative process has certainly been the catalyst in human development throughout history, is the reason that most people have not been taught to be creative the result of its impossibility---that it is impossible to teach or evaluate creativity? Is creativity the mysterious, unattainable gift of genius that has been held throughout time, or can it be reduced to teachable skills? Is creativity’s absence, as argued by Fritz (1994), the result of insufficient understanding about what is creativity, as a skill that can be learned, a skill and
knowledge-area that has been wrongly and generally neglected and underestimated in schools? Perhaps, can the ambiguity, difficulty or impossibility of teaching art (Elkins, 2001) explain the absence of fair and reasonable criterion for evaluating art, specifically the artistic, scholarly and professional work of faculty in the field of film and digital media?

From the theoretical perspectives of quantum physics and chaos theory, supported by nature itself, it is postulated that randomness and unpredictability are inherent, and that change is perpetual, constant, inevitable and infinite (Capra, 1996; Wheatley, 1992). In nature, it is not clear that change for the sake of change constitutes creativity or a creative action because there is no end point or finality, thus no clear function or reference for determining originality (Kaplan, 1966). Nature is adaptive and change seems to come about through fortuitous happenings and processes; so it is not clear that change in nature is creative at all, unless I assume a teleological perspective and consider our world to be the creative handiwork of a Creator. For example, water in the liquid state is not the same as water in the frozen state or the gaseous state. There is a logical explanation, the temperature changes so the water transforms to ice, but is this a creative response? At some point, the water experienced a transition, a change, and an observable difference. Change in the context of such difference is the contrary of equality or sameness, particularly with objects. Such differences “can only be stated on the basis of a comparison or categorization, and since a complete comparison of objects or things is seldom possible in practice, only relevant or defining attributes are used for stating equality or difference” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Difference). In this case, the comparables are the landmarks of water, ice and gas. Similar or different objects are only similar or different “with respect to attributes of discriminative value” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Difference).

Human creativity and the process of creative expression in any medium, including film or
digital media, is presumed to emerge from intentionality. It is considered to be a conscious, strategic action. Human creativity is different from the rest of the natural world’s creativity, although human creativity arguably shares many dynamics with natural creativity in the context of change (De Bono, 1990; 1992). Inherent lack of understanding about the question of what is creativity, and what is the relationship of creativity to conventional and alternative understanding of scholarship and professional work in film and digital media, are inherently important areas in inquiry in my dissertation as I try to establish the relevance of creativity in the context of the traditional template---but it is a continuous process of reflection and possibly an unanswerable and limitless question.
4) The non-teachable nature of creativity and art

A connection between what can be taught and what can be evaluated has been established by Elkins (2001). Elkins (2001) argues the possibility that art cannot be taught and therefore are potentially not possible for evaluation. Rand (1990) supports the non-teachable nature of fine arts by stating: “…I am inclined to say that fiction writing---and the fine arts in general---cannot be taught. Much of the technical skill involved can be, but not the essence” (p. 2). Elkins (2001) wrote: “There have long been doubts about whether art can be taught, going back at least to Plato’s concept of inspiration, mania and Aristotle’s concepts of genius and poetic rapture” (p. 95).

In Greek philosophy, a distinction was made between subjects that could be taught and subjects that could not (Elkins, 2001). Whatever could be taught had a theory, or a body of information, a set of methods, or something that could be written down and handed on to students. Such subjects were called “techne”, and for the Greeks they included arts, crafts, and sciences. Other subjects could not be taught. Instead they had to be absorbed, or learned by example (Elkins, 2001 p. 105). Aristotle called them emperia: “…what we think of as art (today) is more like emperia, it does not depend on rules so much as on nonverbal learning, things that can not be put into words” (Elkins, 2001, p. 105). Elkins (2001) further identifies the Romantic art schools as claiming that art is not teachable because individual inspiration is central in art. From Elkins’ (2001) point of view, before it can be said that art can be taught, one important shift is for a rethink of the role of technique is in fine arts, because it is impossible to separate art from technique---despite the common assumption that technique is ultimately separate from art. Elkins (2001) also argues that the teaching of art, at least in the classical sense is not teachable because:
we do not know how we teach art, and so we cannot claim to teach it or to know what
teaching it might be like…Art schools would be very different places if teachers and
students did not continue to hold onto the idea that there is such a thing as teaching art,
even when they don’t believe in it securely, or analyze it directly. That puts art
departments and our art schools in a self-contradictory position (Elkins, 2001, p. 91-92).

Elkins (2001, p. 107-110) provides some “individual claims” that clarify his views that
art is not teachable:

• The idea of teaching art is irreparably irrational. We do not teach because we do not
  know when or how we teach.

• The project of teaching art is confused because we behave as if we were doing something
  more than teaching technique.

• It does not make sense to propose fundamental changes in the ways art is taught (because
  you can’t fix something irrational by trying to rationalize it).

• Art can be taught, but it seems as if it can’t be since so few students become outstanding
  artists

• Art cannot be taught, but it can be fostered or helped along

• Art cannot be taught or even nourished, but is possible to teach right up to the beginnings
  of art, so that students are ready to make art the moment they graduate

• Great art cannot be taught, but run of the mill art can

• Art cannot be taught, but neither can anything else
Elkins (2001) openly acknowledges the high degree of skepticism and pessimism in his analysis, but does not waiver in his conclusion that it is pointless and futile to believe that we can teach art in our modern world. The same question(s) can be raised about filmmaking, namely, for example, what is filmmaking and what are the best ways to teach and empower learning, creativity and competence in filmmaking? With support from Plato, Aristotle, Rand, Elkins, and many more, it is arguable that filmmaking, like art in general, is not teachable because most teachers have no clear idea, beyond technical skills building and demonstrated memorization of facts and steps in processes, how filmmaking is best taught.
Part 5: Change in institutions of higher learning

Part 5 is divided into four parts:

1) Challenges and obstacles
2) Institutional change
3) The need for change
4) Court decisions relating to faculty

1) Challenges and obstacles

What does change in the practices and policies for recognizing and evaluating work by faculty in film and digital media at institutions of higher learning entail? Times are a’changin’ and change is in the air. Boyer (1990) wrote: “It is time to end the suffocating practice in which colleges and universities measure themselves” (p. xiii). Change refers to the transition that occurs from sameness to difference. For example, water in the liquid state is not the same as water in the frozen state; thus, the water experienced a transition from sameness to difference. An alternative view or strategy about change in organizations or institutions, change that benefits those of us at the borders, is not easily or overtly found in the literature, nor is it easily accomplished in traditional and conventional university settings. Scholarly inquiry about change has not overtly examined the issue of (non-) recognition and (unfair) evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Therefore, change can only be advocated from bits and pieces that have emerged, directly or indirectly. The process of inquiry has led to an untested theory that is emerging from the integration of data that I have collected; and change will only be determined through comparison of characteristics that determine the relative sameness or difference over time.
2) Institutional change

Institutionalization of Boyer’s four domains is an important theme in a range of literature relating to change in the ways that the evaluation of research by faculty occurs. Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002) and Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) emphasize the importance of achieving institutionalization of Boyer’s four domains, advocating institutionalization on three levels: structural, procedural, and incorporation. To achieve institutionalization of the four domains, the criteria for defining and rewarding scholarship should match Boyer’s formulations, and should be consistent with the institution’s mission statement (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002). The guiding definition of institutionalization as used by Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002), based upon Clark (1971, P. 75) is:

…institutionalization, more broadly conceived, is the process whereby specific cultural elements or cultural objects are adopted by actors in a social system…to the point at which an innovative practice loses its special project status and become part of the routine behavior of the system (p. 5).

Scholars that advocate institutionalization of Boyer’s four domains unanimously agree that lasting change entirely depends on innovation becomes institutionalized (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002). Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2002) identify many factors about the traditional research template that impede institutionalization of Boyer’s four domains, including: prevailing processes used to discourage innovative approaches to research, the imposition of irrelevant criteria to assess creative or alternative forms of scholarship by faculty, and the failure of institutional processes to acknowledge the forms and domains of scholarship other than discovery (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002).
Diamond (1993c) writes: “In order for institutional change to be successful, those directing the process must have a plan that develops ownership in the final system by everyone who will be involved in or affected by its implementation” (p. 3). But how is paradigmatic change to be achieved? According to Diamond (1993c), change in the processes for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media involves five basic steps:

- Development of an institutional mission statement
- Development of departmental and divisional mission statements in concert with the institutional statement.
- Development of departmental and divisional promotion and tenure guidelines and procedures based on the goals in those mission statements.
- Institutional review and approval of both mission statements and the faculty reward guidelines.
- Change requires a commitment from all participants in the process, but most institutions of higher learning continue to be structured hierarchically, like a pyramid.

The locus of power is concentrated and held by a few at the top point, supported by lesser levels of power in the ranks of followership as the pyramid descends downward toward the base.

Diamond (1993c) lists three recommendations as a framework for change:

- Re-conceptualization of faculty priorities requires a genuine commitment to change.
- The entire academic community must be actively involved in the change process.
- The difficulty of the process of changing promotion and tenure criteria will vary across academic areas and faculty.

It is essential, as explained in Chapter 5, that administrators take full responsibility for providing the guidelines, general procedures, and defining the roles and time line that frame the
process (Diamond, 1993c). It also must also be noted that nothing from the top will change unless everyone from top to bottom buy into the change. Any modification that is anticipated in an institutional system for performance evaluation of faculty work should be clearly articulated and understood by all participants in the process---administrators, committee members and faculty applicants.

3) The need for change

Boyer (1990) has opened up an alternative paradigm for defining faculty scholarship, one that ultimately allows for the prioritization and recognition of artistic, scholarly and professional work in film, digital media, and in many other academic fields (Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2007; Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997; Diamond, 1993; Diamond, 1999; Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The contribution of Boyer (1990) and others (Rice, 1988; 1995) have facilitated a higher level of respect and status for the full range of faculty work and activities relating to the trilogy of teaching, research and service, and has compelled higher education to demonstrate the imagination and creativity to support and reward both scholars uniquely gifted in performing the processes of (conventional and unconventional) research, and those who excel in other uses of knowledge (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, 1997). Boyer (1990) has developed a panoramic, socially involved and socially responsible view for institutional and community-based service, and a meaningful model that equally values and prioritizes the full range of scholarship of activities that are performed by faculty members. However, change is needed and should not be assumed.

As institutions of higher learning have “grown more and more complex, the disciplines have become increasingly divided, and academic departments frequently are disconnected from
one another…evidence abounds that many professors are ambivalent about their roles” (Boyer, 1990, p. 2). The result has been that some, perhaps many, faculty members (including myself) suffer from a lack of intrinsic motivation in the workplace because conflicting priorities “demoralizes the professoriate, erodes the vitality of the institution, and cannot help but have a negative impact on students” (Boyer, 1990, p. 2-3). Intrinsic motivation, and the underlying human need for competence and self-determination, cannot be realized in a negative environment of conflicting priorities (La Pelle, 1997; Deci and Ryan, 1985).

As I began my search of literature, I was unable to define the plethora of problems that face faculty members that enter the seemingly simple process of applying for a promotion of academic rank on the basis of artistic, scholarly or professional work in film and digital media. I intuited problems through my own personal experience, but after reading a range of literature about the process of academic performance evaluation I became more able to systematically understand the scope and nature of the problem situation. Inconsistencies and ambiguities became apparent in my own workplace as performance evaluation processes were being conducted without written criteria pertaining to work by faculty in film and digital media, and the depth of the problem was affirmed in the literature that I was beginning to find and read. The first scholarly writing that I was fortunate to read, found luckily through a random search of the Fielding database of doctoral dissertations that used grounded theory methods (Glaser, 1976), was a doctoral dissertation written by La Pelle (1997). La Pelle (1997) provides a useful description about a lack of intrinsic motivation that can occur as the result of a performance evaluation:

When people are intrinsically motivated, they will be involved in an ongoing cyclical process of seeking out or creating optimally challenging situations and then attempting to
conquer those situations. They will direct their attention to those activities that require
them to learn or stretch their abilities a small amount. Activities that are too challenging
or too easy/boring will be abandoned. An intrinsically motivated activity is one that
would be undertaken without any apparent external reward, where the reward is said to
be in the activity itself (p. 10).

Recognizing the significance of intrinsically motivated work, in contrast to and distinct from
extrinsically motivated work, magnifies the most important purpose of this dissertation---
developing a model (in Chapter 5) for performance evaluation that can increase personal
satisfaction and intrinsic motivation; and reinforce the perception that individuals and groups
have control over their self and their actions.

What will happen if change is not forthcoming, or if faculty succumb (or are forced to
succumb) and thus abandon the principles the possibilities offered by change? Wait and Hope
(2009) offer five probable results for faculty in the arts based on observations of what has
already been happening, and what potentially will be the long-term results:

First, we will be placed in an evaluation environment that is alien to the pursuit of our
particular goals, an environment that attacks any attempt to solidify the validity of our
goals.

Second, our precious time will be requisitioned for purposes not consistent with the nature
of our work. Because time is a finite resource, our ability to be productive in our fields is
lessened.

Third, the illusion has already been created and will be furthered that assessment requires
no expertise in the thing being assessed, but only expertise in assessment. A way-station to
this goal is the splintering of wholes into parts and then focusing on the parts that are easy
to evaluate in a technical way and magnifying them to obscure or deny the existence of the whole.

Fourth, these three results will lead to a loss of control in curriculum, teaching, individual approaches, and evaluation. Control passes from the field to external, usually centralized bodies that make judgments on the basis of images created by numbers, rather than real achievement in the discipline.

Finally, an abandonment of our principles and ways of working will reduce our productivity as our time and energy are spent either fighting for the working room we need to be productive, or answering assessment requirements that are not based on the nature of what we do (p. 10-11).

4) Court decisions relating to faculty

Litigation and decisions that emerge in courts of law are potentially powerful facilitators of change. There is a changing legal landscape as society, including faculty, becomes more litigious. There are laws, legal protections and court decisions that are applicable to faculty, colleges and universities that are related to the inquiry of this dissertation. In theory, institutional change can emerge from conflicts that are resolved through litigation in the court. Conflicts and litigation emerge from disagreements about the (mis-) application of institutional processes, rules and regulations; from alleged breaches of oral or written contractual agreements pertaining to faculty appointment and contractual renewal (or tenure), from perceived irregular deviations from academic customs, from disagreements about the merits of a rendered decision, and (where applicable) from disputes arising from collective bargaining agreements. In an effort to determine the extent that faculty have found relief from their conflicts through legal litigation in
courts of law, I have searched legal briefs and other documents pertaining to court proceedings and disputes in law at the levels of the state and supreme court, to consider the scope and nature of judicial decisions concerning faculty in higher education.

Faculty in many fields have been terminated, professionally marginalized, or prejudiced in their academic workplace as a consequence of negative performance evaluations, and lawsuits have ensued (See Appendix M). Faculty members have sought remedy and relief, successfully and unsuccessfully, from the court in matters involving negative performance evaluations which have resulted in the denial of tenure, denial of promotion of rank, or a perceived breach of contract; lodging legal complaints on alleged violations of academic freedom, discrimination of the basis of gender/sex, and negative perceptions about collegiality (Fisher v. Vassar College, 852 F. Supp. 1193 (S.D.N.Y. 1994), rev'd, 6 F.3d 379 (2d Cir. 1995), aff'd, 114 F.3d 1332 (2d Cir. 1997) (en banc), cert. denied, 118 S. Ct. 851 (1998); Brown v. Trustees of Boston University, 891 F.2d 337 (1st Cir. 1989); Kunda v. Muhlenberg College, 621 F.2d 532 (2d Cir. 1980)).

Courts have long adhered to a rule that college and university tenure decisions are presumptively correct and entitled to deference. This is derived from the common-law rule of academic abstention protecting colleges and universities from judicial reconsideration of the merits of tenure decisions and from contemporary principles of institutional autonomy. It is a fundamental precept of American higher education law that courts should refrain from reviewing the merits of tenure and promotion decisions. There is a long history of case law and judicial opinions that support the doctrine of institutional autonomy, protecting the tenure and promotion processes of colleges and universities. The rule has been uniformly applied to insulate colleges
and universities from judicial reconsideration of the merits of faculty tenure and promotion decisions.

Byrne (1989) describes academic *absention* as: “the traditional refusal of courts to extend common law rules of liability to colleges where doing so would interfere with the college administration’s good faith performance of its core functions.” Such core functions include the decision whether to promote a faculty member in rank or to a tenured position. There are essentially two reasons that justify judicial deference:

- Tenure decisions involve complex, subjective assessments of scholarship—a task that courts are generally not equipped or willing to make.
- Institutional autonomy promotes academic freedom by insulating colleges and universities from the potential effects of external intrusion in the performance review process that are not necessarily related to the merits of particular case.


[A reviewing] court is powerless to substitute its judgment for that of the University as to whether plaintiff’s academic credentials are such that tenure should have been awarded. The judiciary is not qualified to evaluate academic performance. The courts do not possess the expert knowledge or have the academic experience which should enlighten an
academic committee's decision. The courts will not serve as a Super-Tenure Review Committee.

Over the last three decades, courts have consistently applied the doctrine of academic abstention and declined reconsideration of the merits of institutional tenure and promotion decisions. The historical context in which the courts’ strong reluctance to intrude in tenure and promotion decisions have been consistently reflected the courts of the United States (p. 1270).

The most efficient way to find legal cases is through the fee-based data base service of Lexis/Nexis (www.lexisnexis.com), though it only highlights appellate cases. For jurisdictions in the United States, a free site for some legal information is FindLaw.com, and a google.com search can also be fruitful in locating basic information and linkages to additional resources. I also found excellent data bases of legal briefs and analytical writings about higher education law at the websites for the American Council on Education (www.acenet.edu/bookstore) and the American Association of University Professors (www.aaup.org). For my research to be comprehensive in scope, if I were examining the breadth of legal issues and court decisions pertaining to faculty performance evaluation in a particular state or nationally, I would also have to decide what jurisdictions are to be focused upon, and to look for cases that might not have necessarily been appealed or tried, neither of which did I find it necessary to do for this inquiry. Pure legal research sources are not likely to highlight professor vs. non-professor plaintiffs and college vs. non-college employers, so it would also be extremely difficult to locate such cases to determine relevance to this inquiry.

In order for a claim to proceed in a court of law it must be based upon a breach of expressed or implied contract, or upon some other form of unlawful employment practice (hostile environment, retaliation, wrongful termination, defamation; or upon a form of
discrimination that violates statutory or Constitutional protections. The latter would have to involve a protected class or characteristic under the Human Rights Act, Civil Rights Act, American with Disabilities Act (ADA); and involve claims such as discrimination on the basis of age, speech protections, disability, sexual preference, race, or religion.

I have read and reviewed at least twenty-five court decisions about faculty claims of wrongful termination, arbitrary dismissal, violations of constitutional protections, and other concerns that relate to performance evaluation in higher education. I have observed that in a large number of cases the faculty claim does not prevail, particularly at the appellate court level, probably because the threshold for proving discrimination that coincides with the claim of employment termination is extremely difficult to meet to the satisfaction of the court. Alleging that a decision to not-renew a contract or not award tenure is unfair or baseless is not enough to satisfy the court, there must also be a provable case of discrimination that coincides with the employment issue.

The emerging conclusion from my reading and review of legal cases, as further discussed in Chapter 4, is that an aggrieved faculty member in the academic field of film and digital media cannot expect change or to find solace or resolution in the court by filing a claim about disputed performance evaluation decisions or processes. The gauntlet of faculty performance evaluation is backed up by a litany of institutional rules upon rules, reinforced by local, state and federal labor laws and other legal protections that are enjoyed by an employer; with the case being argued by an army of lawyers who are on the university’s payroll. Colleges and universities are protected by a long history of legal precedent for academic absentism, while faculty have few ways to overcome this legal and theoretical threshold. For a faculty to find relief in the court, opposing a university or college, would be (at best) a David v Goliath battle, one that is argued in
a setting that might be willing or inclined to intervene in institutional matters, nor be willing to facilitate change through its rendering of judicial opinion.

Therefore, this dissertation places great emphasis upon the imperative for establishment and implementation of clear, written, fair and relevant criteria, emerging from a broad-based consensus of opinion that includes all concerned parties (including faculty) about what constitutes the expectations of faculty and faculty work, particularly in the academic field of film and digital media. This pro-active effort will preclude a quagmire of conflict and litigation in the future.
Part 6: Summary

I have searched and studied a broad range of literature, building a theoretical and practical understanding of problems and issues relating to the recognition of faculty work in the field of film and digital media; with the goal of developing an informed, fair and proper ways to evaluate artistic, scholarly and professional work that implements film and digital media technologies. My intention is for greater understanding and the development of an appropriate approach to performance evaluation, facilitating better outcomes (in the form of institutional rewards) for faculty who engage in creative, alternative and innovative activities as part of their scholarly work. My hope is that the result of this literature review provides a landscape that is shaped by a range of interrelated sources, a panoramic view that provokes thought and continuously offers insight, meaning and helpful solutions; and is a starting point for further research.

This chapter reflects my understanding of literature relating to the recognition and evaluation of scholarship activity by faculty in the field of film and digital. The framework for this understanding is built upon comparative analysis of conventional and traditional approaches to what constitutes research and faculty work; then contrasting the norm with other perspectives that are appropriately termed as alternative or innovative. Meaning has emerged from a broad and open search for relevant connections in the literature about the recognition and evaluation of faculty work, with specific focus upon the unique character of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film or digital media.

Data in Chapter 4 demonstrates that the four domains of Boyer (1990) are not common knowledge for faculty in the field of film and digital media; while a review of literature shows only rare cases where Boyer (1990) has been implied. No literature that I found in relation to
educational leadership, administration or performance evaluation addressed, integrated or applied a critical approach to power, and none advocated shared governance, revolutionary change, or other alternative perspectives to issues relating to faculty roles, faculty work, faculty-administrative relations, or the power structure at institutions of higher learning. Generally, it appears that much of the literature assumes that change emerges from the top levels of administration and trickle down to faculty, if at all.
Chapter 3: METHODS

Chapter 3 is divided into four main parts, with parts 1-3 sub-divided into several sections.

1) A synthesis of methods
2) The Scholarly Self
3) Interpretation, limitations and the future
4) Summary

Part 1: A synthesis of methods

Part 1 is divided into seven sections.

1) Overview
2) Various methods of inquiry
3) Dual roles
4) Qualitative and quantitative methods
5) Methods and the use of literature
6) The survey and the recruitment of participants
7) Borrowing from grounded and action-oriented research methods

1) Overview

I approached this inquiry with an understanding that scholarship can emerge from all of Boyer’s four domains (Boyer, 1990), hypothesizing that change in the process of evaluation of faculty scholarship (the problem situation) is long overdue. My choice of methods was focused upon building knowledge and finding ways to explain and improve the process of performance evaluation for artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

2) Various methods of inquiry

From a conventional perspective, scholarly method is a crucial factor in any judgment made about the integrity, quality, or professionalism of research and its output. Methods of inquiry can vary vastly from each other, yet it is arguable that many qualitative and quantitative
research methods are doing essentially the same things, albeit in different ways (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Just as pedagogy cannot be narrowly reduced according to a specific discipline, for example, psychology, sociology, theology, or history---and must not be subservient to social, cultural, political, corporate or social sectors of society---I have taken a holistic view of research methods and the approach to my work. My intention has been to exercise relative autonomy as I move forward, therefore, by choice I have not succumbed to the temptation of a singular method in my inquiry, nor am I intending to describe or implicitly defend the status quo through reductive discourse, as might be the case in a more conventional approach.

Most researchers who are working within the broad spectrum of conventional or alternative research methods, like myself, are motivated by a confidence that they know something worth telling to others, and they use a variety of methods and means to discover and communicate their ideas and findings. My research writing emerges from systematic observation, personal reflection and integrative analysis about the problem situation and the emergent data, including the placement of value upon my own perceptions that emerge from self, in tandem with phenomenological data gathered from multiple other perspectives. I have used a multi-method approach, prioritizing individual experience (my own and others) as fundamental to the scope and nature of the research problem and research question. My inquiry has taken place over time, in various stages, using what I have determined to be the most appropriate methods and tools for the purpose at hand. In my opinion, the research question that frames this dissertation has determined what methods are appropriate; and I have borrowed from various methods and theoretical approaches, to varying degrees at different times depending on the context. I have engaged in various stages of research as follows, not in any particular order:

- Identification and recognition of the problem situation
• Reading many kinds of literature to contextualize the problem situation---before, during and after I commenced work for this formal project

• Formulation of the research problem and research question

• The recruitment and in-depth interview of participants for the survey

• Data analysis and synthesis

• Formulation of themes and theoretical conclusion(s) that emerge from data

• Formulation of recommendations and theoretical conclusions to be used by others during evaluation of faculty scholarship and professional work in the field of film and digital media

• Seeking considered input from my dissertation chair and committee members as I write/edit/re-write/finalize this dissertation

The above-listed stages of research in which I engaged did occur simultaneously and in random order---it was not imperative that one stage necessarily occurs before another. The process of writing for me was non-linear in nature. For example, during the process of writing/editing/re-writing/finalizing I found a need to re-formulate the research problem or research question; through reading I found the need to re-write or edit my written work; and so on. The first step was a certain awareness that a problem situation existed, and from that point the reticulated stages of research inquiry commenced---and a re-formulation of what I imagined to be the first step also did occur. Each step and stage of inquiry shared a frame of reference with all of the others. My intention was to achieve a deep understanding of substantive issues in the problem situation, to take time and reflect upon my new understanding and then make
connections is disparate and creative ways with other knowledge that emerged. My search was for implicit and explicit meaning occurred within a reticulum of values, feelings, actions and purposes that are objectified in text based artifacts, beliefs and institutional value systems. My exploration was open to the possibility that problem solving action and informed change are needed and could occur at individual and macro levels within educational institutions.

Specifically, I have borrowed and relied upon the following methods:

- Auto/ethnographic writing: my reflections are largely a part of my personal story as it relates to this topic;
- Quantitative surveys: this data will help illuminate the degree and extent to which the problem exists;
- Phenomenological interviews: in depth written interviewing in which I hope to unveil the conscious feelings and ideas about this issue in ways that will help me reflect upon my own;
- Qualitative analysis: many of my interpretations and conclusions about theory and phenomenon emerge from literature that is directly or indirectly related to this topic.

As I have borrowed, applied and integrated the various methods above listed, I have also relied upon Bloom’s (1956) taxonomy of learning, with its various key verbs/words to depict the different levels of action and thinking that are used during research (Appendix F). Bloom (1956) has been recommended by Levy and Ellis (2006) as a useful framework for developing and structuring the entire process of research inquiry. Bloom (1956) facilitates an understanding of the sequential nature of learning through a series of domains and steps—for example, from knowledge recall to comprehension of meaning, from application to analysis, from synthesis and
pattern making to judgments and appraisals (Appendix F). In the context of this dissertation, Bloom (1956) facilitates a systematic approach to the process of inquiry that makes discernment of key and relevant ideas more tangible, and helps to highlight gaps in knowledge that the dissertation research aims to fill (Levy and Ellis, 2006).

3) Dual roles

I have worked in dual roles on this dissertation, as a participant and as an observer. I have been a participant as I researched and wrote this dissertation, while working as a faculty member at a university in the field of film and digital media and simultaneously applying for promotion of rank, from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. I applied for promotion of rank on the basis of my artistic, scholarly and professional work in the field of film and digital media, instead of meeting the conventional expectation for faculty to submit peer-reviewed publications for their performance evaluation. I am also a participant through my use of an auto/ethnographic writing approach, wherein I reflect upon the personal experiences and circumstances that relate to the ongoing problem and question under inquiry.

Aside from gathering and evaluating data from others and reflecting upon my own journey as an applicant for promotion in academe, I am a participant in this auto-ethnographic doctoral dissertation based the following aspects of my background:

- I have been an undergraduate (B.A, Film and Television Production) and graduate student (M.F.A., Film and Television Production) at UCLA’s School of Film and Television, and this has given me first-hand pedagogical, theoretical and practical experience in a prestigious film school;
• I am a professional filmmaker with more than 25 years of international experience in documentary, commercial and experimental filmmaking; and with a resume of recognized, award-winning creative work to my credit;

• I have been a professional consultant in media production for social development in many countries worldwide;

• I am an educator with more than 12 years of full time teaching experience at the university and College levels in the knowledge-and-practice areas of film/TV production, electronic/digital media production, multimedia design and other related areas of fine arts and design practice.

In addition to my role as a participant, I have also been an observer. I have experienced and have observed the scope and nature of actual performance evaluation processes in higher education, and in other hierarchical systems. I am also an observer of alternative and indigenous worldviews that are non-hierarchical, for the sake of learning what may once have been useful but now ignored or forgotten in the mainstream of contemporary institutions of higher learning---but of potentially great value if renewed and revisited at this time. In my role as observer, I have recruited faculty to respond to a Survey (Appendix C) to determine and compare the nature of their/our perceptions and experiences with performance evaluation on the basis of creative scholarship and professional work in the field of film and digital media. While filmmaking and digital media production are relatively new domains of knowledge and practice in the bastions of academic institutions, in the data I have observed the idea that change in the existing institutional paradigm about scholarship is overdue but slowly emerging in some corners (Boyer, 1990). In sum, as a participant and an observer I am seeking to build a deeper theoretical and practical
understanding of the research problem and research question, and to facilitate and develop a useful model for change.

4) Qualitative and quantitative methods

By definition, qualitative research and qualitative research are fields of inquiry in their own rights. My first interest was to compare qualitative with quantitative methodology in relation to creative work in the arts (including work in the field of film and digital media), to discern differences and similarities, and to determine applicability in the case of the my evolving understanding of the research problem. Quantitative methods emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables. Quantitative researchers argue that their work is done within a value-free framework. I do not consider quantitative methods to be the most useful way to inform this inquiry, nor is this method been a major factor in my research approach, but I have made use of this approach in a survey (described below, Appendix C) to facilitate the emergence of unanticipated data. The process of knowledge building through quantitative methods is considered to be an accumulation of accurate facts that represent what is--and what is infers to that which exists outside or independent of self. Accordingly, by employing and adhering to quantitative methods it is presumed that subjectivity---opinions, ideologies, biases---are constrained and the knower (myself) thereby gains an accurate and objective description of reality. As I quantify and compare particular aspects of the participant responses from the survey, I am borrowing from quantitative methods.

In contrast, qualitative researchers are encouraged to use (for example) ethnographic prose, historical narratives, first-person accounts, still photographs, life histories, fictionalized facts, certain kinds of films and other media elements, autobiographical materials, in addition to
more conventional writings, as preferred sources---for the purposes of representation, interpretation, establishment of trustworthiness, and (self-) evaluation; while quantitative researchers commonly rely upon mathematical models, statistical tables, and graphs---and they usually write about their research in impersonal, third person prose (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative research is usually committed to a naturalistic, interpretive approach to subject matter, emphasizing the qualities of entities; and on processes and meanings that are not intended to be experimentally examined or measured (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). There is an intimate and value-laden relationship between the qualitative researcher and what is studied, with situational constraints continuously shaping the scope and nature of inquiry. Qualitative research has separate histories in education, social science, communication, psychology, history, organizational studies, medical sciences, anthropology, sociology and the arts, so qualitative research methods are not a homogenous whole, and their variant forms constitute many different things to many people.

Although both quantitative and qualitative methods have focused upon the search for empirical truth, the broad range of methods that comprise the qualitative approach are more oriented toward commentary and interpretation; for the purpose of exploring, studying and answering questions about attitudes, behaviors, values, concerns, motivations, aspirations, experiences. Qualitative research methods are concerned with what people do, say, desire and experience. A qualitative approach reflects the scope and nature of my pursuit as a researcher, and it generally reflects the underlying purpose(s) of most work (artistic, scholarly and professional) in the field of film and digital media. I acknowledge that defining precisely what constitutes qualitative research is a vast and complex challenge, particularly in the specific, unique and qualitative field of film and digital media.
This dissertation can be generally described as partially quantitative, but mostly qualitative and personalized in its approach to inquiry. I have considered a fairly broad range of data sources in my inquiry, including my self, and I collected data mainly through the use of qualitative methods. My inquiry was a strategic process that generally moved from collection and thinking about the data, to description and analysis in relation to the problem, to self-reflective writing about the problem and question, to theory building. A process of data sampling followed my description of the problem, and the data included text-based literature, a survey and interviews. The collection of qualitative and quantitative data was theoretically based, rather than random—although serendipitous good fortune was never discounted or ruled out. Sources were identified, gathered, and selected for further analysis according to my perception(s) about their relevance to the research problem and research question; and upon their impact and influence upon the theoretical conclusions that were constantly emerging and re-emerging. Over time I observed, defined and analyzed the problem from many perspectives, over and over again, without knowing how or when I was going to reach a point of finality.

5) Methods and the use of literature

In my reading, I was able to identify a vast array of many important variables with significant implications. As I read, I began to perceive multiple possibilities and systemic connections—theoretical, political, sociological, psychological, and historical—that were relevant to the process of performance evaluation in academic settings, reified and reinforced by what I was experiencing in my own workplace; and through what I was gleaning from interviews with project participants. The possibilities and systemic connections that emerged from my reading began to clarify the scope and nature of the problem that was negatively impacting my
own career, and the careers of others like myself who are faculty members in the field of film and digital media---those of us on the borders who have faced the gauntlet of performance evaluation.

In some ways, my search for relevant literature and data sources relates to my background with the method of grounded theory and grounded action (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), yet in other ways it clearly does not. The approach of grounded theory and grounded action are framed consistently by systems theory and systems thinking. Throughout my inquiry I have been guided by an underlying belief that everything is data (Glaser, 1978; 1998), so I have searched through a broad range of emergent bits and pieces of information and other evidence to build and achieve a better understanding, leading to my writing with a hopeful aspiration that change can occur. My approach is also similar to GTGA because I did not seek to verify or refute an already established theory, and I subjected the data that was gathered to rigorous inferential and deductive analyses (Glaser, 1978). In a subsequent section of this chapter I further discuss the role of GTGA in this project.

Critical reading of what has already been established and known, as conveyed in the literature, has facilitated my ability to build an integrated awareness of what is not known---as I have expressed in the research problem and the research questions. By establishing the state of the previous research, it is more possible to establish how new research can advance previous research (Gall, Borg and Gall, 1996). Critical reading of the literature is necessary for building a bridge between the controversies, discrepancies, assumptions, gaps and alternative perspectives that have emerged from my inquiry. Inquiry and examination of a range of conventional, traditional and alternative views of scholarship has helped to contextualize and enhance meaning about the present-day ontology and practice of performance evaluation of faculty work in
institutions of higher learning, and has also facilitated my ability to build a tool for use in performance evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media. These are the benefits of what constitutes my methodological approach to the literature for this dissertation.

My interest and approach has been to read literature from historical and contemporary perspectives, framing my analysis in the form of a problem and related questions that are posed by this dissertation. My motivation is driven by curiosity and courage, but my purpose constitutes a reflection upon issues that reach to the heart of what it means to be a faculty scholar and professional in higher education---specifically asking, as a faculty member, what am I expected to do and how am I expected to spend my time?

6) The survey and the recruitment of participants

In an effort to improve its scope and nature as I commenced my work, I developed the survey after review of some other surveys. I looked closely at previous sampling, measurement and other questionnaires for ways to improve and enhance the scope and nature of this quantitative and qualitative tool. My goal was to recruit and interview professors (through the Survey) who rely upon filmmaking as an important aspect of their intellectual and professional work, and who have successfully (or unsuccessfully) undergone a process of evaluation for promotion of rank at an academic institution. As described in Chapter 4, I have been particularly interested to learn about the experience of faculty members who rely upon the alternative forms of scholarship in a performance evaluation setting, specifically in the field of film and digital media. The Survey is included as Appendix C. From this group of faculty members who responded to the survey, I solicited further participation from three individuals for personal interviews. My
goal has been to discover or affirm a range of ideas, problems or solutions that emerge from data gathered in response to the survey, analyzed in the context of my own experiences and critical reading of literature.

The survey sought to solicit, measure and form the basis for interpreting the experience of others with direct knowledge with performance evaluation processes in the field of film and digital media. I recruited participants for this purpose from various professional organizations such as the University Film and Video Association (UFVA), CILECT, International Documentary Association, Explorer’s Club of New York City, Broadcast Education Association (BEA), and others. In total, I contacted more than 300 professors (assistant, associate and full) in the United States, Canada, Europe and other parts of the world, faculty in the field of film and digital media who have previously applied or are planning to apply for promotion of rank, presumably including those who have been denied promotion of rank. While it was disappointing that only 13 of the 300 faculty members took the time to take the survey, there is likely some data to be discerned in the friendly notices of regret that I received. One professor wrote:

Dear Anthony…no way I will get to this in near future. I apologize. I am way behind my own work on top of which I have several interviews to address. Good luck with it

Best, xxx (email message to me from a colleague)

My feeling of dejection due to the low level of response can be summed up in stoic terms: All circumstances will eventually be transformed in their time in accordance with their inner nature. Alternatively, it can also be argued that people get the government, situation, relationship, and life that they deserve for themselves. Faculty are overworked and in many cases, as illustrated in
Chapter 4, de-motivated to the point that pondering of theoretical issues concerning faculty advancement is not prioritized.

The quantity and quality of response to the survey (Appendix C) prompted my decision to conduct more in-depth one-on-one interviews with particular participants. My intention was to know more about their first hand experiences, opinions and feelings as faculty members who have gone through the process of administrative and peer evaluation of their creative scholarship output. This data is described in Chapter 4 and integrated into the recommendations of Chapter 5.

First, I sent an email message to the above-listed organizations to solicit their cooperation by allowing me to contact their membership (Appendix A). That effort was less than successful and I basically received words of encouragement but no direct assistance from any organization. Second, I contacted and recruited the members of the University Film and Video Association (UFVA), using the UFVA’s 2009 membership catalog, selecting from the membership roster all the full time faculty that were accessible by email, seeking their informed consent (Appendix B) and completion of the Survey (Appendix C). Specifically, I sent each of them an email message with a hyperlink to the online survey. The survey was sent electronically to a wide range of faculty members in the United States and other countries worldwide, targeting those who have submitted creative scholarship or professional work in an educational institution setting for the purpose of achieving some form of institutional reward in an academic setting, including but not limited to promotion of rank, tenure review, contractual renewal, and more. The majority of faculty members who participated in this project are practitioner-filmmakers, and those who are creatively producing film and digital media for various reasons, in any style (or combination of styles) of filmmaking---commercial, experimental, documentary, industrial, dramatic, etc. In
other words, the project participants are filmmakers, artists or digital media producers who also work simultaneously as full time as faculty members at an institution of higher learning. I sought project participants with successful and/or unsuccessful personal experience in the process of evaluation of scholarship in an academic setting, including those who may not have had such experience(s) because they have found that creative scholarship is discouraged or disallowed from the evaluation process in their particular setting. I also sought and considered the perspectives of academic administrators as project participants, those persons who make final decisions at the University level about the evaluation and acceptance of creative research in the context of rewards. I also have sought out the perspectives of other faculty members who advocate conventional notions of research output, to represent a full range of perspectives as I collect data, develop grounded conclusions and formulate a theory. It was unnecessary, in my view, to interview those who advocate the traditional template and the trilogy of faculty work because this perspective is well articulated in the mainstream literature. At this time I believe there is a broad and accessible body of scholarly literature that adequately summarizes the conventional paradigm that is in place in most academic settings.

As data emerged in the initial stages from the survey, I decided to modify my approach and ask participants to write about their personal experience(s). Based upon my new knowledge about the importance of experiential narrative in inquiry I have modified Section II of my Questionnaire (Appendix C) to read as follows:

Please write a direct account of your personal experience with the academic faculty promotion process as you lived through it. Describe the experience from the inside, as it were-almost like a state of mind: the feelings, the mood, the emotions, etc. Focus on a particular example or incident as your object in that experience: for example, describe a
specific event in the process as a particular experience. Recall and write about how you felt and sensed during the process of that experienced.

It is not of great concern to me whether the participants conveyed their experience exactly as it literally may have happened. I am less concerned with factual accuracy than with the plausibility of their account---whether it reveals a living sense of it was experienced, or not. In the survey and in interview situations, I asked participants to write vignettes in a free association style (Freud, 1995)---where the participant is encouraged to talk with little or no guidance from the researcher (myself). Chapter 4 provides a detailed analysis of what was expressed and learned through the process of surveying and interviewing project participants, and the cumulative results are interpreted within the recommendations and analysis of Chapter 5.

7) Borrowing from grounded and action-oriented research methods

This dissertation includes elements of grounded theory and action-oriented research methods that I have borrowed, when appropriate. Grounded theory is a highly systematic research approach and method for the development of theory to explain basic patterns that are common in social life, and there are many aspects in its practice that are useful in this research project. Grounded theory research is similar to other research methodologies in that it is a rigorous process of data comparison, collection and analysis, but there are many other important differences. I share the view set forth by Chenitz and Swanson (1986) who argue that grounded theory is complimentary with other methods, not as a replacement, where my job is “to take the role of the other, to discover all of the variation and perspectives in the situation, determining levels of symbolic and behavioral meaning wherever the problem occurs” (Chenitz and Swanson, 1986, p. 46). For example, a grounded approach is very appropriate as I code the
interview responses, being sensitive to the data that emerges without regard to my own preconceptions and expectations, and as my data reaches a point of saturation that enables the generation of theory and the possibility of theoretical fit (Glaser, 1978; Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Grounded theory methods were useful to me as I posed a question in my mind throughout the process of my research inquiry---how long must I continue and how I will when/where to end? The methods and approach of grounded theory research recommend that data be gathered until all categories are saturated, so the theory that is developed will be dense and precise (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Glaser (1978) wrote: "In trying to reach saturation he maximizes differences in his groups in order to maximize the varieties of data bearing on the category, and thereby develops as many diverse properties of the category as possible” (p. 62). The conventional method and approach would be to compare data from one institution that does not deviate from the expectations of the trilogy and the traditional template in the recognition, evaluation and rewarding of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, then to compare that institution with another (more supportive) institution; and then seek to make recommendations (regulations) with regard to how the first institution manage their staff and running a further analysis as to whether this may be linked with improving faculty satisfaction, etc. While this type of investigation may yield short-term solutions, a lot of theoretically relevant data could be ignored and many important questions do not get addressed (Haig, 1995).

My approach to literature, in some ways, contradicts the GTGA approach. According to method and approach of GTGA, the review of literature should be conducted after the emergence of substantive theory; it is then, and not before, that data from literature contributes to a study (Glaser, 1978). But, in my research I did my reading(s) before, during, and after the time of
determining the research problem and research question; and before, during, and after doing of my investigative search through surveying and interviewing of project participants. I did read for the specific purpose of building broader knowledge, regardless whether or not it would be directly or indirectly relevant to my purpose of building a theoretical understanding; always hoping that connections would emerge, but with no guarantee of results.

The approach of reading the literature first (or during), with the objective of identifying gaps and relevant theories, is opposite to the role that literature serves in GTGA. Glaser (1978) is specific in recommending not to do a literature review in the substantive area and related areas where the research is done; waiting until the grounded theory is nearly completed, during the processes of sorting and writing. Only then is a literature search in the substantive area to be accomplished and woven into the theory, itself becoming just one more source of data for constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 360-67). Some observers might construe this approach as a neglect of the literature, but I perceive that the purpose is to keep the researcher as free as possible of influences that could restrict the freedom required for theoretical discovery, not to ignore current and relevant knowledge (Glaser, 1978). I have no regrets about my approach, and I am aware of its (partial) inconsistency with GT.

Saturation is an important concept that is borrowed from grounded theorists (Glaser, 1978). Saturation is the intended end result, after the process of gathering, organizing and preliminary analysis of incoming categories of data, that affirms that my research has reached a point that I can quit my search because an appropriate number of groups have been surveyed and no additional data can be found (Glaser, 1978). Saturation means that I have continued my inquiry until (a) no new or relevant data seem to emerge regarding a category, (b) the conceptual categories are well developed in terms of properties and dimensions that demonstrate variation,
(c) the relationships among categories are well established and validated. Categorical saturation means that one category is saturated. Theoretical saturation means all categories are saturated, but core theoretical categories should be saturated more than peripheral ones. Strauss and Corbin (1990) wrote:

A category is considered saturated when no new information seems to emerge during coding, that is, when no new properties, dimensions, conditions, actions/interactions, or consequences are seen in the data…In trying to reach saturation he maximizes differences in his groups in order to maximize the varieties of data bearing on the category, and thereby develops as many diverse properties of the category as possible (p. 62, 136).

I also have borrowed from the approach of action-oriented research methods. Action-oriented research does resemble certain methods and ideals found in conventional approaches to research, but it is fundamentally different in many other ways (Reason and Bradbury, 2001). Although my dissertation will not directly develop or implement the cycles of a pure action-research project, what I do can be considered a first step in data gathering and reflection upon my hypothesis with interested parties, including my own reflection. Action research cycles involve reflection on data, participant ownership of organizational change and implementation of actions based on research conclusions, and I view these cycles as ideal for my research. Although I will not address the action-research cycles of organizational change in this dissertation per se, it is my intention to reflect upon data for the purpose of finding a grounded theoretical basis for implementation of actions based upon research conclusions. In these ways my research borrows from action research. This dissertation is also borrowing from the philosophical purpose of action-oriented research as I am intentionally seeking to find ways to facilitate intrinsically-
motivated autonomy, enhancement of competence, and career advancement for creative faculty in academe that seek a fair and considered evaluation of their creative research with film and digital media as a communicative means for expression (Reason and Bradbury, 2001; McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead, 1996).
Part 2: The Scholarly Self

Part 2 consists of five parts:

1) Introduction
2) Curiosity and courage
3) An auto/ethnographic approach to inquiry
4) Doubts about auto/ethnography
5) Reflecting upon auto/ethnography as a method of writing

Part 2 examines the scope and nature of personalized methods for research inquiry in response to the research problem and research question.

1) Introduction

The ways that research findings and interpretations are communicated has been undergoing significant changes in recent decades as a result of the postmodern critique of the representational neutrality of social science research; epistemological challenges to traditional dissemination forms; and the broadening social, cultural, political, and pedagogical concerns of education researchers, among other factors (Voithofer, 2005). As a result of these changes, the discourses that define what it means to be a scholar, educator, student, or researcher have shifted and continue to be in motion. According to Voithofer (2005):

the portrayal of this movement demands evolving forms of representation…Arts-based researchers in education have worked at the borders of academic, aesthetic, and representational design resources in order to connect the embodied and emotional experiences of learning with larger social and cultural contexts…One illustration of this can be seen in developing theories about how to design the representation of voice through multiple media. Voice can be described as a channel of communication that personalizes and contextualizes the representation of verbal, textual, and mediated information in space and time (i.e., embodies it). Using descriptors such as tone, volume,
pitch, silence, cadence, rhythm, inflection, expressiveness, and emotion, the design of the representation of voice presents a unique opportunity for new media researchers (p. 9-10).

Auto/ethnography and performance offer illustrations of how the approach in research and the scope and nature of research resources can guide the design of voice in new media. With its origins in the crisis of representation in anthropology, auto/ethnography is attentive to situating the researcher’s voice among those that are relevant to the evolution of a study, including participant, reviewer, editor, and reader voices (Voithofer, 2005). Informed by “research on oral and personal narratives in performance and communication studies, situating the socio-politically inscribed body as a central site of meaning” (Spry, 2001, p. 710), auto/ethnography is one way for new media researchers to situate technotexts in time and space (Voithofer, 2005).

1) Curiosity and courage

My mindset has prioritized curiosity as I have collected and read a wide range of literature and other data during the process of inquiry. I have always been asking—what’s out there, and what’s in here? Curiosity is what best describes the nature of my approach to literature in the scholarly domain. But, the selection, inclusion, and use of literary and other sources data in my inquiry are not necessarily random, nor are my impressions or decisions determined a priori. My approach has given no preconceived or predetermined position of privilege to a text-based or any other source; each artifact and idea is initially treated as a source of data, with all sources being considered as equals at the outset. This approach recognizes that
important connections can emerge by surprise, and that resonant meaning is not necessarily guaranteed by strategic planning. This is an emergent study, one that does not set out to test an existing theory *per se*; so it is not known at the outset which sources of data will eventually (or will not) turn out to be relevant to the inquiry. In some cases, an important connection and meaning can be drawn upon from a first reading or encounter; in other cases, tiny or substantive yet rich systemic connections and meanings emerge over time; while in other cases there will be promising sources that make no significant impact upon my emerging understanding about the problem and therefore are not further considered. I consider this to be an open approach to inquiry.

As *curiosity* describes my approach to the collection and interpretation of data (described in further detail in Chapter 2), *courage* describes my methodological approach to this dissertation. Courage is a personal, psychological, spiritual, and essential virtue that guides my method of inquiry, including my willingness to be informed through systemic connections that are not imitative of conventional understanding. Expressed in a personalized way, I submit my thoughts in prose:

**Courage (by Anthony Collins)**

Forward movement through an onslaught of obfuscation, resistance and doubt

Overcoming the anxious ambience of existential nothingness

Thriving in an uncharted forest where there are no well-worn paths.

This chapter describes my methods and methodology, including my courageous commitment to inquiry through auto/ethnographic writing has facilitated expression in its many forms---physical, moral, social, creative. The assertion of courage is what makes possible the emergence
of other virtues such as honesty, integrity, commitment, and diligence (May, 1975). The word, courage, comes from the same stem as the French word, ‘coeur’, that signifies ‘heart’. Courage is not necessarily the absence of fear, but is a heartfelt action in the face of adversity, based upon one’s beliefs, values, principles, or morals. Curiosity and courage are two virtues that describe my approach and method of inquiry.

2) An auto/ethnographic approach to inquiry

I am a participant and observer in this research, seeking to understand the convergence of personal experience with explanatory context that emerges from others. Systemic connections, sources of fact, truth, aesthetic beauty, or any other descriptive category of data are non-predictable in their origin and can emerge from anywhere, including the self. Quantum physics teaches about the impossibility of separating the manner in which a phenomenon is explained from the personal equation of the experimenter, the self, who has informed the explanation (Wheatley, 1999). Denzin and Lincoln (2000) write:

> various labels define the qualitative research process including theory, analysis, ontology, epistemology, and methodology. Behind these terms stands the personal biography of the researcher, who (knowingly or unknowingly) speaks from a particular class, gender, racial, cultural, and ethnic community perspective (p. 29).

Using the self as the central or sole point of inquiry can be described as an alternative perspective about scholarly inquiry, an approach that is diametrically opposite to conventional norms (Tierney, 1998, p. 66).
Scholars are regularly advised to keep self and any trace of emotions out of their scholarly work because this is viewed as compromising the credibility of the work and the scholar. Up to the present time, the conventional approach is to present a logical progression of knowledge and opinions through evidence and systematic thought, carefully following an introduction-body-conclusion template, albeit without any expression of emotion. In this light, Charmaz and Mitchell (1997) argue that scholarly writers are expected to stay on the sidelines and keep their voices out of their writings—“the proper voice is no voice at all” (p. 194). From the alternative perspective, scholars argue that the techniques and criteria used in the conventional approach to ensure reliability, validity and other verification measures should be questioned; and that judgment about alternative forms of scholarship activity, including work in the field of film and digital media, should not necessarily the based upon traditional criteria used to judge qualitative investigations (Holt, 2003; Garratt and Hodkinson, 1999; Sparks, 2000; Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson and Spiers, 2002).

Auto/ethnography is a method and philosophical perspective that prioritizes knowing about self, while also allowing for the recognition of other people's thoughts and experiences. Reed-Danahay (1997) explains the interconnection and meaning of auto/ethnography as a composite term: auto (self), ethno (culture), graphy (the research process), and suggests that auto/ethnography transcends the dichotomy of self and social group, the self/society split, and constitutes a form of writing that is simultaneously about one’s societal group and one’s self. Auto/ethnography is a qualitative approach to research inquiry that synthesizes ethnography and autobiography, reflecting a postmodern tendency to position the self and subjectivity in relation to what is being studied. Auto/ethnography calls into question the purported objectivity of conventional methods because it enables a confrontation with dominant forms of representation.
and power in an attempt to reclaim, through self-reflective response, representational spaces that have marginalized those of us at the borders (Reed-Danahay, 1997, Chang, 2008; Van Maanen, 1988). Auto/ethnography is a personalized, evocative and first-person form of scholarly writing that connects, represents and uses the dual aspects of person/self within a cultural and social context, but also allows for an array of emotions and self-conscious reflections to emerge and be revealed (Holt, 2003). Auto/ethnography is an authentic, boundary-crossing approach for conveying the multiple natures of self-hood and opens up a new way of writing about social life, one that is based upon the assumption that the insider’s voice and perspective is more true than that of the outsider (Reed-Danahay, 1997, Chang, 2008; Van Maanen, 1988).

I am writing from my personal perspective as I locate my self within a social, cultural and intellectual milieu. Richardson (1995) has given a special name to the specific approach of writing and inquiry that I intend to use---a ‘writing story’. What has motivated me to expend so much effort toward a writing story, writing with the use of proprioceptive methods (Metcalf and Tobin, 2002), confessional, impressionistic, auto/ethnographic way? Of what value or merit or difference is this personalized approach to my scholarly activities, in contrast to any other approach? Knowledge and reflection about self as the sole source of data remains an off limits and no-go area for inquiry in academic contexts, with scant chance of recognition---and very likely to generate skepticism and controversy---so why bother taking such a risk when recognition and reward are unlikely? Is the intrinsic reward guaranteed and enticing? On the other hand, what is so offensive, un-scholarly and problematic about using self as the focal point for inquiry? How is it possible to move forward by writing in a scholarly way while remaining true to an introspective self? Can scholarly writing be meaningful, expressive and defiant in the face of the hegemonic ethic to conform, verify, and assent to the status quo? As is now obvious,
I am keen to follow a problem-posing model as my mind is bursting with thoughts and lines of inquiry (Freire, 1998). Therefore, I have followed an auto/ethnographic approach for inquiry and expression, through my own writing story.

I am not intending to denigrate the value of conventional scholarship with its various approaches and methods; but I do intend to clear a pathway that facilitates the recognition of a new approach and method for scholarly work. In contrast to the traditional and conventional approach that emphasizes empirical truth, I have employed a personalized and self-reflective approach in my scholarly writing. I am imagining and seeking a form of expressive writing that is open to more than one authority, one that is not so reliant upon claims of absolute correctness or insistent upon canonical subservience to authority in order to justify its interpretive stance. I have sought a way to articulate my knowledge and awareness through a form of storytelling, in a semi-formal way that would be expected of a doctoral dissertation, yet in a way that also reflects or expresses my thoughts, feelings and perceptions. I am seeking and am requiring a new form of writing, one that is less reliant upon the hegemony of conventional expectations (van Maanen, 1988, 1990).

As a painter uses various materials---oils, brushes and a canvas---to convey what is known, seen, heard, sensed, or felt, I intend to express myself through words, metaphors, phrasing, imagery, and most critically, the expansive recall of personal experiences (Van Maanen, 1988). Van Maanen (1988) has shown that “confessional and impressionistic tales” are comparative with the “necessarily imaginative” form of highly personalized, innovative, unposed and figurative paintings labeled as “impressionist” that emerged in the West during the late 19th and early 20th centuries (p. 101-102). Using this analogy, as an auto/ethnographic writer and through my use of an auto/ethnographic approach, I am producing an impressionistic and
confessional writing story that personalizes and represents my perceptions, interpretations, and recollections while extending the scope of inquiry and reflection to include various other methods for critical analysis and qualitative scholarly inquiry as the need and circumstance arises—phenomenological, semiotic, symbolic, linguistic, semantic, literary, grounded, textual, philosophical, and hermeneutic (van Maanen, 1988).

A personalized work can be considered valid as a form of scholarship if it evokes in the reader a feeling that the experience is authentic, believable, and possible (Ellis, 1995). An auto/ethnographic approach to scholarly writing and reflection, one method within a myriad of personalized approaches and methods, is intended for the building of knowledge and the conveyance of understanding. The approach of auto/ethnography has provided a means to address the scope and nature of issues relating to my inquiry in this dissertation, but magnifies the potential for problems that can be expected when one shifts research methods away from convention and more towards a personalized approach. The traditional and conventional expectation for objectivity is perceived to be unmet because auto/ethnography is a value-laden approach located a zenith point away from such the norm. Auto/ethnography can be loosely, yet accurately, labeled as a qualitative research method, and I have opted to tell my story by using a qualitative and personalized approach, distinct from quantitative methods because it requires a close look at everyday life of the self, as I inhabit the borders within my social and professional milieu.

3) Doubts about auto/ethnography

Doubts have been raised about auto/ethnography, including whether or not it is a proper form of scholarship action, and whether or not it is convincing authentic or worthwhile (van
Maanen, 1988). Auto/ethnographies have been described as being touchy-feely, self-indulgent, too introspective, too narcissistic, insufficiently theoretical, and not properly grounded to be credibly considered as a form of scholarly writing (Holt, 2003; Coffey, 1999; Sparkes, 2002). The ethnographic approach has been characterized by intellectual restlessness, uncertainty and discomfort as the practitioner occupies:

…a literary borderland somewhere between writers who reach for very general audiences and those who reach for a specialized few. To the generalists, ethnography often seems pinched and inelegant, its standards stiff and restrictive. To the specialists, the same writing may seem imprecise and unfocused, its standards loose and unfathomable. Versions of these borderland skirmishes are played out within ethnographic circles as well (van Maanen, 1988 pp. ix-xi).

These criticisms provide political justification for the marginalization of auto-ethnographic writing and other forms of unconventional scholarship.

Even within the general field of ethnography itself, its own practitioners have represented themselves as marginal natives (Freilich, 1970), or professional strangers (Agar, 1980) who, as self-reliant loners (Lofland, 1974) or self-denying emissaries (Boon, 1982) who work to bring forth their ethnographic accounts in writing (von Maanen, 1988). Doubts have been raised in what has been regarded as the:

…excess of anti-methodological, ‘anything goes’, romantic postmodernism that is associated with qualitative research methods such as auto-ethnographic writing, with assertions that the results are more fiction than fact, not in accord with facts, low quality, stereotypical and too close to common sense to be constituted as credible research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000 p. 13).
Holt (2003) has written an auto/ethnographic essay that illustrates the problems facing auto/ethnographic writing in an academic setting. Some sections of his paper include a dialogue between himself and two reviewers of a research paper that he has written in auto/ethnographic style—the reviewer is actually a composite version of several reviewers of his work as he attempted to get his work published (excerpted):

Reviewer: It is generally not wise to conduct a study of self… It would be difficult to classify this manuscript as ‘true’ research even after a revision.

Holt: The genre of auto/ethnography is based on, and designed for, the use of self. Without the self there could be no auto/ethnography. You are dismissing the entire methodology rather than critiquing this particular investigation…

Reviewer: Certain scientific tenets must be adhered to. The manuscript should be grounded within a theoretical framework. We cannot publish good stories in an academic journal. Methodological procedures and data analysis must be clearly explained and supported with references. You failed to comply with these demands in such a manner that your work could be replicated.

Holt: How could someone else replicate work based upon my personal experience?

Reviewer: That is exactly why this material is not of publishable quality!

The dialogue sequence by Holt (2003) demonstrates the gap that exists in traditional academia, between acceptance and alienation, for the practice and practitioners of auto/ethnographic writing. The gap is rooted in the perception that theoretical concepts are not reliably emergent or apparent in a writing story of self, and that auto/ethnographic writing does not enhance the rigor of qualitative investigation (Holt, 2003).
4) Reflecting upon auto/ethnography as a method of writing

As an auto/ethnographic writer I am engaged in a process of remembering, reflecting, and expressing. As discussed in Chapter 1, perceptions and memories of phenomena in my life are the outcomes of pattern recognition by the brain. Auto/ethnographic writing is a form of creative expression from a scholarly perspective, albeit with a different point of view and unique form of representation than a conventional qualitative and quantitative approach. What is auto/ethnographic is original, personal and arguably categorized as scholarly; but it also must be asked, why is artistic, scholarly or professional, by faculty in the field of film and digital media not openly recognized and accepted as scholarly work in higher education? What does creativity have to do with scholarly work, if anything? The common view is that creativity is antithetical to traditional conventional notions of what is expected in the process and output of scientific research, representing a perilous venture into the realm of subjectivity. Creativity is commonly perceived as a mysterious gift that is only bestowed to a chosen few, like Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Mark Twain, or Pablo Picasso, and not a characteristic of the neo-realist ontology. I hold a different view, one that advocates creativity can be related to scholarly work, and is skill that can be learned, nurtured and improved.

All written descriptions can be described as forms of interpretation about what is known, and in this way my auto/ethnographic writing can be described as a way that I write, interpret and express what I have learned in a scholarly yet personalized way. Auto/ethnographic writing is used primarily when research inquiry intends to discern the primacy of self, personal feelings, attitudes and perceptions within the contexts of an external phenomenon or situation. In the case of my dissertation, the phenomenon or situation is the process of evaluating faculty performance that appears film and digital media. My use of an auto/ethnographic approach in writing is
descriptive, fictional and experiential. It is a written gathering of observations, conversations or written interviews; and an artistic work that constitutes the basis of my inquiry and research. It has always been done with a primary aim to determine what is the meaning and essence of involvement for the individual who is experiencing the situation under study. The main assumption in auto/ethnography is that writing is a philosophical approach and method that contains an essence of truth, and that reflective writing and its emerging meaning are the data. From the perspective of auto/ethnographic inquiry, my intention is to learn from my first-hand experiences as I have faced the power structures and linear systems of academic institutions. Participants in this project have also undergone the process of applying for promotion of academic rank on the basis of creative work in film, video and/or digital media---and my work describes and analyzes the significance of our experiences, prejudices, historical contexts, and other understandings that are emergent.

My auto/ethnographic writing story is intended to demonstrate to myself, and to any reader with an inclination to read my work, that I am able to produce, in writing, an evocative auto/ethnographic account about my personal knowledge, understanding, experiences, perceptions, feelings and inclinations that are emerging and present in my life at this time---as a doctoral student deeply immersed in the process of dissertation research and writing, as a practicing filmmaker and artist working on the margins of the profession, and as a full-time professor in a college of fine arts and design in the Arabian Gulf, not to mention a husband and father of three children, ages 16, 14, and 6. In essence, I am a person experiencing the push and pull of life forces while seeking deeper levels of knowledge and awareness, hoping to facilitate greater intrinsic motivation for future action. As a professional in higher education, I seek meaningful acknowledgement and recognition in my workplace; as an artist-filmmaker-scholar I
seek more knowledge, skill and understanding that empowers productivity, change, future action and new possibilities for creative expression; and as a man I seek seeking a lasting sense of well being in life. Such a tall order cannot be realized or satisfied with just one project, but I am focusing this paper upon my interest in auto/ethnographic writing and exploring its relevance and usefulness as I complete my writing story and the process of work on my doctoral dissertation.

The conventional expected outcome for scholarly research is the discovery of empirical evidence that supports a conclusion. Empiricism as a value indicator does not fit or rightly describe my theoretical and personal intermix of postmodern sensibilities, is not consistent with my personal approach to the literature (and the topic), nor does it accurately describe the scope and nature of how artistic, scholarly or professional work in the field of film and digital media is realized. “Modern empirical methods in the social and educational sciences are largely predicated on the eye as giving truth” (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 20). And yet, as Fischman (2001) notes, education research has, by and large, eschewed the study (and corresponding epistemological debates) surrounding visual culture. This paradox has led to research methodologies that translate visuals into text (e.g., through coding), while generally avoiding the study of the perception and reception of visual culture and downplaying the epistemological consequences of word–image relationships in both the collection of data and the reporting of research results (Voithofer, 2005). As quantitative methods make perceptions, opinions, attitudes, and thoughts visible through statistics, and qualitative methods engage in naturalistic studies of human processes that are directly visible through the eye, “looking, seeing and knowing have become perilously intertwined” (Jenks, 1995, p. 1).

In contrast to empiricism, as a filmmaker and a doctoral dissertation scholar, or scholarly scriptor (Barthes, 1977), I openly strive to imagine alternative conclusions and unstructured
perspectives, a diversity of conclusions, departing from the tautologies of circular logic that are inherent to the traditions and conventions of empiricism. I do not automatically assume the future will be like the past, nor do I believe that what was known yesterday will be the same as I what I know today, or what I will know tomorrow will mirror what I knew before. When watching a film or any time-based work in digital media, as in other expressive form of output, the viewer is not just a consumer of a pre-determined, unilateral message. Meaning is connoted and denoted in the mind of each viewer/audience member, and the film adds or detracts from the notions that the viewer has created (Barthes, 1977; Moriarty, 1991). My writing expects that the reader will make meanings that diverge from mine---a writerly approach, in contrast to writing that is intended to be a unilateral voice---a readerly approach (Barthes, 1977). My approach in this inquiry has been qualitative rather than quantitative, deductive rather than empirical, writerly rather than readerly.
Part 3: Interpretation, limitations and the future

Part 3 is divided into three main sections:

1) Data Analysis and Synthesis
2) Limitations
3) Future possibilities

1) Data Analysis and Synthesis

Upon receiving consent from participants (Appendix B), I transcribed data from the survey (Appendix C), then proceeded to code, describe, analyze and interpret the emergent data. Data from the initial and subsequent interviews was transcribed and coded into themes that described my understanding of the data. Data was transcribed from the questionnaires and was used to determine the need and scope that informs subsequent in person interview questions. Subsequently, new and better questions continued to emerge from the response(s) given in the survey, and when that happened the respondent was re-contacted for their further input. Through a synthesis of data by means of various research methods, I integrated and accounted for diverse views, with the intention of improving the existing systems for evaluating diverse forms of research---for my personal benefit and the improvement of the problem situation (McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead, 1996).

2) Limitations

There are some obvious limitations in this study.

- First, I am limiting the interviews (Survey, Appendix C) for this study to faculty members who have sought or will seek promotion of rank and other rewards at institutions of higher learning. I have no ability to contact every single academic faculty member worldwide in the field of film and digital media, past and present, so I have to
believe that the 300+ faculty members I did contact, with 13 respondents, suffices as a representative number for a useful analysis.

- Second, I have chosen to focus upon faculty in the field of film and digital media at academic institutions of higher learning. An opportunity for future research exists, perhaps motivated by this dissertation, to examine the process, problems and challenges of performance evaluation in other disciplines in fine arts such as painting, musical performance, performance art, creative writing and poetry, theater arts and many other fields where faculty may be producing scholarly work that is not text-based in nature; but in this dissertation I am focused only upon the problem of performance evaluation for faculty in the field of film and digital media.

- Third, I have chosen to focus upon faculty who submit films, videos and/or digital media work in their dossier for performance evaluation in teaching, research or service.

- A fourth problem that affected the way research was conducted is the fact that I am located in the United Arab Emirates, far away from most of the participants in this project. I have had to rely upon email as my primary means of information gathering and communication. Therefore, a limitation could be perceived that my access to a pool of potential respondents was limited to asynchronous contact in writing, and determined by the respondent’s (un-) willingness to access/respond to email messages and apply their internet skills to respond to the survey. I reasonably assumed that a representative high percentage of the specific population that I was studying (faculty in the field of film and digital media) have adequate access to a computer with email capability, and that a reasonable number would take the time to check their email and provide an online response to the survey.
The use of asynchronous internet-email based electronic interviewing as the sole means of information gathering might be perceived in a traditional and conventional context as a limitation, although I view it as a relatively quick and low-cost option. It does eliminate the dimension of face-to-face interaction with the nuanced reading of non-verbal behavior and expression. The rapport and emergent relationship that is formed through electronic means is arguably and potentially more superficial and difficult to establish, in comparison with personal contact, and there is an ever-present risk of misunderstanding, mendacity, or misrepresentation by all concerned parties, plus electronic interviewing can not fully ensure that anonymity will not be breached. On the other hand, Schaefer and Dillman (1998) found that email surveys achieved response rates similar to those of mail surveys but yielded better quality data in terms of completion and more detailed response to open-ended questions.

The focus of my dissertation is a restricted one, tied to a problem situation that has been framed in the opening paragraphs as the research problem and research question, and limited in the ways that are above-listed, with the particular problem more or less resolved by the conclusion. As described at the outset of this chapter, this notion of a conclusion reflects a conventional realist practice of textual organization. By framing the representation in such a fashion, closure of the materials can be claimed. Closure is itself an argument that subsumes knowledge to be verifiable, replicable and certain. Yet if I leave the issues raised in this dissertation without a determined resolution, up in the air, ambiguous, or in some other state of uncertainty, the reader would probably be disturbed and such an approach might undermine the authority of my work (Van Maanen, 1993).
Traditionally, shorthand terminologies such as validity, reliability, trustworthiness, and triangulation have been used in support of parsimony in the reporting of research. But as I have reflected and integrated multiple (media) data sources and mixed methodologies into this project, I have needed to be more explicit than reflective in reporting the process of data abstraction in the transition to text-based dissemination. Pink’s (2001) call for new discourses to represent visual data raises the question of how to develop non-reductive languages for the abstraction of multiple media data that do not conflate seeing with knowing (Voithofer, 2005; Jenks, 1995). Exploring the limits of visual culture through aesthetic techniques such as video editing is one possible response to this question. Another possibility would be to develop a vocabulary of metaphors related to new media characteristics.

3) Future possibilities

After publication of this completed dissertation, I will be able to follow-up on program implementation possibilities in many universities, using appropriate action-oriented approaches for participant ownership and organizational change. Further, it is my intention to demonstrate how the process of documentary filmmaking and digital media production for social development, a particular kind of filmmaking practice, can exemplify all of the action research cycles to a credible degree that should be recognized during faculty performance evaluation.
Part 4: Summary

When compelled to label the approach of my inquiry, I argue that it falls under the umbrella of qualitative methods, in comparison with quantitative methods. I would also argue that faculty work in film and digital media should also be labeled as a form of qualitative inquiry. The output is not text-based publication, but the approach to inquiry is relatively consistent with a qualitative approach.

I have used a range of relevant methods for inquiry and analysis, enabling me to move forward to develop a new theory and tangible written model that can be used to improve existing practice. Also, I have deconstructed conventional notions of what constitutes scholarship and professional work, for the purpose of locating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media within the continuum of academic scholarship. My overarching purpose is to benefit faculty members in the field of film and digital media in academic institutions of higher learning, facilitating change in the ways that artistic, scholarly, and professional work is recognized and evaluated during a performance evaluation.
Chapter 4: FINDINGS

Chapter 4 is divided into five main parts.
1) Overview
2) From an auto/ethnographic perspective
3) Thematic analysis
4) Other Considerations
5) Summary

Part 1: Overview

This chapter is an account of data that has emerged from research. Findings in this chapter have emerged from observations, experiential accounts, interviews, surveys and readings. There is no singular way to present the findings because my approach to inquiry has been rooted in qualitative methods. The term, findings, most closely relates to quantitative methods, where findings are data intentionally separated from any trace of interpretation. A qualitative approach prioritizes interpretation as inherent to the purpose and process of research and inquiry. In conventional and traditional qualitative studies, findings are typically represented as patterns or themes that have emerged from collected data; structured and grouped (subjectively) according to the perceived significance of what has been collected.

In a typical qualitative study, the presentation of findings depends significantly upon the approach of the research. Interpretation and subjectivity are relatively unavoidable and implicit in the qualitative research findings of this dissertation because my inquiry largely involved the reading of scholarly literature written by others, the self-reflective practice of personalized writing, and analysis of phenomenological writings by others. The majority of my interpretive analysis occurs in Chapter 5, although there are some interpretations and contextualizing that occur in this chapter. I believe it is impossible to dispassionately convey data findings in this chapter, although I inject my own opinions a minimum of times. As described in Chapter 3, I have used four different approaches in my inquiry to facilitate these findings:
• Auto-ethnographic writing was used to describe and reflect upon my experience as a faculty member in the field of film and digital media, and upon my knowledge and experience as a professional filmmaker, in light of the research problem and research question posed for inquiry in this dissertation.

• Qualitative research of relevant literature was used to discover theoretical perspectives concerning the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in higher education, and in the specific field of film and digital media. There was no precise match between my research question and an answer, nor did I ever expect one.

• Because there was no particular source that was completely relevant in all ways, meaning that no single source had all the answers to the questions that I am raising, my standard was one of presumed relevance. Presumed relevance is an open approach that freed me from the need for opaque answers, correctness, or authority; my open approach to the literature can be described as a quest for trustworthy information that enabled systemic connections to emerge — not trustworthy in the sense of correctness, popularity, or authority.

• Surveys (online) were used to collect qualitative and quantitative data from faculty members in the field of film and digital media, relevant to the research problem and research question.

• Phenomenological interviews were used to collect narrative data about the thoughts and feelings of faculty members who have experienced a performance evaluation process in a higher education setting.
Part 2: From an auto/ethnographic perspective

As I sit in an allegorical forest I am safe and protected with the sound of my own voice. I am also nourished by the power of listening to what is around me. The energy of so many sounds intermingles like a timeless carpet of sonic colors, inside and outside of myself. The sounds can seem meaningless, random, cacophonous and incomprehensible in complexity, but my heart and mind become absorbed, even transformed, as I listen. I can choose to listen inwardly or outwardly to the wholeness that is formed by the myriad of sounds, or to the careful selection of a particular sound that is moving within the whole body of sounds.

Meditation on inner and outer sounds is calming. It brings my self to deeper realms of thought, feeling and a sense of knowing. As I sit here, linking my voice, thoughts, breath, and awareness, I enhance my appreciation of the power and problems of life, humbled by what is outside of my self and also by that which is within my own being. The layered sounds of the allegorical forest are capacious to an extent that is beyond what I can know. The wild sounds and tones of the forest are a reticulum of secret languages, replete with bio-social, bio-chemical, electromagnetic and spiritual meaning---and so much more---a world of information and meanings that have not yet been noticed or decrypted by me, and possibly not by other humans either---so their uniqueness invisibly passes by; but its parts might still be within my reach, yet as a whole it goes unnoticed in its significance and uniqueness.

What is being communicated, what is out there that I have not yet deciphered? Unlike human beings, animals such as rats, monkeys or cobras are immersed in their world and probably do not reflect upon it. Animals live their lives in each moment, but are not able to transcend that setting. It is generally agreed that many kinds of animals can hear, interpret and communicate expressively, even with the use of elaborate codes and calls, and might possibly also be able to
think in sentences; but humans are comforted by a sense of probably being the only creatures with communication skills based upon real syntax; and the only ones possessing an inclination for expression through art. It is argued by scholars that one important distinction between humankind and animals (i.e. rats, monkeys, cobras, etc) is their lack of a theory of mind; the recognition that others have thoughts that are distinct from my own thoughts, and vice versa. I speculate that baboons or ostriches or pythons or rats, probably do not worry or know about what other baboons or ostriches or pythons or rats know; and it is not clear to me that other animals possess a sustained urge to share or distinguish their individualized knowledge. I can cautiously conclude that ostriches or baboons or pythons or rats differ from humankind in a large percentage of ways---but I do find that animals and humans share a curious range of similarities, such as in the ways that social hierarchies and interests are protected and sustained.

Because I am human, I have learned to form and link symbols and sounds in a formalized language that is loaded with underlying and interconnected meanings; and as a human I exhibit a specific intention and desire to share thoughts and knowledge. As an artist and scholar, I have carefully listened to the harmony and the cacophony of the allegorical forest; reflecting, revealing, and expressing my conscious awareness of an exposed outer reality and an emerging sense of my inner life. The process of reflecting upon the ideas of others, in literature and in interviews, has deepened my understanding and ability to articulate about what is my experience, my knowledge, feelings and response. Reflective inquiry has uncovered the illogic associated with the ways that work by faculty in the field of film and digital media is being recognized and evaluated in higher education settings according to the traditional template, and from this perspective I begin my analysis.
Part 3: Thematic analysis

Six themes have emerged from data and are presented herein as findings:

Theme 1: Marginalized by a monolith of tradition and convention
Theme 2: The internal mobility of faculty
Theme 3: Attributes of faculty evaluation systems
Theme 4: The nature of faculty work in film and digital media
Theme 5: The evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media
Theme 6: Post evaluation considerations

These themes have emerged from a broad range of data and expose fundamental problems for faculty in the field of film and digital media as they face the gauntlet of performance evaluation. Each section of Part 3 represents a theme of significance that emerged from the literature, from the survey and interviews, and from my self as an on observer and participant in this study. A theme of significance connotes pervasiveness in a broad range of the literature, or that a large percentage of participants in the survey gave the same or very close responses, or that my own observation compelled a particular perspective about the problem situation—all of which are examined in relation to the research problem and research question posed in this dissertation.

Data has confirmed that the research problem—that artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media is not being adequately recognized or rewarded as scholarship—is prevalent and seriously jeopardizing the careers of faculty members. The research question is—what work and activities by faculty in film and digital media should be recognized and rewarded as scholarship during a performance evaluation in an academic setting? The following sections are an analysis of each of the six themes in relation to the research problem and research question.
**Theme 1: Marginalized by a monolith of tradition and convention**

Data supports the argument that artistic, scholarly and professional work by individual faculty in the field of film and digital media is not fairly or fully recognized because performance evaluation systems are too narrowly focused upon the priority of text-based publication and scientific research; and many performance evaluations are being framed by vague, unwritten or improvised criteria. As stated in the research problem and discussed throughout this dissertation, in higher education settings there is a trilogy of expectations for faculty work and a traditional template that measures faculty performance; and these criteria do not openly or adequately allow for the recognition or evaluation of alternative forms of research method or output, such as those common to the field of film and digital media. Consensus does not exist about the scope and nature of what constitutes research; or about the criteria to be used for defining, evaluating and rewarding faculty scholarship within the arts and other creative disciplines.

As discussed from historical and theoretical perspectives in Chapter 1, the trilogy and the template of expectations pervade and are strongly intact in higher education, yet a wide gap has opened and revealed inconsistencies that have marginalized faculty in the field of film and digital media from their peers in other, more conventional disciplines. Data in this chapter demonstrates that Boyer’s (1990) tolerant and inclusive view of scholarship and scholarly work by faculty is not commonly known by faculty in the field of film and digital media, thus not broadly advocated as their theoretical starting point in the struggle for change. In the basic economic terms of dollars and cents, one professor wrote, “those teaching film and video production are paid 90% of the salaries of those teaching film theory and criticism” (Respondent #4). A discrepancy in salary is just the tip of the iceberg that constitutes the problem.
One explanation that emerged from data that can be viewed as a contributing factor in the marginalization experienced by faculty in the field of film and digital media is their lack of seniority, matched with a corresponding lack of influence within the institutional power systems. One professor wrote:

…film theory, history and criticism entered Academy curricula in the 1970s. By contrast, more expensive programs in film production could be found only in a few schools (mainly in New York and California) before about 1987. Faculty teaching production, therefore, tend to be younger (and thus, on a lower rung of tenure's ladder) than their theory-teaching colleagues. The resulting hierarchy means production faculty are often minor players in defining the forms (and venues of peer review) of their own scholarly work (Respondent #4).

Data confirms a perceived inequality in status for hands-on, production faculty in the field of film and digital media, in comparison with those others who teach theory courses (the more conventional approach to classroom learning).

Literature has confirmed that a problem of unequal status is not solely unique to faculty in the field of film and digital media, as it exists among faculty throughout higher education. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) describe a “crisis of purpose” in colleges and universities as the mission of higher education has become increasingly skewed toward the priority of theoretical (text-based) research over other forms of scholarly work, such as artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media (p. viii). When faculty perceive that they are being marginalized in the hierarchy of power and influence, or that their intrinsically motivated work will not be recognized and that extrinsic rewards might not be reachable, their energies could be diverted away from types of research and creative work that do not fall neatly and
safely within the strictures of the traditional template---leading to an overall drop in productivity and a dissipation of energy (La Pelle, 1997). The academy has witnessed a decreasing level of publication productivity by faculty over the past few decades, and Boyer (1990) reports that 41 percent of faculty members have never published an article, monograph or book during their academic careers (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002).

Marginalization that is experienced by faculty members in the field of film and digital media production can be discerned in my own story. Applying for a promotion of rank was a frustrating and unsuccessful experience for me because the process was blatantly unfair. It was conducted non-transparently behind closed doors, based upon preconceived and unwritten criteria while being performed by colleagues with no knowledge or experience with alternative forms of faculty scholarship output. Despite ten years of positive evaluations for teaching, research and service at that university, and despite the fact that my work in the field of film and digital media had been internationally recognized and successful for its intended purposes (television broadcast, corporate client, commercial promotion, artistic expression), the inner circle of evaluators from outside my field but within my workplace responded by not changing their rigid and unbending old ways of thinking about what constitutes research and how its output should appear. Films and digital media were not considered, recognized or to be rewarded as research, period, by those who do more conventional forms of research activities. In that workplace, creative work is held up for scrutiny against a model that pertains strictly to written, text-based publications and scientific methods of inquiry. There were no written or specific criteria that remotely pertained to the creation or evaluation of work in video, film or any other form of art, and the university committee that was evaluating faculty work for promotion was composed of engineers, chemists and others who had zero knowledge about the
worth, process, purpose or nature of artistic work in my field. The inner circle of scrutinizers continue to have a very narrow idea of what constitutes research and faculty work (or what does not!), and filmmaking and its related fields are not on their list of what is or can be allowed. I thought my situation and my place of employment were uniquely awful, but then through rigorous inquiry I discovered that many others had similarly difficult experiences at other universities. Needless to say no one at my place of employment will ever be promoted unless they do scientific research and get it published in a prestigious journal---and this rigid expectation is what constitutes the problem situation.

Referring to interview data from this dissertation about the marginalization of faculty in the technical (practice) areas within the field of film and digital media, in contrast to the theoretical or historical aspects of the field, a professor wrote:

Colleges with a narrow definition of the liberal arts are often uncomfortable with the fit of media production, because of its apparent reliance on technique. The discipline's steady update of hard- and software frequently requires its professors to attend classes or seek certification. Yet seldom are such classes credited to the scholar as continuing education or post-graduate work. Indeed they might be dismissed as mere vocational training (Respondent #4).

As every scholar knows, having one’s academic orientation and expertise described as vocational is dismissive, a big insult that implies a lower rung of scholarship within the walls of the ivory tower. The statement implies a theory-practice dichotomy, with an apparent elevated preference for theory over practice. The dichotomy is supported by the hierarchy of power in higher education and is enforced by traditional policies that have placed theory-makers above practitioners. In this context, I recall that in my own teaching load, I get only .66 credit hours for
teaching a studio practice-based class, while a theory-lecture class gets a full credit hour for each hour of teaching. A studio-based teacher has to teach 18 semester credit hours to constitute a full load, while a lecturer in a theory based class only has to teach 12 credit hours per semester. The result is a misunderstood, lower, and marginalized stature for faculty (and students) as they pursue the complex and ever-changing requirements for learning and professional practice in the field. To this same point, another professor adds:

I am not an artist but I am a scholar in a Faculty of Fine Arts that has specific tenure criteria that take into account different measures of productive work. The Faculty of Fine Arts has internal awards that are labeled "Research/Creation" and the rhetoric of research creation is one that recognizes that 'creative' work is a legitimate form of research. The downside to this is that some forms of 'creative' work (e.g., expressive, personal forms) are subtly undervalued…while more conceptual forms of art making are privileged (Respondent #6).

Any distinction that dictates a preference for one stylistic approach or form of creative work over another without any apparent rationale or justification imposes yet another variant form of marginalization and inequality, to the detriment of all faculty members.

A wide range of alternative approaches are observed in qualitative research, including (non-text) creative art forms (such as paintings, sculptures, musicianship, performance and in many others) are not deemed by the mainstream as scholarly work, are not recognized for their uniqueness and merits, and are not fairly evaluated for faculty rewards in many institutions of higher learning; nor has such work been firmly located upon the continuum of qualitative and quantitative research that was suggested by Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2007). There is even a wide range of writing output by faculty scholars in higher education that goes unrecognized as
scholarly work according to the traditional template, such as auto/ethnography, textbook writing or editing, journalistic writing in any form; scriptwriting, screenwriting or playwriting; grant proposal writing; poetic or a myriad other forms of creative, fiction or non-fiction writing; and many other forms of text-based publication. One faculty member, in reference to his particular problems with the performance evaluation process as a specialist faculty practitioner in screenwriting, wrote:

There are no formal criteria. I believe this is especially problematic for screenwriters. We have a dean who did not even understand that a script that was optioned actually earned money. The development process, as arcane and opaque as it may appear to us, is completely off the radar of most academics (Respondent #3).

As described in Chapter 2, the aggressiveness of Lorenz’s rats (1966) and the oppression as described by Friere (1998) are reflections of the marginalization, elitism and arbitrary withholding of status that are experienced by many faculty in the field of film and digital media, sustained and enforced by administrative policies---and the actions of peers.

The marginalization of work in film and digital media is not limited to the academy. Within the industry and business of filmmaking, the commercial enterprise of making films for broadcast, and in the distribution and public presentation, there is marginalization of some forms of work that are on the borders or outside of expected conventions. Dick (2006) has produced a feature length independent documentary film titled, This Film Is Not Yet Rated, about the Motion Picture Association of America’s (MPAA) rating system and its powerful yet insidious effect on American culture, business and filmmaking. As I have used an open approach to sources of data that inform this dissertation, Dick’s (2006) film and subsequent writings about his film have provided a useful analysis that is relevant to the research problem and question of
this dissertation—-it examines an example of what can happen in an insulated and non-transparent environment for evaluating creative work. The film is about the MPAA’s mandate to enforce self-regulatory censorship in the film industry, and the bureaucratic monolith that is commonly referred to as the Hollywood studio system. Dick’s (2006) film reveals that the MPAA is a secretive watchdog and gatekeeper that sustains the hegemony of the Hollywood studio system as a source of films worldwide. Bradshaw (2006), writing about Dick’s (2006) film, refers to the MPAA as:

…a bizarre institution: secretive, cantankerous and paranoid, high-handedly slapping certificates on movies ranging from G - all ages allowed - up to an R (under-17s need parent or guardian present) and then an R-17 (no under-17s allowed at all)…a commercial catastrophe for film-makers hoping to get their product out to the all-important youth market. The MPAA never discusses its reasoning, and never reveals the identities of its ‘raters’ or members of its absurdly pompous ‘appeals board’ which, in certain cases, will grandly condescend to reconsider its verdict, prior, in the vast majority of cases, to solemnly announcing that the original decision was correct.

The film’s director, Dick (2006) suggests an alternative to the existing MPAA rating evaluation system for motion pictures, and this alternative may have relevance to the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Dick (2006) states:

I personally would think that it’s really important that there be an extensive list of what’s in a film so that people could make a decision on their own, children and adults really, in terms of sex, violence, drug use, thematic content. I would like to see a rating between R and NC-17 where art filmmakers can make films that aren’t stigmatized. The process should be open. That won’t hurt anybody. There should be written standards and
certainly there should be some experts, child psychologists and media experts on the board. Everything they don’t want should be changed, really (Bradshaw, 2006, p. 1).

Theme 2: The internal mobility of faculty

What is tenure? What is a promotion? Tenure is a professor's permanent job contract, granted after a probationary period of six or seven years. Similar to the lifetime tenure that some judges enjoy as a protection from external pressures, academic tenure is intended to protect the academic freedom of faculty researchers, to give job security and to provide a sense of autonomy. It is associated with the two more senior faculty job titles, Associate Professor and Full Professor. One criticism of the tenure system in higher education is that it most often depends solely on research publications and research grants although the universities' official policies are that tenure depends on research, teaching and service (Boyer, 1990). Although tenure is an example of internal mobility for faculty, for the purposes of this dissertation, I am primarily focusing upon performance evaluation for the purpose of promotion of rank, although the relevance of this inquiry to the tenure review process is presumed to be significant.

Empirical evidence on internal mobility of workers in relation to performance evaluation processes, including the movement of faculty members within academic institutions, is scarce (Pergement and Veum, 1995). Seldin (2006) lists two primary reasons for evaluating faculty work and performance for the purpose of determining upward mobility within the workplace: 1) to improve performance and 2) to provide a rational and equitable basis for personnel decisions (Seldin, 2006). However, for the most part, literature will label the upward movement of workers within an organization with a generic term, a promotion, when in fact there is virtually no evidence about what a typical faculty member constitutes as a promotion. In many
organizations, including academic institutions, the notion of advancement and internal mobility by the means of promotion exists within a well-established organizational structure.

The conditions of employment such as wages, benefits, and an upwardly mobile work environment are extremely important aspects of any job; and most commonly it is observed that employees actively strive to work their way up the organizational career ladder. Employees learn to strive for promotion of rank and to seek its accompanied benefits as a sort of prize that is to be won, seeking an ever-upward position within the institutional hierarchy. Promotion is an organizational mechanism that hopes to motivate workers to work harder with the explicit and implicit promises of increased wages, receipt of training opportunities, greater supervisory responsibilities, more prestige and status, and greater job satisfaction. Most people commonly view their promotion to be a positive occurrence that is to be celebrated, as it indicates that the individual being promoted is successful, valuable, and useful (Pergement and Veum, 1995).

Pergement and Veum (1995) indicate that for most workers a promotion is *passive*, and this model applies to what is constituted as a promotion in an academic institution. Pergement and Veum (1995) list eight forms of promotion:

- A position upgrade;
- Taking over old supervisor’s job;
- Elevated to a higher level job in a different section;
- Chosen to fill a newly created position with greater responsibilities;
- A structural reorganization and was promoted;
- Receiving promotion but continued to perform the same duties as before;
- Lateral move to a different section; and
- Other
The notion of passivity is consistent with the nature of promotion for faculty in institutions of higher learning. Passivity infers that a promoted worker experiences no move to another position, but does enjoy increased benefits within the scope of a relatively similar position. If an actual position change were to be required for a promotion, then faculty members in higher education are not, by definition, being promoted at all. The consequences of the promotion process might be active---the promoted faculty member will be receiving increased wages, is more likely to be trained, is tasked to supervise other workers, and will possibly experience other changes more so than are non-promoted faculty members---but the promotion itself can be described as passive because faculty are simply being upgraded in title but not in the scope and nature of work; they are doing the same duties on the job (Pergement and Veum, 1995). The trilogy of expectations in teaching, research and service will remain intact, before and after a promotion is awarded.

The seemingly passive nature of expectations relating to the process of performance evaluation and promotion in higher education may be related to the notion of plateauing in the organizational behavior literature (Bardwick 1986). This concept usually refers to the plight of workers who, while not at the top of the job ladder, find that direct upward movements in the hierarchical ranks of the firm are not as frequent as desired (Pergement and Veum, 1995). Although faculty members in this study do not appear to be in dead end jobs and are not necessarily at plateau stages in their careers, data from the academic workplace shows that promotions usually do not involve moving to another position, but are simply upgrades of a current position or involve performing the same duties as before the promotion.

In an educational institution, like some other corporate or commercial organizations, the reward of promotion might be accompanied by a raise in pay, benefits, and responsibility, but
probably would not involve a change of job or position within the educational institution, as might be the case in a corporate or commercial setting. The organizational structure that renders decisions about promotion of rank in an educational institution is similar to the ranking system that is found in the military or in a fire department, and as such promotions are most accurately referred to as position upgrade with (possibly) an increase pay as adjusted according to a rigidly pre-determined scale. In an educational institution, a promotion is simply an upgrade of the current position and does not involve any significant change in duties. Unlike a corporate environment, an academic promotion does not usually allow the faculty to negotiate new terms of employment, such as a request for bonus pay, a bigger share of profits, a change in working hours or a bigger office. Promotion of rank in an educational institution usually does not involve any change in position or duties, and are simply an upgrade of the current position, although the job title changes from Assistant to Associate to Full Professor. Data shows that men are more likely to be promoted than women and whites more so than blacks or Hispanics (Pergement and Veum, 1995).

Data shows that success in a prior promotion application is an important determinant of future promotion, possibly demonstrating that promotion has a direct impact on job attachment. Ten of the thirteen faculty members who responded to the research survey for this project were successful in at least one previous application for promotion, with one faculty member “in the process of applying for promotion and awaiting a decision” (response to survey question # 11). Eight of the faculty respondents had successfully undergone a process of performance evaluation for promotion “more than one time” (question #5). Twelve of the thirteen respondents were submitting their application dossiers on the basis of a combination of creative and scholarly text-based work (survey question #6). It is noteworthy that 0% of faculty respondents to the survey
acknowledged a failed attempt for promotion or tenure. I must assume that at least one of the 300+ faculty members that were contacted had experienced a rejection or other failure in the gauntlet of promotion or tenure review, but no one with such experience responded to my survey. I have access to some data about failed attempts by faculty to secure promotion or tenure in court cases that have been appealed, and also by using my own experience as data.

Researchers in sociology, psychology, business and human resource management have written about the structure of the employment relationship, and the notion of a career or career management. The commonly held assumption is that mobility within an organization is successful (or not) in the context of compliance (or not) with a set of rules and guidelines that reflect the organization’s structure and nature of the employment relationship. The individual is compelled to fit within the organization’s structure, and not vice versa. Promotion is commonly presumed to based upon the firm's evaluation of the worker's productivity, although Asher (2007) writes:

A promotion is not a reward...Most people believe that getting promoted is a reward for past performance. This is absolutely false. Employers are not rewarding strong performers for their past contributions, they are investing in their future contributions. The sooner you grasp this fundamental truth, the closer you will be to getting promoted. So, no matter what you have done in the past, the boss really doesn’t care. What she cares about is what you can do for her (and the company) in your new position. Your past only serves as an indication of what you might do in the future, one piece of evidence, at best. It is only what you may do in the future that drives the promotion decision (p. 1).

Consequently, Asher (2007) raises the disturbing possibility that hiring, firing, retention and promotion are possibly based upon personal characteristics, upon qualities that are unquantifiable
such as potential ability, presumed dependability in performance, and personality attributes.

I cannot minimize or neglect the notion proposed by Asher (2007) that hiring, firing, retention and promotion are based upon unquantifiable, personal characteristics. I will apply my open approach to data and use the example of beauty contests to make my point. I recognize that my understanding of the problem and the emerging data is not completely saturated unless I venture into realms of scoring and evaluation for events like beauty contests, gymnastics competitions, show cat and show horse competitions, and other activities that attempt to objectify, measure, and reward abstract notions such as beauty and its ancillary qualities such as poise, talent, posture, and others. This is, of course, in contrast to something such as a hot dog eating contest---at least in that event it is clear that the winner is the eater who ate at the most. Activities and efforts that attempt to measure the beauty of a woman, or a weight lifting man, or a film or a horse illustrates the arbitrary and sub-conscious nature our decision-making processes that are in place as we attempt to measure the unquantifiable. It reinforces the idea of that a competitive evaluation of art work of any kind on the basis of merit, worth or norm is ludicrous and impossible. At the end of the day it is simply a matter of (learned) taste and (learned) thresholds of open or closed thinking.

**Theme 3: Attributes of faculty evaluation systems**

Theme 3 is sub-divided into ten thematic sub-sections (3a through 3j).

a) Facilitating intrinsic motivation and thriving on evaluation  
b) An inexact process  
c) Honesty is the best policy (unless you want to land in court)  
d) The importance of relevant criteria  
e) Criteria and the evaluation committee  
f) The role of supervisors and administrators  
g) The process of peer review: What is a peer review?  
h) The problems with peer review
i) Alternatives to traditional models of peer review
j) The non-teachable and evaluation

Developing a high-quality reward system at an institution of higher learning is “not a chance activity. It is must be developed over time through a process that actively involves faculty and administrative leaders” (Diamond, 1999 p. ix). The development and implementation of a thorough and well-planned reward system could lessen the likelihood of confusion as to priorities, roles, procedures, and requirements; and reduce the extra work, frustration, and poor decision making that can result from a poorly conceived system (Diamond, 1999). Theme 3 is a discussion of key elements from data to be included and considered as a faculty performance evaluation system is being developed at an institution of higher learning. Overall procedures and general statements from different programs or schools may have much in common, yet there are significant variations in terms of criteria used and the weight given to specific activities under consideration (Diamond, 1993b). Variations can be framed according to two fundamental issues:

- What is to be recognized and constituted as scholarly activity by faculty for institutional rewards (Boyer, 1990; Bukalski, 2000).
- What are the priorities and processes for evaluating scholarly activity by faculty for institutional rewards (Diamond, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c).

There is an overt and inextricable connection between these two fundamental issues. It would be counter-productive to separate the ontology of recognition from the ontology of evaluation. But how can differences, discrepancies and variations that are observed---from one faculty member to another within the same discipline, from institution to institution, and from department to department within the same institution---be reconciled? What can be done that represents an
a) Facilitating intrinsic motivation and thriving on evaluation

Some institutions appear to be doing a good job of facilitating a workplace environment that thrives of evaluation and facilitates intrinsic motivation, at least to a certain extent (La Pelle, 1997). One full professor wrote:

I believe we have an open and transparent process, and valuable mentoring throughout the process. Our faculty members come in with the expectation that they will be tenured; standards are high and clear; they are given a leave in their 4th year, as well as an extra course release in their first year, to ensure that they can do their research. There is substantial university-level mentoring as well (Respondent #2).

Some faculty member respondents to the survey describe their experience in the performance evaluation process as “positive”, but not without mentioning the problem that is being scrutinized in this dissertation:

My experience has been positive but the process, in my experience, is too subjective, depending on who is elected to the promotion committees…I do believe valuing creative expression is crucial and often misunderstood in our field, especially by those with orientations to publication and scientific research (Respondent #9)

Several faculty participants expressed a view about the importance of clear, coherent and written criteria to “spell out” the performance evaluation process at his workplace, regardless of the arduous and highly ambitious expectations that are placed upon the faculty member in the field of film and digital media:
We have a fairly comprehensive departmental document that spells out the expectations for tenure. Applicants must complete work at least equivalent to the scale of one feature length film. Then all the categories of participation are spelled out: there are different expectations for author/directors than for crew members, such as DPs and Editors (Respondent #8).

These relatively positive comments can be categorized as the exception, not the norm.

The norm appears to be an ongoing struggle to achieve change in the attributes of faculty evaluation systems---with the intention of reaching a suitable level of equity within an environment where scientism, the trilogy of expectations, and the traditional template prevail---and this journey is not been easy, universally successful or finalized. One professor wrote:

I was part of a faculty that led development and acceptance of creative products as scholarly research equal to traditional written scholarship. Prior to that, it was a nightmare for production faculty, being looked down upon. It was a major battle but is now settled (Respondent #7).

The data demonstrate that the performance evaluation process for faculty members in the field of film and digital media, on the basis of artistic, scholarly or professional work, in lieu of a text based publication of scholarly research, is problematic, at least.

From my own perspective, the process of performance evaluation at the university level was so discouraging and non-transparent that I am doubtful about continuing my career in an academic workplace anymore. I am a good filmmaker and have a lot of professional experience, I have been recognized as an effective and motivating teacher of students, and I am very active in all kinds of service related activities, but those things do not really count that much during the evaluation because there is such narrow emphasis that prioritizes scientific research and
publication of (boring?) papers. I feel that the system is guarded by mean-spirited, anti-creative old men who do not care about anything that they did not already know about—meaning there is no chance for upward mobility for people like me who do not comply with what those in power presume that faculty are supposed to be doing.

The need for change and the risk from inaction is serious. If faculty rewards and advancement are delayed or thwarted, faculty careers flounder or derail, and intrinsic motivation levels dissipate negatively (La Pelle, 1998). La Pelle (1997) used grounded theory methods (Glaser, 1967; 1978) to develop a theory about motivation and de-motivation in the context of performance evaluations in the workplace. The two-part grounded theory that emerged from La Pelle’s (1997) study has addressed motivating and de-motivating performance evaluation experiences. La Pelle demonstrates how a highly motivated worker can become a highly de-motivated worker when an organization and supervisor maintain a poorly designed process of performance evaluation. The first part of the La Pelle’s (1997) theory—Thriving on Performance Evaluation—describes:

…a thriving experience…one that provides enjoyment and continued high motivation at work, is heavily dependent on the supervisor’s intentions and skills in setting the state for the work and the ongoing evaluation process, at least for people who are intrinsically motivated to do their chosen work. The supervisor must be an expert not only in the required job skills, but must be able to provide collaboration and autonomy support, situation coaching and supervision, and effective human interactions. This certainly has implications for how organizations should select and develop supervisors in order to create thriving situations (Le Pelle, 1997, p. 11).
La Pelle (1997) found that comments by participants in her research were envisioning performance evaluation as:

an opportunity for change to happen…a potentially powerful vehicle for learning…a renewing of the stuff you talked about at an interview…a true dialog back and forth…a mutual evaluation…a mirror held up so you can see what you are doing—-the more robust the better for your development…a way for the institution to get faculty (employee) to play at the top of their game…we are talking about humanness and human relations. It’s about me as a human being needing love, attention, care in an organization, and if get even a little bit of it, it will be amazing what I can do (p. 11).

Intrinsic motivation is difficult to teach, inculcate, or measure, and is not directly factored in the criteria of conventional performance evaluation systems, yet the opportunity for faculty that seek extrinsic rewards on the basis of their work are not equitably available in many traditional and conventional institutions of higher learning, so the spiral of complications that revolve around de-motivation in the workplace persist. Many faculty members pursue their artistic, scholarly and professional work for more than formal extrinsic rewards. Instead, they pursue an underlying need for a sense of competence and self-determination, with self-determination being the more fundamental component (Deci and Ryan, 1985; La Pelle, 1997). White (1959) argued that people are inherently motivated to obtain competence in dealing with the environment as part of the human condition. DeCharms (1968) believed that people have a basic desire to experience themselves as causal agents. Bandura (1997) argues that self-perceptions of competence promote subsequent interest in an activity. Deci and Ryan (1985,
1992) maintained that the need for competence and self-determination is the psychological basis for intrinsic motivation.

As La Pelle (1997) places the onus of responsibility upon the supervisor and the organization for maintaining (and developing?) an effective and motivating process of performance evaluations, Franke (2001) provides guidance for the benefit of tenured faculty, department chairs, and academic administrators by listing, explaining and analyzing the importance of making defensible decisions in the process of performance evaluation.

b) An inexact process

In comparison with the requirement for precision, accuracy and veracity in scientific research, the work that emerges by artists, including filmmakers, is by nature ambiguous and emergent. The analysis and evaluation of work in the field of film and digital media is a complex and subjective challenge, perhaps even elusive, because of its ambiguous nature. Science prioritizes discovery through the identification and association of laws, principles, and formulas that have always existed, expressing its concepts most usually in mathematical terms. According to Wait and Hope (2009), science is:

…finding out how things work; art is creating new things from what is already available—although each approach is a mode for discovery…looking for the universal answer while art is always crafting a particular answer—often within the context of a framework, such as in a photographic landscape or in dramatic tragedy, for example. For this reason, scientific kinds of evaluations can never do the entire job of evaluating in the arts disciplines. Science is looking for single answers; the arts, for multiple answers conceived by individual creators as they set their particular goals for specific works or
performances. (p. 4-5).

No matter how objective a system of evaluation might intend to be, the process can be described as an inexact process of observation, measurement, feedback and judgment. Evaluation guidelines from the widest range of fields and domains, all of which have a good-faith intention of providing reference points upon which evaluations should take place, are in fact are laden with expectations that work should be clear and realistic, accurate and specific, adequate and suitable, amongst others. These vague and open-ended terms are inherent to the perpetuation of the traditional template for evaluating faculty work, but perhaps serve to facilitate an un-intended subjectivity that undermines the process of evaluation of work in the field of film and digital media (Oral History Association Evaluation Guidelines, 1980; Lim, 2006: Diamond and Adam, 2000). Such terms also facilitate a failure in the process by disallowing the recognition of differences in the nature of knowledge from one discipline to another—-that in turn affect the narrow latitude of differences in the practice of research in a particular setting.

Diamond and Adam (2000) argue that a system for evaluation and recognition of scholarship should emphasize the approach of scholarly inquiry rather than solely upon its artifacts, placing more value upon one’s approach to an activity and not so much upon the activity or end-product itself (p 8). In that same vein, it can be inferred from Morse et al (2002) that constructive rather than evaluative (post-hoc) techniques should be used during faculty performance review---such as examining the sensitivity and reflexivity of the researcher (the approach) to the particular situation under investigation as a constructive strategy for determining validity. Research by Dweck (1986) found that highlighting performance goals (in a competitive reward structure), in contrast to learning goals, could promote defensive strategies
that interfere with the seeking of challenges and persistence in the face of difficulties. There are many theoretical propositions about what should constitute a performance evaluation process, but the problem and question for this dissertation remain, culminated in Chapter 5, is to determine a practical and theoretically grounded set of recommendations about what constitutes the best way(s), the most fair and relevant, for recognizing and evaluating the approach and artifacts of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Many will expect that this research should result in a singular and ultimate model to replace the irrelevant template being used; but as articulated from the outset and demonstrated in Chapter 5, this simplistic solution is not possible nor the intention of this dissertation.

Most institutions of higher learning aspire to the values of a meritocracy, where advancement, rewards, esteem and stature are based upon demonstrated (yet inexact) evidence of merit, such as superior skills, innate talent, high test scores, and other perceptions of expertise in comparison or in competition with others. A meritocracy presumes itself to be based on rational thinking with predetermined criteria, resulting in a system that is just, productive and fair. It places high value on hard work, attitude, moral character and integrity---as determined by others. It is highly valued in higher education for precluding an inexact, nepotistic, arbitrary or unfair system for evaluation, advancement and other opportunities and rewards. According to McNamee and Miller (2004): “Americans not only tend to think that is how the system should work, but most Americans also think that is how the system does work” (p. 1). McNamee and Miller (2004) argue that meritocracy, the idea that societal resources are distributed exclusively or primarily on the basis of individual merit, is a myth. McNamee and Miller (2004) write: “It is a myth because of the combined effects of non-merit factors such as inheritance, social and cultural advantages, unequal educational opportunity, luck and the changing structure of job
opportunities, the decline of self-employment, and discrimination in all of its forms” (p. 4). A meritocratic system may not be entirely desirable (Young, 1961; McNamee and Miller, 2004). Young (1961) envisioned a society in which those at the top of the system ruled autocratically with a sense of righteous entitlement while those at the bottom of the system were incapable of protecting themselves against the abuses leveled against them from the merit elite above. Instead of a fair and enlightened society, the meritocracy became cruel and ruthless.

An alternative method of scoring, albeit inexact, can be borrowed from the methods used at a beauty pageant, cat show, or body builder contest. In those cases, entirely subjective (inexact) sets of criteria are used, under the guise of objectivity. The Official Guide for judges of the Miss America contest (2009) are advised:

Remember the contestant is competing against herself and must receive a score in a 1 to 10 point range, using whole numbers only. The five areas of competition are:

- Talent
- Private Interview
- Evening Wear
- Lifestyle and Fitness in Swimsuit
- On-Stage Question

Judges for the Miss America contest (2009) are advised in official documents to award points immediately after each contestant is seen. Talent is perceived to be an intangible vehicle that explains a contestant’s commitment and discipline as she performs on stage. Official literature from the Miss America contest indicates that the evaluation selection of a woman based upon her talent should distinguish the contestant’s:

- True talent and entertainment abilities
• Interpretive ability
• Technical skill level (execution, technique, synchronization, control)
• Stage presence and on-stage personality
• Totality of all elements (including costume, props, voice, use of body, choreography)

In the score sheet for judging a Miss American contestant in a swimsuit, the following guidelines are provided to judges:

SCORING IN LIFESTYLE & FITNESS IN SWIMSUIT

• The Lifestyle and Fitness in swimsuit is designed to see how well the contestant maintains a lifestyle of good physical health, whether she meets the public expectation of a titleholder, and whether or not she has the confidence needed to be a titleholder. The contestant’s drive, energy, and presence are to be likewise considered.

• Each contestant is competing against herself and MUST receive a score in a *1 to 10 point range for all Single Night State and Local Competitions and Preliminary Nights of a State Multi-Night Competition (OR a 6 to 10 point range for the Final Night Of A State Multi-Night Competition), using whole numbers only. More than one contestant may receive the same score.

CRITERIA FOR SCORING LIFESTYLE & FITNESS IN SWIMSUIT

• Overall “first impression;” physical fitness; physical beauty; sense of confidence and composure; display of drive, energy and charisma; and does she meet the public expectation of a titleholder?
How are first impression decisions about beauty, fitness, confidence, composure, energy and charisma to be made, confirmed or justified? Of course, there is no objectivity that is possible and the entire process relies upon the personal tastes, biases, proclivities and attitudes of the judge(s). Criticisms about beauty pageants range arguments about the objectification of women to the elitist hegemony of blondes in a racist society, but an unfortunate comparison can be made with the way that some performance evaluations of faculty work in the field of film and digital media are handled; but there is a relevant comparison to be made with the process of evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media. My point in providing this data is to illustrate the arbitrary and subjective nature of evaluation that could (and does) creep into a faculty performance evaluation process when the criteria are generalized; with scoring that is based upon the tastes, proclivities and interests of the evaluators. In those cases, the evaluation process is more closely representative of the judge than of the person, place or thing that is under evaluation.

c) Honesty is the best policy (unless you want to land in court)

There can be serious legal repercussions if such an inexact process of evaluation leads to misunderstanding, marginalization and implicit bias. As articulated by an academic administrator in the field of film and digital media:

…at many institutions, evaluation and tenure procedures, especially criteria, are deliberately vague. Sometimes this helps the faculty candidate, and sometimes not. It can lead to abuses, especially in the area of creative accomplishments when faculty and administrators are unfamiliar with the artistic venues and standards in a given discipline (Respondent #12).
Franke (2001) provides five recommendations that concern legal repercussions from a problematic turn of events in a performance evaluation. Franke (2001) writes: “On an ongoing basis, provide tenure-track faculty with honest evaluations of their work and prospects for tenure” (p. 2). Candid evaluations are the backbone of defensible decisions in performance evaluation. The department chair often plays the major role in evaluating faculty. Candidness and frankness in the context of performance evaluation, implying the value of honesty, is a word/concept that continues to re-emerge in the literature and in data interviews. Franke (2000) writes:

The process requires the chair or other evaluator to (a) know the criteria for evaluation, (b) fairly assess the candidate’s work according to the criteria, and (c) candidly and effectively communicate the evaluation to the individual…Uncertainties may arise, however, if the candidate is in an interdisciplinary program, the department has not coordinated any unique departmental criteria with institutional requirements, or the institution is raising its academic standards…If the candidate has room for improvement (as most of us do), or is irredeemable, the job can be harder. It is critical to rise to the challenge, because frank evaluations provide the candidate with feedback that is vital to his or her professional development and career planning. An effective evaluation will (a) cover the entire review period, not just the most recent few months; (b) apply clear requirements for reappointment and tenure; (c) provide specific examples illustrating the quality of the individual’s performance; (d) offer appropriate constructive criticism and practical guidance; (e) avoid making guarantees or promises about the future; and (f) be written in plain English, not diplomatic argot. Should a lawsuit later be filed, candid
evaluations also document the institution’s care with the review process. Among the hardest cases for an institution to win are those in which a faculty member received a series of five or six glowing evaluations but was then denied tenure. Tenure denial should never be a surprise to the candidate, and frank evaluations play a key role in preparing the individual for a possible negative outcome (p. 2).

Secondly, Franke (2000) advises supervisors to “be willing to make hard judgments to ensure effective shared governance” (p. 1), then adds:

Shared governance requires the honest exercise of both individual and group judgments. Chairs and senior faculty need to lay aside factors such as friendship with a candidate or discontent with the administration as they make their recommendations. Departments must resist any tendency to defer hard judgments to a campus wide committee or administrative authority (p. 3).

Aversion to conflict, friendship, or the potential for embarrassment should not drive performance evaluations. Departments should be prepared to make honest collective decisions, and individuals who might succumb to inappropriate factors should recuse themselves from the process (Franke, 2000).

Franke (2000) adds a third recommendation: Consider nonrenewal during the probationary period in appropriate cases. Franke (2000) writes:

Most tenure-track faculty receive a series of contracts…If, however, it appears during the probationary period that the candidate will not meet the standards for tenure, the better course is not to renew the individual’s contract. Some faculty and administrators harbor the belief that it is preferable to deny tenure than not to renew a contract in the middle of
the probationary period. Yet the earlier decision will be both fairer to the candidate and better for the institution. From a legal standpoint, a conscientious nonrenewal decision is at least as defensible as a tenure denial. On most occasions, it is more defensible, and the stakes are also far lower on both sides (p. 3-4).

A fourth recommendation by Franke (2000) is to be mindful that all oral and written comments can be used as evidence in a tenure-denial lawsuit. In 1990, the Supreme Court ruled that no special academic privilege shields tenure reviews from the normal rules of evidence. This means that faculty and administrators should act on the assumption that all their written and verbal communications about any performance evaluation decision will be disclosed in court. Franke (2000) warns: “Everything you say, and most especially everything you write, can and will be used against you in a court of law” (p. 3).

Franke’s (2000) fifth recommendation is that the application of tenure processes and the making of tenure decisions should be consistent. Most candidates who challenge denials on legal grounds allege discrimination by the institution. Franke (2000) writes:

The most common claims involve gender, race, age, national origin, or disability. The crux of these lawsuits is that had the candidate possessed different personal characteristics, he or she would have been treated more favorably. Consistency is the key to fairness. Consistency operates along several different planes. First, a stable set of criteria, with consistent relative weighting, should be applied to all candidates, and the types of material included in the tenure dossier should be comparable for all candidates. In addition, the same procedural steps should be taken, so that the same framework of timetables, evaluators, and recommendations applies in every case. Unusual programs with, for example, a heavy clinical component or an interdisciplinary focus should
establish stable procedures in advance of evaluating a candidate for tenure (p. 4-5).

In virtually all tenure-denial lawsuits, the plaintiff points to inconsistency and deviation from established procedures. Franke (2000) suggests the benefits of simplifying the performance evaluation process by collapsing “some of its proliferating layers of review, appeal, grievance, review of appeal, and the like. Other institutions with tenure processes that have, over time, sprouted too many internal review steps would do well to consider some pruning” (p. 5). Franke (2000) also advises that successive reviews of a person need to make sense relative to one another. An effective evaluation will reflect both improving and declining performance, but “successive evaluations should not fluctuate markedly in the absence of changed performance. Inconsistency stands at the heart of most discrimination lawsuits, and juries seek proof that the institution treated tenure candidates fairly relative to one another” (p. 5).

Most tenure-denial cases in courts of law involve some differences or inconsistencies in opinion among the evaluators (Franke, 2000). Jurors can accept some differences of opinion as a fact of life, but are far less ready to accept faculty evaluators who based their opinions on factors that were not demonstrably professional or who participated less than forthrightly in making their recommendations; and patience juror runs out with evaluators who change their stories over time (Franke, 2000). The same characteristics of honesty, professional judgment, and a willingness to make hard decisions that support effective shared governance also support legally defensible tenure decisions. Franke (2000; 2001) frames ethical and practical issues about what to do after an unsuccessful performance evaluation process are considered later in this Chapter and as a recommendation in Chapter 5.
d) The importance of relevant criteria

Consensus in opinion about criteria to define the scope and nature of what constitutes research in the field of film and digital media has not fully emerged, nor has the necessity for establishing relevant criteria for evaluating and rewarding faculty performance been widely accepted. Simply describing the status quo, the importance or the need for better outcomes in the performance evaluation process will not generate better outcomes, however it is possible to achieve better practices as the result of analysis, discussion and careful construction of relevant criteria.

In the context of its role as an accrediting body for programs and institutions of higher learning, NASAD (2009, p. 3-4) provides a 20-point list for basic assessment of faculty evaluation and reward systems in an institution or its administrative units. The list (NASAD, 2009) is as follows:

Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Institutions and Arts Units

• What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the entity being considered, and to what extent are they expressed in written statements and demonstrated in practice? What is the correlation of written and operational expressions of mission, goals, and objectives with faculty evaluation and reward systems?

• What internal or external factors and considerations are critical in establishing or changing the entity’s mission, goals, and objectives, or in defining its sense of identity? How does this identity and the process of defining it affect faculty assessment?

• How will issues of stability or change affect formulation, operation, and adjustments to the faculty evaluation and reward system?

• What comparisons between units within an institution, or between a unit and the
institution as a whole, may be made by asking the foregoing questions with regard to other units or to the institution as a whole? How do these comparisons relate to the respective missions and content being addressed?

Content and Characteristics Profile

- What approaches and perspectives for work in and about art are present in the entity to be considered?

- What are the relative weightings or priorities among them? (This presence may be in terms of written literature, past and present practice, aspirations, plans, etc.)

- What values, philosophies, or criteria are present with regard to concepts and issues such as originality, experimentation, simplicity and complexity, interdisciplinary work, faculty development, and collaboration?

- What do comparisons among findings thus far (i–vi) reveal about the logic, values, and futures issues associated with faculty evaluation and reward systems? (The answers provide a context for the next questions.)

Faculty Evaluation

- What are the stated or operational priorities with regard to various aspects of faculty work (i.e., teaching, creative work and research, and service)? To what extent does the faculty evaluation system consider the relationship between priorities and the resources needed to address them?

- How are faculty responsibilities and workloads defined and established? To what extent are there logical relationships among workloads, definitions of productivity, and expectations regarding teaching, creative work and research, and service? To what extent is consistency from faculty member to faculty member, or from unit to unit, a goal?
• Are the evaluation mechanisms able to deal adequately with the complexity of work in the arts? For example, the complex and subjective nature of new work, the distinctions and interrelationships between work in art and work about art, the need to work with the arts both in their own terms and in terms common to other disciplines.

• How is merit defined, determined, and indicated? To what extent is merit within the unit dependent upon and/or correlated to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution as a whole, other units, or specific individuals?

• What opportunities are available to faculty in terms of support, time, and peer review?

• What criteria are used to judge faculty work? Are these criteria safe against the influence of image making techniques that may mask issues of merit? To what extent is public or professional image deemed important to the fulfillment of mission, goals, and objectives?

• Is the evaluation mechanism able to deal adequately with the values, priorities, and complexities that surround ‘innovation’?

• What priorities do evaluation mechanisms express regarding equivalency, consistency, and diversity among various kinds of work and among disciplines and faculty members?

• What do the processes of forming, evolving, and operating evaluation and reward systems reveal about institutional values concerning standardization, evaluation techniques, and expertise?

• To what extent do the purposes, values, philosophies, and approaches discovered thus far reveal effective synergies within the institution as a whole, various units of the institution, search committees, and promotion and tenure committees?

• What are the issues to be considered in developing documentation policy? (For example: values, protocols, nature of the work to be documented, standards of measure, types of
Policy Questions and Issues

- What issues of context and capability should be addressed by institutions and units reviewing or contemplating change in faculty evaluation and reward systems? What philosophical, financial, and positioning issues and risks must be considered?
- What procedural, political, and communication issues need to be addressed to ensure understanding and support, fairness and feasibility for faculty and administrators in and beyond the unit? What personnel, work load, and security issues and risks must be considered?

Summary: Comprehensive Correlations, Synergies, and Issues

- How can all policies, perspectives, priorities, characteristics, influences, conditions, mechanisms, and aspirations (discovered in i–xix) best be integrated to support a positive and productive evaluation and reward system?

These general questions are important and relevant to the possibilities of change and improvement to the systems of performance evaluation for faculty work. As illustrated in Chapter 4, as inquiry moves from the institutional level to more local and individual levels, goal setting becomes more precise. Wait and Hope (2009) write:

The more complex the goals to be expressed in art- or design-based logic become, the harder it is to write them down in words with clarity and specificity. But the basic truth is that the art and design field does have goals at all levels that are expressed in standards. And, whether or not specific goals can be expressed easily or at all in speech logic is not the determining factor in whether or not goals exist. There is no reason for the art and design fields to agree with critics who charge that there are no specific goals
Diamond (1999) discusses the need for developing a quality institutional mission and vision statement upon which the priorities of a faculty reward system must be based. A mission statement can be a complete and clear set of criteria pertaining to the guiding principles of the institutional purpose(s), and framing what priorities are to be recognized and rewarded. A clearly articulated mission statement helps evaluators who are tasked to consider scholarship and professional work, perhaps coming with expertise in the field or specialization that is relevant to the faculty work under review. But there are a number of statements and policies, in addition to the mission or vision statements, that together combine to provide the working base of information that form the guidelines for the faculty reward system (Diamond, 1999). These include:

- The institutional mission (and vision) statement
- Institutional guidelines
- The school or college promotion and tenure or merit pay guidelines
- The departmental promotion and tenure or merit pay guidelines
- The collective bargaining agreement (on unionized campuses)

In addition, there are two external documents that may play a role in the development of guidelines:

- Disciplinary statements
- Accreditation standards

Ideally, the goal is to develop statements and policies that are supportive and consistent. Conflicts, including litigation, can arise from poorly articulated policies, inconsistencies, or
contradictions among campus-produced documents (Diamond, 1999). Institutional statements will articulate priorities for a college or university, but sometimes these are not consistent or supported by the faculty reward system (Diamond, 1999).

Diamond (1999) provides a list of characteristics of an appropriate and effective promotion and tenure system:

- The faculty reward system should be sensitive to the differences among the disciplines
- The faculty reward system should be sensitive to differences among individuals
- It is the responsibility of each individual committee member, and then the group as a whole, at the departmental, college and university levels, to strive and to successfully understand how to apply the best model that is appropriate to the scholarship being evaluated— not the other way around.
- The faculty reward system should include an assessment program that is appropriate, perceived to be fair, and workable
- The faculty reward system should recognize that most action takes place at the departmental level and the most specificity in documentation is required there
- The faculty reward system articulates the characteristics of scholarly work

Through the use of a survey (Appendix C) and interviews with faculty, collected data demonstrates faculty questions about the fairness and workability of existing, traditional templates for performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media. Additionally, some data has been gathered from faculty in other creative disciplines, fields and domains such as drama, writing, fine arts, photography and design that confirms concern. In response, Diamond (1999) further states:
…it is best left to the individual institution, school, college, or department to determine which combination of features or characteristics is appropriate for their use…such a model eliminates the many problems associated with definitions of scholarship where disciplinary differences are most apparent (p. 9).

Austin, Rice and Splete (1991) reported a correlation between high faculty morale and a clearly articulated institutional mission statement (p. 33). Conversely, data also demonstrates a perception that there is too much talk and too little action, which is a highly de-motivating phenomenon. Data shows that in order to properly recognize and reward faculty work, individual faculty members and administrators must work in partnership and solidarity to achieve solutions (statements) that are consonant with the specific discipline, contextualizing the scope of nature of the highest standards of faculty work in a particular field, in a way that is reflective of the institution’s mission.

Data facilitates questions about the faculty handbook—an official document which includes policies, rules, and procedures that define the work conditions for faculty. Does the faculty handbook establish a contractual relationship between a faculty member and the institution, making it directly relevant to any discussion about the practice of performance evaluation? The issue has arisen in the context of breach of contract claims in matters relating to performance evaluation for tenure, promotion and other institution review (Franke, 2001). As raised by Franke (2001), the question is whether the faculty handbook is part of the employment contract between the professor and the institution. In one case, the Iowa Supreme Court ruled that the University did not breach its employment contract with a faculty member who was denied tenure. The court stated that “a faculty handbook may rise to an enforceable contract
under three conditions: (1) document must be sufficiently defined in its terms to create an offer; (2) document must be communicated to and accepted by employee so as to create acceptance; and (3) employee must continue working, so as to provide consideration” (Taggart v. Drake University, 549 N.W.2d 796, Iowa 1996). In another case, the Iowa state trial court ruled that a University faculty handbook:

…constitutes a unilateral employment contract between the University of Dubuque and individual faculty members, the terms and conditions of which are incorporated into existing letters of appointment and grants of tenure, and are legally binding and enforceable upon both parties (University of Dubuque v. Faculty Assembly, District Court of Iowa (June 23, 1999).

In light of this data, faculty, supervisors and administrators should make themselves fully cognizant of the written procedures and policies that are published by their institutions, in the various forms of mission statements, vision statements, and faculty handbooks---and respond with action if the written procedures and policies are not appropriate for the intended purpose. Aside from the benefits of clarity when all parties are singing from the same sheet of music, cognizance mitigates further risk of breach or non-compliance.

In an effort to clarify the distinct differences between text-based scholarship and creative forms of scholarly work, an official policy statement of the University Film and Video Association (UFVA, 2008) has made argued that:

…fine arts have clearly established a precedent for the consideration of creative work as part of the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. Exhibitions of paintings, drawings, sculptures, photographs, etc. are accepted as evidence of professional
contributions in the visual arts. Musical compositions and reviews of recitals and solo performances are accepted in the field of music. Creative writing, direction and design of plays, choreography, and dance performances are likewise accepted as evidence of faculty contributions in other creative fields. The same should be true of creative work by a film or video faculty member (p. 2).

The UFVA (2008) has made several observations about the process of recognition, review and evaluation of creative work by faculty, including work in the field of film and digital media, and these points facilitate the basic groundwork for change, and the recommendations of Chapter 5:

1. Creative work in film and video can be disseminated and evaluated in ways that are similar to traditional scholarship, although the process of dissemination and evaluation is less well-developed and less well-understood by some within the academic community.

2. Completed creative work in film and video consists of products whose forms have a greater variety in length than is found in printed materials. A faculty member might be involved in the production of a feature-length dramatic film, a half-hour documentary, a three-minute animated work, or a work of some other type and length; many possibilities exist. The length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of the effort required to complete it. A short experimental video piece or a multi-media production might require even more time and effort to create than a relatively straightforward hour-long documentary.
3. Peer evaluation of film or video work should determine the probable difficulty of particular projects. The task of peer evaluators is analogous to that of judging the importance of a multi-year horizontal study in the social sciences; such a study might require many years of effort, yet result in an article of only modest length.

4. Just as instances of joint authorship occur in traditional scholarship, works in the field of film and digital media are frequently, although not always, collaborative endeavors. During performance evaluation it is extremely important to know what role a faculty member played on a particular production. In many cases, the faculty member will have had total responsibility for the production. In other cases, his/her role might have been that of writer, editor, etc. It is appropriate to give varying levels of credit for varying levels of responsibility. In cases of shared responsibility, it is best to rely on experts in the field to determine the relative importance of each individual’s contribution.

5. Public showings of a film or video work to informed audiences should be considered dissemination of the work, equivalent to that of scholarly publication. This is similar to the traditional acceptance of a music recital performed for a knowledgeable audience as the equivalent of publication.

6. The quality of a film or video work may be partially indicated by any festival awards or prizes that have been bestowed upon it. Festival awards and prizes are evidence of a positive competitive judgment about the quality of the work. In evaluating the importance of a festival award or prize, it is important to consider the current reputation of a festival at which it was received. Many festivals have rigorous selection procedures for inclusion of films and digital media within their programs.
Selection of a faculty member’s creative work for showing at a festival that has a good reputation can be considered indicative of the quality of the work.

7. Some academic associations schedule screenings based on a preconvention evaluation of submitted works, and selection for screening can be considered an indicator of quality, provided the current reputation and procedures of the association are known.

8. The merit of a film or video work may be indicated by its broadcast on television. It might be shown on commercial and/or public television, and might be aired on cable systems. Greater weight is often given to works selected for network presentation than to those carried only locally. In all cases, it is important to consider the level at which the work has had public exposure. It must be acknowledged that television showings are not equally accessible to all types of work.

9. Sometimes museums, media arts centers, and universities schedule invited presentations, often including oral presentations by the makers of a work in film or digital media. The prestige of such invitational showings varies, of course, depending upon the importance of the institution and the rigor of the selection process.

10. It should be noted that multiple showings of the same film are not the equivalent of reprints of a scholarly work. In the case of reprints of books or articles, the original printing is often still available through libraries. Reprinting of an article is primarily for the convenience of the readers of a particular periodical. There is generally no such easy access to media works; thus, in most circumstances each showing of a media work makes the production available to a new, previously inaccessible audience.
11. Film and video works may be disseminated through distribution agencies and companies, although most film and video distributors are commercial in nature, and the exclusion of a faculty member’s work from such distribution is not necessarily an indication that it has little or no artistic or social value. It must be remembered that faculty works must compete for distribution with works produced by individuals whose careers are exclusively dedicated to creative film and video production.

12. Meaningful reviews of faculty creative work appear in scholarly and professional publications, library media publications, and even, in some cases, newspapers. In evaluating such reviews, as in the case of scholarly reviews, it is important to consider the reputation of the individual or institution contributing the evaluation.

13. Creative work should be fully accepted as part of the faculty evaluation process when such work is appropriate to both faculty specialization and teaching load. Just as the primary professional contributions of a faculty member teaching media history should be expected to be in the form of published scholarship, so the primary professional contributions of a faculty member specializing in a creative area should be expected to be in one or more of the areas of creative production.

14. Media production is inherently expensive. Thus it is not infrequent for a faculty member to be involved in seeking in support for creative work. This can be a time-consuming process, which requires clear written articulation of creative goals and methods. Credit should be given in the promotion and tenure process for the seeking of grants as well as for any grants received.

15. When a faculty member’s creative work is presented at a university, a festival, or an association conference, it is usual for the faculty member to introduce the work and to
respond to any subsequent questions, comments, and criticisms. Although such a presentation is difficult to document, it should be considered the equivalent of the presentation of scholarly papers for peer critique in academic settings.

16. The UFVA (2008) notes that there are certain types of creative works for which appropriate means of dissemination and evaluation have not yet been devised. Multi-image pieces and some types of experimental work fall into this category. In such cases, it is necessary to rely on peer evaluations to establish the value and importance of faculty creative work.

In 2008, the UFVA added additional observations/recommendations that apply to professors of screenwriting that produce and submit their work during performance evaluation. These recommendations are:

1. Screenwriting is a worthy artistic and academic endeavor in and of itself, and that scripts have intrinsic value whether or not they are produced as films, for television, or for other media form. The fate of a screenplay is not necessarily a reflection of its quality or the skill with which it is written.

2. The timelines of commercial productions are seldom aligned with schedules of the academic world. There are famous anecdotes about scripts being made into successful films ten, fifteen, and even twenty years after they were originally written. This is far in excess of the length of time professors of screenwriting have available in order to prove the value of their work before being subjected to the tenure and promotion process.

3. In relation to the question of quality versus quantity, the UFVA statement argues that the number of scripts a professor produces may be an irrelevant consideration. The
number of scripts often is not indicative of the effort, care, and talent needed to produce them. Of far greater importance is the challenge posed to the writer by the project, the degree of originality demonstrated, the depth of the work, and the skill with which it is executed. As with any artistic creative endeavor, a scriptwriter produces multiple drafts before arriving at a manuscript ready for submission and dissemination; thus “one” screenplay is the result of numerous versions.

4. The University Film and Video Association (UFVA, 2008) recommends that a panel of three to five faculty experts be used in all cases involving the promotion or tenure of screenwriting professors, with the possibility that “an industry professional might also be included on such a panel (p. 8).

5. As with all creative projects, the UFVA (2008) recommends that scripts must be disseminated and evaluated as part of the promotion and tenure process, without the contingency that the script being produced as a film. In order to achieve the threshold of dissemination, the possibilities for faculty screenwriting projects include the following:

- Distribution of scripts to peer screenwriting professors at other universities for reading and evaluation;
- Distribution of scripts to professional organizations that include script evaluation sessions and/or partial or complete script readings among their activities;
- Distribution of scripts to organizations for possible production;
- Readings by local and regional groups, provided selection of material is based on a jury or panel decision rather than mere proximity to the writer;
• Publication of scripts in whole or in part. Publication possibilities might include the following:
  • Selection for existing or future print publications of the University Film and Video Association;
  • Selection for other print publications;
  • Selection for media publications of professional organizations;
  • Internet publication where allowed by institutional regulations.

The UFVA (2008) statement adds:

It must be noted that the possibilities for publication of scripts are extremely limited relative to the number of scripts completed each year. In no case should a college or university require that a script be published in order to validate its use as an accomplishment in promotion and tenure cases (p. 8).

Differentiating between dissemination and evaluation, the UFVA (2008) provides the following recommendations to clarify what are the sources for the evaluation of screenwriting work:

• Peer reviews written by screenwriting professors at other colleges and universities----
  This might be completed for individual works or a body of writing.

• Peer review of scripts by the University Film and Video Association---The Association uses a blind selection process to select the scripts chosen for review at each annual conference. A peer reviewer produces a written review, and, in addition, the public discussion that follows the formal review can be recorded and/or transcribed.
• Screenwriting awards of merit by professional organizations---Using a blind review process, expert judges would normally select a limited number of scripts for recognition.

• Reviews by industry professionals in situations in which institutions allow such reviews, and in the event that the industry professionals are sufficiently aware of the goals of the promotion and tenure process in academe.

• Optioning or actual production of scripts by recognized professional production companies; optioning indicates sufficient merit in a script to warrant a commitment.

• Published reviews in print or media format: These might include but would not be limited to print reviews that appear in the *Journal of Film and Video*, and reviews that appear in the DVD issues of the same periodical.

• Screenplay competitions that screenwriting professors are eligible to enter: In many instances, individuals who have already earned income as a professional writer may be ineligible to compete.

• Selection for competitive writing residencies, writing fellowships, and/or screenwriting awards or grants.

Several of the UFVA’s (2008) recommendations for reviewing, recognizing and evaluating work in film and digital media, including screenwriting are crucially important to consider and implement if sustainable change is to occur. In Chapter 5, many of the UFVA’s (2008) recommendations re-emerge in the context of my own set of recommendations.
e) Criteria and the evaluation committee

Much of the responsibility for success or failure in processes of evaluating faculty work rests with committee members, and it is at this level where many problems with the present system become most apparent (Diamond, 1993c). One obvious and significant weakness in the traditional template paradigm is seen “when faculty sit on institution-wide tenure and promotion committees and are asked to evaluate the research performance of faculty members who are not from or knowledgeable about their academic discipline” (Seldin, 2006; 2005). Oftentimes, distinctions that are unique to faculty work in the field of film and digital media are ignored or unnoticed, particularly when creative work is being evaluated from the perspective of scientism and its traditional template, by faculty or administrators without any real knowledge about discipline-specific forms of practice relating to the work being evaluated, or without vested interest in changing the traditional template.

Data from faculty in the field of film and digital media want the evaluation of their creative work to be performed by colleagues and experts that have awareness of the subjectivity of filmmaking in the thematic context of originality, innovation, application of aesthetic principles and technical skills and processes. Data demonstrates that many faculty members in the field of film and digital media share a perception that some evaluators in faculty performance evaluations do not have expertise with the specific and unique aspects of scholarship and activity in the field of film and digital media. Seven (of 13 total) respondents to the survey in this dissertation, faculty members in the field of film and digital media, indicated a negative perception of the faculty performance evaluation process in their workplace (Question #10), while only two respondents perceived that “the colleagues and administrators who are chosen by administrators to evaluate faculty performance in film and digital media” are qualified for the job.
(Question #11). Negative perceptions are fueled by instances when aspects or examples of scholarship performance remain under-rewarded or unrecognized during a performance evaluation. For example, one professor wrote:

The collaborative nature of film production, however, might invite the filmmaking scholar to a position of responsibility as, say, a gaffer. While lighting is essential to the medium, the gaffer's credit seldom satisfies a tenure committee as a sufficiently creative contribution. Leadership positions in Directing, Writing and -- to lesser degrees -- Cinematography, Editing, and Production Design are thought by publishing scholars to be more analogous to their own academic tasks, and are thus more likely to be rewarded as scholarly (Respondent #4).

Some faculty evaluator-reviewers have minimal knowledge or appreciation of those relevant strategies. They do not understand the scope and nature of creative processes for developing and making a film, video and related creative media work, including the key events and processes for disseminating the creative work for public viewing, and many others aspects. For this reason, it is essential that those who are tasked with the responsibility of evaluating creative scholarship in any field, including film and digital media production, be thoroughly familiarized with the scope and nature of work under review. Further, institutions must reconsider their organizational systems for evaluation of faculty work, and at the same time it is essential that the faculty member prepare a complete dossier that defines, describes, explains and justifies the work for the understanding of evaluators (Bukalski, 2000; Bloom, 1956).

There is a potential risk that an uninformed evaluator could revert to reductive, dualistic, and pre-conceived views (self-other, good-bad, right-wrong, acceptable-not acceptable, and so
on) to supplant a void of knowledge if the evaluator is not familiarized or experienced with the specific and unique aspects of work in the field of film and digital media, a disturbing possibility raised by Ashe (2007) in his research. One professor wrote:

I was on the university-wide Tenure and Promotion Committee at one institution when a colleague's case came before the committee. The other members of the committee viewed the candidate's videotape, his chief creative contribution toward tenure, IN FAST MOTION because they ‘were looking for the good parts.’ (Respondent #12)

Any scholar or artist would be insulted by such egregious disrespect toward their research work. Artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media has a beginning, middle and an end, it is time-based media, and the work was intended for viewing in a proper way. It can be logically deduced that if evaluators are reviewing faculty work in the field of film and digital media possess little appreciation or no direct knowledge, or have nil professional experience in the field of film and digital media, then the faculty member and the faculty work cannot receive a fair or efficient process of evaluation (Diamond, 1993). Further, when important aspects of work that are inherent to the development, production and exhibition of film and electronic/digital media projects remain unwritten, unknown, unnoticed, or undervalued by the faculty member and/or the evaluator, in comparison with the traditional template and its written procedures and criteria for recognizing text-based conventional scholarly output and performance, the faculty member can expect that the complex processes of work for developing and producing artistic, creative, scholarly or professional work in the field of film and digital media might possibly go un-recognized during the processes of performance evaluation in an academic setting. Angier (2010) writes:
Researchers at Yale University divided 41 college students into two groups and casually asked the members of Group A to hold a cup of hot coffee, and those in Group B to hold iced coffee. The students were then ushered into a testing room and asked to evaluate the personality of an imaginary individual based on a packet of information. Students who had recently been cradling the warm beverage to judge the fictitious character as warm and friendly than were those who had held the iced coffee (p. 1).

Angier (2010) cites another study:

When researchers at the University of Toronto instructed a group of 65 students to remember a time when they had felt either socially accepted or socially snubbed, those who conjured up memories of a rejection judged the temperature of the room to be an average of five degrees colder than those who had been wrapped in warm and fuzzy thoughts of peer approval (p. 1).

In yet another study, Angier (2010) reports:

Study participants were asked to answer questionnaires that were attached to a metal clipboard with a compartment on the back capable of holding papers. In some cases the compartments were left empty, and so the clipboard weighed only 1.45 pounds. In other cases the compartments were filled, for a total clipboard package of 2.29 pounds. Participants stood with either a light or heavy clipboard cradled in their arm, filling out surveys. In one, they were asked to estimate the value of six unfamiliar foreign currencies. In another, students indicated how important they thought it was for the university committee to take their opinions into account when deciding upon the size of foreign study grants. For a third experiment, participants were asked how satisfied they were with (a) the city of Amsterdam and (b) the mayor of Amsterdam. In every study,
the results suggested, the clipboard weight had its roundabout say. Students holding the heavier clipboard judged the currencies to be more valuable than did those with the lightweight boards. Participants with weightier clipboards insisted that students be allowed to weigh in on the university’s financial affairs. Those holding the more formidable board even adopted a more rigorous mind-set, and proved more likely to consider the connection between the livability of Amsterdam and the effectiveness of its leader (p. 1-2).

Obviously, it is disturbing to consider how external factors such as room temperature, the weight of a clipboard, or the warmth of one’s morning coffee might have in a performance evaluation, but in the absence of clear criteria that is handled by experienced and knowledgeable committee evaluators, then anything is possible. In relation to performance evaluation in film and digital media, one professor wrote:

For films the criteria seems to be either how much money was raised to produce the film, whether the film was theatrical and if so, was it ever distributed, or what festivals did it play in and what critical response did it get. Other than knowing ‘Sundance is good’ there is no real understanding of ‘publishing’ a film and no equivalent to peer review journals (Respondent #3).

Another professor wrote:

If -- as a matter of scholarly inquiry -- I accept a commission or contract to make an orientation film for a local mental health agency, of what scholarly value is the opinion of the film's commissioner? the opinion of those who watch the film, depending on it for information that may facilitate their treatment? Evaluative practice (in my experience) has been for committees to disregard the benefit to intended audience in favor of awards
and (supposedly) prestigious screenings. Furthermore, the popularity of a moving image (as, say, measured by YouTube viewings) is entirely off a personnel committee's radar (Respondent #4).

Faculty in any discipline are greatly disadvantaged whenever performance evaluation committee members are guided by irrelevant criteria, or are lacking in scholarly or professional expertise about the kind of work being evaluated----as data appears to show.

Reflecting upon my own experience, the university where I work vaguely considers a film to be equal with the publication of paper, and one film is equal to one paper. Whomever has done both, made a film and written a paper, will probably acknowledge that a film requires a lot more risk, work, time and external support than writing a paper does; but the policies were written by non-filmmakers and the reviewing committee members are not filmmakers or artists so most of those in seats of authority do not really care to understand this ambiguity. To make a 30-minute documentary or narrative film or any other style of film on location somewhere, to get it funded, shot and edited, then broadcast---and to have it be worth one measly paper seems unfair, in my opinion. At my place of employment, faculty need five papers to be considered for promotion, so that means five films need to be made in order to have one’s application qualify for consideration. In my case, as I wrote to develop the idea for the project, I received two Ford Foundation grants to produce a documentary video for TV broadcast and social development in the Philippines. I doubt that any of the committee members have ever received one Ford grant, but I was successful in getting two, plus the Fulbright award. As anyone knows who has written successful grant proposals, especially when it is going to be submitted to an entity like the Ford Foundation, it is a difficult and exacting process that requires provable experience, expert skill and in-depth knowledge. Organizations such as the Ford Foundation are not providing funds for
proposals that have not been well written, well conceived and at risk of failure. Yet, all of the work I did in developing and writing the grant proposals had no value whatsoever in the performance evaluation process. Neither did the program’s script. None of the pre-production work had any value. The only value the committee attached to the project was the fact that the completed 30-minute video was eventually accepted and exhibited at several film festivals and was broadcast on TV, although all of the exhibition and distribution only equated in value to one research paper.

Reinforcing the lack of understanding about the scope and nature of work in film and digital media, a professor wrote:

Even if tenured, policy-making theorists acknowledge that the work of filmmakers ought indeed to be a film, they seem to think the pace of filmmaking should mimic that of publication. Thus, the number of films expected for promotion or tenure is often unrealistic (Respondent #4).

Another faculty member writes:

I have been a full-time, tenure-track faculty member at two institutions. At both institutions…there were few specific guidelines or examples of what exactly the requirements of creative/production faculty entailed (for better or worse) and no faculty in my position doing the kind of work I do who had recently applied for tenure whose work/career I could use as a yardstick. This made things somewhat more difficult to project. (Respondent #11).

The data demonstrates that many institutions place high value upon screenings and awards at film festivals or awards as form of peer review. The assumption is that a work in film
or digital media that has been externally accepted by an organization for public presentation must have been good because it has peer-acceptance. The perception of acceptance by established entities assumes a process that was conducted by experts with open minds and a broad base of knowledge, and that the process has been fair and correct. Yet, equating and linking public acceptance of the work with consensus of opinion and interpretation is inevitably at odds with the essential nature of creative, artistic and other original work(s).

Consensus and consonance of interpretation and opinion are prime variables in the evaluation criteria of the traditional template, but these are values that circumvent the most important purpose in works of art and creative expression. There is a fundamental mismatch of priorities---consensus and acceptance on one hand, originality and uniqueness on the other. I cannot predict or assume that peer-review in any form will go away, change its nature, or be any way but the same as usual in the future, but I have questions that have emerged from data. Specifically referring to the problem of narrowly emphasizing public exhibition of faculty work in film festivals as a primary measure in the recognition of work during evaluation, a professor wrote:

With the proliferation of film festivals and competitions, there needs to be some clearer guidelines for what represents a significant (in terms of tenure) screening or award. It's really not that hard to get a film into a small, niche festival, self-publish (distribute) your work, or arrange for a public screening. Conversely, it's very hard to get into the more famous national/international festival, get a distribution deal, or significant run of theatrical screenings. Similarly, some forms of digital distribution need to be taken into account; and again, some digital distribution/exhibition is more valuable than others (Respondent #11).
Some examples of important work that does occur during the filmmaking process, yet at risk of non-recognition, including:

- A comprehensive and successfully funded grant proposal. Although the accomplishment of successfully securing grant funds would probably appear on a faculty resume or curriculum vitae, it might not be specifically and independently recognized according to the traditional template for performance evaluation, and thus have no positive value therein;

- The integration and application of necessary skills and knowledge for creating a script, storyboard, or story treatment. Such work may have emerged in an interdisciplinary collaborative creative environment that might not be recognizable to an evaluator with no knowledge or experience in filmmaking (Note: A treatment is a recognized term in the film industry for a detailed story narrative document that summarizes the story and indicates the stylistic approach of a proposed work in film or digital media).

- The multiple domains of discovery, application and integration that are used in the writing of a script or screenplay; and an extensive range of traditional research methods such as data/information gathering, literature review, synthesis of data/information, and critical analysis to inform the creative research might be deemed as absent, unimportant or irrelevant to an evaluator with no experience with the filmmaking process, but the fact is that a range of research methods for the development of a script or screenplay are rigorous and comparable in many ways to conventional research practices that are commonly found in social sciences or humanities research. It is only the final outcome of the research work that is what significantly differs.
There are any others aspects of work in the pre-production development, production, post-production and exhibition of film and electronic/digital media work that are at risk of being overlooked, undervalued, or deemed irrelevant, unless clear and specific criteria are framing the performance evaluation process.

The above-listed categories of risk are examples of what might go unrecognized in a conventional performance evaluation of faculty work that relies strictly upon the traditional template to the exclusion of a greater understanding.

For the sake of comparison, I am considering the following statement that was used to guide a search committee for employment at the University of X (name withheld). The rigor and clarity of the committee’s responsibilities is remarkable, in light of the lack of relevant and clear criteria pertaining to the evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. The document reads:

Screening the Candidates' Dossiers

Draft fair and objective criteria for review of each applicant's materials. Prepare candidate evaluation forms with job-related reasons used to evaluate the candidates' qualifications based on application material. Avoid allowing any individual Search Committee member to eliminate any candidate; seek the judgment of as many Search Committee members as possible about each candidate. Recommend interviews for those who meet the advertised minimum qualifications only. Provide full analysis of the most qualified female and minority candidates, and draft clear job-related assessments for them if they are not recommended for campus interviews. Be aware of how historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) and other minority-serving institutions fare in
graduate school rankings. Such institutions are major sources of graduate students in a variety of fields.

With slight modification of a few words, I have re-written the statement above so it could be used to guide a performance evaluation committee, as follows:

Evaluating the Candidates' Dossiers
Draft fair and objective criteria for review of each applicant's materials. Prepare faculty evaluation forms with specific work-related criteria used to evaluate the candidates' performance. Avoid allowing any individual performance evaluation committee member to eliminate any faculty applicant; seek the judgment of as many performance evaluation committee members as possible about each faculty applicant. Recommend interviews with faculty whenever questions arise about their dossier. Draft and provide clear performance-related assessments for faculty applicants if they are not recommended for faculty rewards.

If evaluators are not provided with relevant criteria when judging the artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media, then unfounded or irrelevant assumptions will emerge and render the performance evaluation process as non-constructive (Holt, 2003). Data shows that many faculty participants in this study perceive that committee members and administrators who are tasked with performance evaluation duties do not consistently possess a reasonable level of knowledge or expertise about the unique and specific scope and nature of work that relates to the production of scholarly work in film and digital media.

Diamond (1993c) has provided a list of basic requisites that apply to committee members:
• Committee members must understand fully the criteria used for the evaluation of each faculty member and the standards appropriate for the academic discipline and the specific activity involved (as greater diversity in assignments evolves, different criteria for promotion and tenure must be established).

• Committee members must understand the range of techniques and assessment tools needed to properly evaluate teaching (and other specific aspects of individual faculty work).

• Committee members must be willing to separate the criteria used for promotion and tenure in their own disciplines from those used in other fields when the faculty member under review is from another discipline.

Supported by Diamond’s (1993c) list of requisites for committee membership, evaluators and the criteria that are used to define the evaluation process must not rely upon preconceived notions about scholarly research, faculty priorities, and faculty performance. Such preconceptions prejudicially disallow artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media from being fairly considered, recognized and rewarded as forms of faculty scholarship (Bukalski, 2000; Diamond 1993c). Worthen and Sanders (1987) have recommended that evaluators be required to possess an interdisciplinary education that would sensitive them to the wide range of phenomena which will be encountered when the focus of the evaluation is upon the unique and specific aspects of faculty work. Unfortunately, sensitivity and awareness of differences are not recognized characteristics in the common practice of promotion committees and administrators engaged in the evaluation of scholarship.
g) The role of supervisors and administrators

One of the most troublesome areas for supervisors and administrators is the evaluation process. The supervisor(s) and administrators exert influence and a crucial role in performance evaluation process—-in the interpersonal context of facilitating motivation, the promotion of competence enhancement, in facilitating a sense of autonomy, and a perception that power is accessible and equal in the academic workplace (La Pelle, 1997). There is an incentive for institutions of higher learning to become more aware and concerned with the efficacy of the performance evaluation processes that are done by supervisors and administrators. If a supervisor or an administrator is not effective in this task—-by exhibiting controlling behavior, coercion, and ulterior motives—-then faculty may become highly de-motivated, unproductive, withdrawn and hopeless (La Pelle, 1997), plus there could be legal implications that could follow.

Participants in research by La Pelle (1997) described their vision of the ideal supervisor as:

…one who is not only an expert in the content of the job, but also has excellent listening, communication, and coaching skills. What matters is ‘knowing that the person teaching you has your best interests in mind, knowing they’ve got the expertise to say what they are saying, that respect…if I see that person knows what he or she is doing, I want a part of it (p. 12).

For the de-motivated participants in La Pelle’s (1997) study, the supervisor was perceived and described with words such as:

…controlling, distant, not really in charge, acting in their own self-interest, or not qualified…out to see how quickly he could move up the ladder, particular, very
dominant, very much in charge, poorly skilled, reactive, a lousy manager, not very credible and ill-informed (p. 167).

Starting with the departmental chair, it is critical that each player in the institutional hierarchy be accurate and compassionate in reporting on a faculty member’s status within the process of performance evaluation. AAUP (1989) provides a statement on the procedural standards pertaining to transparent communication regarding status of the performance evaluation process, starting from the first days of employment. From the outset, department chairs should give new faculty members an explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure. According to the AAUP (1995):

Probationary faculty members should be advised, early in their appointment, of the substantive and procedural standards generally accepted in decisions affecting renewal and tenure (and promotion). Any special standards adopted by their particular departments or schools should also be brought to their attention (p. 15-16).

Conway (1991) adds:

On humanitarian and professional grounds, junior faculty should get a clear understanding of their status long before tenure is considered. It is the head's solemn duty to report to the candidate any bad news that comes out of the retention review…There is the legal question, but there is also your obligation as a human being and the unofficial mentor of this young colleague. Do you really want them to spend the next few years thinking there is nothing to correct? That what they have been doing is
leading toward tenure? And meantime the faculty is anticipating a change and will conclude, when it fails to appear, that this person did not heed a warning and, hence, is unworthy of tenure. I have known of cases where a department head did not pass on the faculty's concerns. When tenure was eventually denied, the candidate was shocked, the faculty discovered their warnings were not transmitted, and the head's prestige and reputation suffered…your job, and that of your colleagues, is to promote the well being of the university. It is not to promote the sociability of the department (p. 43-48).

Diamond (1993c) lists five responsibilities of supervisors and administrators (chairs, deans and other upper administrators):

- The administration must place revision of the promotion and tenure process on the institutional agenda.
- The administration must propose a process for change.
- The administration must facilitate the development of an appropriate mission statement. Austin, Rice and Splete (1991) report a correlation between high faculty morale and a clearly articulated institutional mission statement (p. 33).
- The administration must understand the important roles that faculty, department chairs, and the academic discipline play in the change process.
- The administration must develop an active information program that systematically reinforces the importance of the project and describes its progress.

Engaging in philosophical dialogue with academic administrators is usually a luxury not granted to those of us at the borders, but it is often the senior administrators at our colleges and universities who have closer contact with those proposing policy objectives that may challenge
our way of doing things. Therefore, a faculty member should ask oneself, what are the philosophical and programmatic situations of senior administrators at my institution? Faculty are asked to respond and prove themselves---in writing---to chairs, deans, vice chancellors and provosts who oversee processes of performance evaluation in a conventional environment. In such cases, a faculty member is asked to demonstrate to these administrators or to university committees how requirements have been met. It is obvious that the faculty’s task is not to question the assessment, but rather to show how everything that has been done is in compliance. Oftentimes, institutional administrators and committees choose not to get involved in the grand philosophical arguments with a faculty member. Rather, they are seeking merely to get through another cycle of performance evaluation or accreditation or other process with the least possible disruption.
h) The process of peer review: What is a peer review?

It would be convenient and expeditious if I were able to simply develop a list of criteria upon which artistic, scholarly or professional work in film and media could be evaluated, so that a committee of peers and higher administrators could simply follow directions and simply conduct a proper performance evaluation. The University Film and Video Association (2008), a professional organization, has provided some basic guidelines for peer review of work in the field of film and digital media:

It is fairly usual for faculty members within a department to evaluate the creative output of their colleagues as part of the promotion and tenure process. It is increasingly common, and indeed essential in a relatively new field such as film and video, for a panel of outside evaluators to be established for the purpose of examining creative work. It is important that the evaluators should be knowledgeable about, and sympathetic toward the type of creative work completed by the faculty member who is being considered for promotion and tenure. For instance, an evaluator whose sole interest is narrative film should not be asked to evaluate an experimental video work. In some cases an institution might wish to include professionals from the media industry on an outside evaluation panel. It must be remembered, however, that media professionals may not be attuned to the requirements of the promotion and tenure process (p. 1).

The fact is that a process of recognition and evaluation is not simple and not as straightforward as suggested by the UFVA (2008) recommendations. It involves and requires consideration of many factors, plus there are issues that stand in the way of change, and most of those obstacles are substantial. The following section is a critical and not favorable analysis of
peer review, expressing my concerns about the use of peer review/evaluation; of particular concern in the absence of criteria guidelines for a peer reviewer/evaluator to apply when making their opinion and judgment about works in the field of film and digital media.

What is a peer review? Peer review or peer evaluation (also known as refereeing) is the process that seeks to determine, possibly in subjective and arbitrary ways, whether a work by faculty is considered equivalent to conventional research standards. The process seeks to determine the worth of the work in relation to other work in the field or the profession, and to determine whether (or not) the work meets (or not) accepted standards of professional achievement, as compared with other more familiar work that the peer-evaluator(s) may have encountered. There are two common approaches to peer review at present: Single-blind peer review and double-blind review. Single-blind review is most common for evaluation of works in film and media production, and this means the author’s identity to be known to the reviewers, but the reviewers’ identity to be hidden from the author (Ware, 2008). The main argument for blinding the reviewers’ identity is that it allows them to comment freely without fear of repercussions (Ware, 2008).

Performance evaluation in higher education settings subjects faculty work to the scrutiny of the peer-evaluator(s) who are considered to be experts in the field. Peer review is based upon the requirement that an identifiable and available community of experts in a given, narrowly defined field of study are willing to participate and inform the process of evaluation. The participation of peer reviewers/evaluators is a common requirement in performance evaluations in the field of film and digital media. Peer-evaluators are perceived, through job title or external reputation, as qualified and presumably able to perform an impartial review based upon accepted (and sometimes unwritten) standards. The traditional measures for establishing quality in faculty
work are based on peer review, prestigious publication, the extent a work was referenced by others, selection by librarians, and more. According to Ware (2008):

Peer review is widely supported by academics, who overwhelmingly (93%) disagreed in our survey that peer review is unnecessary. The large majority (85%) agreed that peer review greatly helps scientific communication and believed (83%) that without peer review there would be no control (p. 4).

The purpose of the peer reviewer/evaluator is to assist administrators in reaching their intended objective assessment of the work, in relation to recognized standards of the academy and profession. The process of peer evaluation as it occurs in the field of film and digital media is relatively equivalent to the peer reviewer/evaluator that reads and evaluates a written research paper in a traditional context. The peer reviewer/evaluator is supposed to consider and locate the submitted work in relation to other work in the field, from technical, creative, educational and other perspectives. Further, external evaluators with a high level of experience and breadth of knowledge will be able to provide more comment on the significance of the achievements that may be related to the submitted work as it has enjoyed presentation and success in innovation, originality, participation in key film festivals, scope of broadcast or in other forms. If and how this might be accomplished fairly is up for debate and is certainly not assured.

For decades, academicians have assumed that peer-review is a necessary and non-negotiable aspect of a faculty evaluation process; a step that is used for comparison, reification, or justification of opinion about the work being submitted for review, particularly in the case of creative research output by faculty members. Peer-review is a summative evaluation, a judgment
and decision-making process about research output or other professional performance by peers in the context of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and compensation.

i) The problems with peer review

An [uninformed] idealist is one who, in noticing that a rose smells better than a cabbage concludes that it will also make better soup — H.L. Mencken

At first glance peer review/evaluation might appear as harmless, normal---perhaps desirable, logical and good---but in actuality it is a thorny conundrum with a lot of potential pitfalls, snags and crags. Many consider peer review/evaluation as a sacred cow with unblemished relevance and importance to the performance evaluation process but, in my view, there are many potential problems that can appear under the surface, after scrutinious inquiry.

Peer evaluation is an activity in the performance evaluation process that has effectively resisted change. The common assumption is that peer review is a democratic and fair way for administrators and committee members to balance the perceptions and opinions of the university and college, with expert opinions from external bodies. However, after inquiry I have some serious doubts about the fundamental notion of the peer review process, and am holding skeptical views about the arbitrary and non-critical application of peer review for evaluating works in film and digital media.

The fundamental problem with peer review is the possibility that guardians (old guard committee members and administrators) of the old paradigm (the trilogy and the traditional template) are also the gatekeepers that are stymieing the fullest recognition of new forms of work and expression during a performance evaluation. Although formal and informal critiques by
peers and mentors are common to all forms of art, including filmmaking, the process of peer review/evaluation, if done by the old guardians of the status quo, can facilitate unfair, irrational and subjective decision-making. In this light, it is difficult to openly accept peer review as a solution in performance evaluation.

Peer-review intends to establish, measure and confirm consistency with norms---but how is it possible to judge original and new work if the role of peer evaluator is to recognize and judge continuity with conventions and expectations that reflect values and priorities of the past? It is arguable that newness can be perceptible in its relation to established norms, but if a work conforms to established norms then how can it be also be considered as original? An argument in favor of peer evaluation could be that knowledge, familiarity and experience with established norms and in the field puts one in a catbird seat for appreciating, recognizing and evaluating the originality and newness of a work---but, again, how can work be considered as original if it is compulsorily anchored to what has previously existed---and if the work is original then how can it be measured, recognized or evaluated on the same terms as other work(s)? What about the potential risk of conscious or sub-conscious jealousies, biases, negative responses to unmet preconceptions, and the gumbo of individual preferences that might creep into a peer reviewer’s heart and mind if confronted by a new and original (and presumably unfamiliar) work? Again, how can absolute compliance and conformance with norms allow the possibility for work to be truly original? These lines of inquiry are not intended to denigrate the value of conventional work. Instead, these questions are intended to challenge the value of opinions that derive from consensus or peer review, particularly when the process of performance evaluation is being conducted in the absence of relevant, written criteria.
It has been suggested that peer review lacks accountability, can lead to abuse by reviewers, and may be biased and inconsistent, alongside other flaws. Horton (2000), wrote:

The mistake, of course, is to have thought that peer review was any more than a crude means of discovering the acceptability — not the validity — of a new finding. Editors (of publications) and scientists alike insist on the pivotal importance of peer review, but beneath the surface of the apparent rightness of colleagues to review the work of colleagues, in the case of films and media productions, a peer review has the potential for replicating bias, political slant, or ignorance of the artist’s intent. No matter what the finding, story, style or view of the film might be, a peer-review by colleagues will usually end with nothing more or less than a mere stamp of approval or disapproval by the evaluators. The peer-review might be done by mercenary consultants from outside the institution, by a review committee, or by an audience that may or may not appreciate, understand, comprehend, or care about the work being submitted for evaluation or presentation. Throughout history, we portray peer review to the public as a quasi-sacred process that helps to make science to be our most objective truth teller. But we know that the system of peer review is biased, unjust, unaccountable, incomplete, easily fixed, often insulting, usually ignorant, occasionally foolish, and frequently wrong (p. 149-49).

The peer review process can conceivably exacerbate collusion, or it can supress dissent against ANY style of work (mainstream, alternative, etc), or it can be preferentially biased for or against one stylistic, political, cultural view, personal opinion, technical treatment or approach to the subject matter, or favor any other subjective condition over another. Reviewers tend to be especially critical of conclusions that contradict their own views, and lenient towards those that accord with them (Martin, 1997).
Oftentimes, fairness is equated with consensus, and consensus of opinion about a creative work could likely be at odds with originality. Further, the personal qualities of the scholar (or artist) could be assumed as inherently interconnected to the perception of the original work in peer-review evaluations (Lamont et al, 2007). Judgments about the character and the personal qualities of scholars (or artists) remain intrinsic to academic recognition and perceptions about the value of the faculty work, and such judgments about personal qualities and characteristics can become ambiguously merged with judgments about originality. To illustrate this point, consider the experimental film works of Stan Brakhage, Maya Deren, Man Ray and so many others, some famous and some not so famous. Consider the innovative and controversial documentary works by Michael Moore, Leni Riefenstahl, Les Blank, Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov, not to mention a world of narrative film works by so many others like Akira Kurosawa, Zhang Yimou, Luis Bunuel, Werner Herzog, Woody Allen, and thousands of others. The wonderful ambiguity that exists when trying to define creative works in film---inquiry whether this or that work is best classified as a documentary, experimental, narrative, or something beyond in nature---can not be resolved by a peer-review committee that decides the scope, nature, or worth of the work(s). As a chair of a graphic design and multimedia program once expressed to me: “At this college we do not make documentaries in our video classes. We are a design program so students (and faculty) should instead be making animations and storyboards and commercials and logos. Documentary filmmaking would be done somewhere else, not here” (email from a faculty colleague). A narrowly-conceived bias against a particular style of filmmaking---excluding a particular form or approach regardless of reason---is unsupportable and contrary to notions of academic freedom. In the case above, where documentary filmmaking is singled out as unacceptable in a program where video production
and other time-based media forms are taught, the only reasonable explanation can be that the chair, faculty and program are limiting the scope of learning according to their own ignorant, incapable and myopic limits as they exclude alternatives---to the detriment of students and faculty.

A particular stylistic approach or purpose of a particular work may or may not appeal to a particular peer-reviewer/evaluator, and it is conceivable that a new and original work might even be categorically considered as inferior, abhorrent, morally wrong, or devoid of meaning in comparison with their expectation of what work in film and digital media should be. It is human nature, in the absence of a paradigm that is in writing and understood by all concerned parties, to celebrate what we like and to dismiss what we don’t like; to appreciate, agree with this, and to consider that to be provocative or wrong. Even peer-evaluators who consider themselves to be professional and objective will find it challenging to fully detach themselves from preference, value judgments, and subjectivity when confronted with newness and originality---and an absence of written criteria that enlightens the process.

The most commonly held expectation and standard for faculty work is conformity with preconceived expectations, norms, and values; and peer reviewers find themselves tasked to determine worth in relation to those existing, known standards. As faculty work is being evaluated by critical gatekeepers (peer reviewers) tasked to recognize and evaluate the level of a work’s worth by measuring its competence or mastery, in comparison with the met expectations of other works and conventional standards, it is possible that true originality will remain invisible to the reviewer/evaluator. Original work, by definition, deviates from all that has preceded it. The potential for contamination of the evaluation process through personal jealousies, unfairness that emerges from unfamiliarity with the scope and nature of work, and other forms of bias by
evaluators is always of concern, and explicit expectations of peer review leaves that possibility wide open. In this way it is possible to imagine that some of the greatest artists and thinkers in history (there are innumerable examples), including filmmakers throughout the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries, might not be able to successfully pass through the gauntlet of academic performance evaluation and achieve a promotion of rank from assistant to associate professor at xyz university. The peer-review process would be blind to the newness and originality of their work(s), and instead would decide their works were non-compliant with prior norms—a failure in comparison to that which was known or expected.

**j) Alternatives to traditional models of peer review**

The traditional, anonymous process of peer review has been criticized for its lack of accountability, possibility of abuse by reviewers, its possible bias and inconsistency, alongside other flaws, but discontent does not always translate into support for change. Nonetheless, in response to these criticisms, alternative systems and methods of peer review with various degrees of openness have been suggested. One response to the problems of reviewer bias has been to move to double blind rather than single blind review (Ware, 2008). However, the secrecy involved in blinding the reviewer’s identity has itself been criticized on two main grounds:

From a pragmatic viewpoint, most studies that have investigated reviewer blinding have failed to measure improvements in the quality of the review and, conversely, other studies have shown that making the reviewer’s identity known to authors had no effect on quality. There is also a strong ethical argument against secrecy, namely that it is seen to be unfair for somebody making an important judgment on the work of others to do so in secret (Ware, 2008, p. 17).
When asked which options they thought were effective, however, respondents expressed a clear preference for double-blind review, but according to Ware (2008): “it was clear from the verbatim comments that the preference for double-blind review was largely a response to the potential for bias in single-blind review. The reasons given for this preference were primarily its objectivity and fairness” (p.18).

A newer approach to dealing with the criticisms of single-blind review is an open peer review (Ware, 2008). In this model:

…the author’s and reviewers’ identities are known to each other, and the reviewers’ names and (optionally) their reports are published alongside the paper. Advocates of open review see it as much fairer because, they argue, somebody making an important judgment on the work of others should not do so in secret. It is also argued that reviewers will produce better work and avoid offhand, careless or rude comments when their identity is known (Ware, 2008, p. 6).

More recently, electronic publishing technology has allowed a variant of open review to be developed, in which all readers, not just the reviewers selected by the editor, are able to review and comment on the paper and even to rate it on a numerical scale following publication. This post-publication review could occur with or without conventional pre-publication peer review. The benefits are “that it takes account of comments from a wider range of people (‘the wisdom of crowds’) and makes the review a more living process” (Ware, 2008, p. 7). This alternative solution might be relevant in the context of uploading media-based work onto the YouTube website (www.youtube.com) as inferred by Respondent #4 in this dissertation’s survey: “Furthermore, the popularity of a moving image (as, say, measured by YouTube viewings) is
entirely off a personnel committee's radar.”

There are committees within a college and within the university that review research output and make a report that may or may not concur with an administrator’s evaluation. Subsequent to any faculty involvement, administrators have the final decision-making power whether the faculty member’s research will successfully or unsuccessfully be considered. As previously discussed, there is little that a faculty member can do about the hierarchical nature of the power structure within academe, at least in the context of his/her application for promotion, tenure or other rewards. There are some areas within the process of peer review where heightened scrutiny and pro-active concern might be appropriate. I can not predict or assume that peer-review in any form will go away, change its nature, or be the same as usual in the future. I have provided an overview of what might be the concerns of the peer-review process in the context of evaluation of creative work by a faculty member in the field of film and digital media.

k) The non-teachable and evaluation

Elkins’ (2001) has argued that art is not teachable, and he might be right. If Elkins (2001) is right that art and its aspects of work cannot be taught, then how can that same thing be evaluated? This provocative question reaches to the core of the fundamental aspects of the processes and purposes of filmmaking, as an area for study and practice, in the context of performance evaluation.

The committed filmmaker has a high threshold for coping with a myriad of problems: 1) financial and creative risk-taking, 2) emotional indecision that is inherent to the process from start to finish, the 3) psychic pain of facing risk in the pursuit of an elusive reward, and 4) other
undue forms of suffering, necessary sacrifice and misery that constitute the daily life of many filmmakers. No coping mechanism for dealing with these real and serious problems can be taught; and the non-teachable nature of these important aspects of work done by filmmaker-artist-faculty members might also be (nearly) impossible to properly evaluate in an academic setting. A technique or a fact might be teachable, but Elkins’ (2001) idea continues to resonate in my head—art cannot be taught, and if so then logic dictates that evaluation of art is nothing more than a subjective expression of taste.

Perhaps some coping and stress-reduction mechanisms can be learned, but perhaps only on theoretical and abstract levels. Situations that require risk-taking and result in emotional stress surely affect the life and career of a filmmaker, and are similar to any other battle situation. These conditions require a uniquely high threshold for pain tolerance in relation to other more normal activities in life, and are not directly teachable or predictable. In the film, The Karate Kid, Mr. Miyagi does not know for sure how the young student will respond in the heat of battle to his teachings, and only during the test of battle does it become known. To attempt teaching in the areas of battle readiness, pain tolerance, stress coping, and risk taking would be noble, but also be perceived as cruel and unusual punishment, a form of harassment, and would certainly invite legal action against the teacher. How can a teacher inflict a situation where stress is inflicted without the teacher being considered an ogre or abuser? While the Marine Corps drill sergeant might test the emotional limits of a soldier’s coping skills in boot camp, who knows how the soldier will react when the missiles and bullets are whizzing around his head in real battle? Coping skills in real conditions of extreme stress and a high tolerance for real pain that a filmmaker will experience during a career can not be directly be predicted or taught, much like
the heroic behavior of a warrior is not teachable, just as the masked decision-making of a high-stakes poker champion, or the sharpshooting skills of an assassin are (probably) not teachable.

All that a teacher can do, perhaps aided by Bloom’s verbs in his taxonomy of learning (Bloom, 1956), is to describe, encourage, dissuade, instruct and inform the student of what is forthcoming, to facilitate problem posing/problem solving dialogue and learning opportunities where the student might intuit and discover the odds that are for or against his favor, and to remind students of the biographical stories of countless others who endured deprivation as the cost of their commitment. A potential area or question for future inquiry concerns what is teachable or not in art(s), leading to even greater understanding about what is possible for evaluation.

Filmmaking clearly has many aspects that are not teachable and probably not conducive to a formal evaluation process that would rely upon the use of conventional and irrelevant criteria; but does this disallow recognition of these aspects during evaluation? In Chapter 5 the specific and unique aspects of work in film and digital media are prioritized and thereby an argument can be made for inclusion. A teacher can pose problems that facilitate the opportunity for students to experience and problem-solve very challenging and difficult scenarios where many types of risk, suffering and emotional distress are inherent, and perhaps this is the only way that learning is achieved anyway, but as a body of knowledge, such things are not overtly teachable, and therefore, not easily evaluated or measured.
Theme 4: The nature of faculty work in film and digital media

Theme 4 is sub-divided into four thematic sub-sections (4a through 4d).

a) How a film is made
b) Four aspects, four phases, four domains
c) Research and the field of film and digital media
d) Boyer (1990) and faculty work in film and digital media

A broad range of artistic, scholarly and professional work is being developed and produced by faculty in the field of film and digital media. This work is being broadcast and exhibited worldwide, justifying the curtailment of marginalization for faculty members in the field, and compelling institutions of higher learning to find new and better ways to recognize, evaluate and reward this work. The question for faculty in the field of film and digital media is what should be recognized and rewarded as scholarship during a performance evaluation in an academic setting? To address this question, the following sections examine the processes of how films and digital media works are made.

a) How a film is made

Talent without skills, inspiration without knowledge, and creativity without technique count for little but lost potential. The first step in the education of a filmmaker is to recognize the view, attributed to Aristotle, that the universe exists independent of anyone’s awareness of it, that the function of consciousness is to grasp reality, not to create it or to dictate its nature, and that the absolutism of existence is what ought to shape one’s thoughts and actions (Durant, 1960). The possibility of creating or dictating reality might be perceived by some filmmakers as appealing, but it must be remembered that the entire process is an illusion that is ever-changing; therefore we can never dictate anything beyond an illusion of invention and control. Filmmakers
create the illusion of control, by engaging and interacting with the observable world by using a variety of intelligences (Gardner, 1983; 1989; 1991). From that point, one begins doing things to get it done in a holistic effort to communicate one’s thoughts and ideas, in response to prior knowledge, a set of acquired and expert skills, and with the use of creative thinking. Filmmaking is a representation of an orderly system of interrelated systems within the context of creative thinking, a challenge that magnifies the importance of self-knowledge and self-leadership.

All films share some very basic and essential component parts and rules, all of which converge and are integrated in a whole. A frame is the term that describes the smallest unit of a motion picture shot, which is the smallest aesthetic unit of the sequence of scenes within the film. A frame is essentially a still photograph, and in the United States there are 24 individual still photographs per second (24 fps) being projected on the cinematic screen (in Europe the projection rate is 25 fps, and in video the USA standard is 30 fps while in EU it is 25 fps). The most basic definition of a shot is--from the total amount of frames, first the frame when the camera starts rolling until the last frame when the camera stops rolling---simple as that. The combined total of frames that result from the camera starting, rolling, then stopping, constitutes a shot. Shots can be assembled or edited together to make a scene or sequence, or a shot can inclusively be a scene or shot.

---

1 In motion picture filmmaking, in the USA, there are 24 frames per second that are shot in the camera. In Europe, there is a different frame rate of 25 frames per second. In video, the European standard is 25 frames per second (PAL), and in the USA the standard is 30 (or 29.97) frames per second (NTSC). Thus, each “frame” is essentially a still picture, whether it is shot on film or video, and the amount of frames per second that are projected gives the viewer the impression of movement and motion.
Alfred Hitchcock’s “ROPE”, a feature dramatic film, gives the impression that the film is only one long, continuous shot---although the film is actually made up of a few shots with editing being cleverly concealed\(^2\). The basic unit of a motion picture is a *shot*, and a movie is constructed through the linear assemblage of shots, one after the other, ad infinitum, or at least until the story is told and the images and audio exhausted.

Each *shot* can be divided into two basic categories or types:

- process and/or
- interaction and/or
- a combination of both, process and interaction.

Each shot in a film, without exception, can be sub-divided into one of two categories, or both---a *process* and/or an *interaction*. Any *shot*, in any *film*, without exception, can be described as either a *process*, namely a depiction of someone or something doing something, or an *interaction*, namely, where someone or something is engaging in communication with someone or something.

A filmic *process* is fairly obvious to imagine---someone is crossing a street or picking up a book or tuning a violin, etc. Simply, a process is a step-by-step sequence or series of shots that depict someone and something doing something, from a beginning point to an end point.

*Interaction* is a little more abstract, but basically can be defined as a situation that involves the exchange of information, ideas, and opinions, specifically including the response experience of actor(s) -reactor(s) during communication or interpersonal contacts. Interactions are diverse and limitless, perhaps two persons in a verbal exchange, or perhaps a baby with a bottle, or perhaps a cat with a string, ad infinitum. Interactions involve actor(s)-reactor(s), and those can be persons,

\(^2\) “Rope” is a motion picture that was directed by Alfred Hitchcock.
things, or other independent variables. Basically, an interaction in filmmaking would
demonstrate an observable relationship among objects, persons or other variables that do
something to, or somehow affect, one another. Successfully filmed interactions usually
demonstrate the active engagement of actor(s)-reactor(s) in the process of reciprocal action or
exchange, resulting in new knowledge about the outcome of how one thing/person affects or acts
upon encountering another.

It is useful for a filmmaker to know that each individual shot is demonstrating a process
or an interaction, or a combination of both. This is a fundamental fact of reality in filmmaking,
most applicable when one is pointing a camera at someone or something with the intention of
making a movie. If one is clear about what is being seen or observed on this most basic level,
the shot will be much more successful toward exemplifying its intended purpose. The filmmaker
must continually ask is, what I am seeing through the camera’s viewfinder an interaction, or a
process, or both? Is it a process that I am intending to shoot, one shot at a time? What step in
the multi-step process am I observing? How many steps of the entire process should be included
in a particular shot?³ These thoughts and questions are continually racing through the mind’s
eye of the filmmaker, particularly the one who is observing the world through the camera’s
viewfinder.

It is also true that processes and interactions share some commonality; it is possible that a
shot could involve a process and interaction at the same time, simultaneously and independently
observable, depending on content of the filmed action, and the frame of reference by the

³ For example, if the process is making dinner, then how much detail should each shot contain?
Should the farm where the meat and vegetables originate be included? Should the onions being
chopped be included in the same shot as the salad being mixed? Important “frames” are selected
and de-selected by the filmmaker who is attempting to demonstrate a process of work on film.
interpreter. For example, a shot of a person opening a bottle of wine can be interpreted though the camera’s viewfinder, ultimately on film, as a process and an interaction, or merely a process, or merely an interaction—the wine bottle is handled and opened by the waiter, a close up shows the wine pouring out of the bottle into the glistening crystal glass, the wine taster savors the bouquet of the wine, the shimmering wine in the glass reflects the nearby candlelight, etc. Each of these shots could be framed or described as a process, from beginning to end, or as an interaction where relationships are explored within the action, or both at the same time. The bottom line is that process and interaction are basic facts in filmmaking, fundamental units in the effort to achieve and realize a completed work in this time-based form.

b) Four aspects, four phases, and four domains

Filmmaking is creative and interdisciplinary praxis that integrates many kinds of content or approaches—artistic, experimental and artistically expressive. Works can be commercially crafted for maximizing profits or entertainment value; educational, propagandistic or misinformational, journalistic or anthropological in intent; a form of amusement for voyeuristic or emotional escape; a new commodity for business enterprise; socially relevant or commercially persuasive or politically expedient; dogmatic and didactic, elitist or mainstream, and so on. Although not taught as a holistic system in programs of study and practice at schools, filmmaking can be taught as a holistic system that relies upon a broad range of knowledge, skills
and opportunities. More specifically, filmmaking is an interconnected system of relationships and processes, an integrated set of actions that comprise four aspects:\(^4\):

- Creative (art, lateral thinking)
- Technical (craft)
- Business (currency, dissemination/outreach)
- Legal (agreements)

The *four aspects* are independent systems, yet are largely inseparable and interconnected with each other in the context of filmmaking. Each aspect has its own particular scope and nature, but is entirely reliant upon every other aspect. Each of the four particular aspects is inseparably reliant and mutually dependent upon each of the other aspects. Not one aspect is more important, or less important, than any other aspect. But, a question looms, what is filmmaking, is it possible to teach filmmaking, and is it necessary to teach filmmaking in a holistic way that integrates all its aspects?

A filmmaker may have no overt awareness or conscious understanding of the four aspects (to his/her peril), or may choose to take personal responsibility and control over the Four Aspects on a solo basis, or may choose to collaborate with one or more other persons to accomplish and successfully realize each of the four aspects during the process of making a film\(^5\). Each aspect is

---

\(^4\) When a filmmaker assumes responsibility for all aspects of the process this might be referred to as “auteur” filmmaking, work done by solo filmmakers in documentary, experimental, commercial and other forms.

\(^5\) This might be referred to as “corporate” filmmaking, when individual specialists collaborate within one of the four aspects, perhaps in very different ways, on work toward a common goal, usually under the direction of a supervisor or set of supervisors.
essential to the entire process of work on any particular filmmaking project, and is requisite on all filmmaking projects of any kind. Without exception, the four aspects are facts in filmmaking.

A plethora of scholarly and popular books and writings emphasize one or more of the four aspects as of primary importance in the process of filmmaking. But the theory of the four aspects that I am setting forth in this paper is grounded in my own experience, and in the experiences of many students and colleagues with whom I have collaborated over the years who have worked without the benefit of a previously written guide or reference. It is my intention in this paper and through my continuing research to formally address this gap. The fact of reality is, without exception, that each aspect (business, creative, technical, legal) is inextricably interconnected to each of the aspects, and that successful filmmaking, including learning and teaching in filmmaking does not overlook any of the four aspects, as mentioned above. A person might be a cinematographer (technical and/or creative), or an editor (technical and/or creative), or any other technical or creative team member (director, audio recordist, set designer, etc) on a filmmaking project, but, for example, each of these team members would be stymied and mired in non-productivity, if the business or legal aspects remain unrecognized, or if some other aspect were to be neglected. As described above, the four aspects of the filmmaking process are creative, technical, business and legal. Using Boyer’s (1990) model, scholarly filmmaking and scholarly teaching in filmmaking would include discovery, application, and integration that emerge throughout the process of making a film (Boyer, 1990).

The process of producing a film can be sub-divided into at least four sub-processes of work, and I will refer to these steps as the Four Phases. The four phases—the process of developing,
• Pre-Production. This is the time when ideas for story or program content are developed, researched, written into a script, treatment or other plan of work, money is raised, crews are assembled, and the project is initiated.

• Production. This is the time when the actual work with the camera, lights, audio recording equipment and other “capture tools” takes place. Production can occur in a studio, on location, with actors or any other on-camera talent, or any other place. It is the time when the raw elements, visual and/or audio\textsuperscript{6}, are made.

• Post-Production. This is the time when the raw elements are organized, assessed, selected and de-selected, assembled into sequences, mixed, polished, and constructed into a rough cut, fine cut, and eventually, a final cut, namely, a finely-constructed assemblage of shots that (at least) resembles what was planned and scripted during pre-production.

• Distribution/Broadcast. This is the time when the final cut is presented to audiences in any number of ways—television sets, theaters, internet access, classrooms, libraries, video shops, and much more. This is also the time when a range of agreements pertaining to the sales and marketing of the completed program are realized and consummated.

The four phases are an overview of the process of work that relates to making a film. The four aspects are also critical to the development and completion of work in a holistic way, but when considered as a whole then both lists (four aspects, four phases) can be considered as a holistic theory of filmmaking.

A third model, the four domains, facilitates an overview of filmmaking that emerges from Fraser and Restropo-Estrada (1998). In the context of describing opportunities for media

\textsuperscript{6} Audio elements are recorded sounds. Sounds are not “audio” until recorded. Recorded sounds are audio.
production that extend beyond conventional notions for media program dissemination, a four part model is established that I refer to as the four domains. The four domains include media production for commerce, entertainment, education and social development. In most schools and in most paradigms that apply to learning of skills in new media, the emphasis is upon student’s receiving appropriate and relevant training for employment in the context of entertainment and commerce, namely, feature filmmaking, TV commercial production, broadcast TV media programming, and other programming that intends to facilitate commercial and entertainment expectations. The remaining two domains—social development and education—oftentimes remain untapped for students in schools and left underrated in terms of the identification of vast, creative and professional opportunities that exist outside of media production for mainstream commercial and entertainment purposes. For example, the opportunities for media producers at the Ford Foundation, United Nations (UN Development Program, UNESCO, etc), National Endowment for the Humanities, and many other private and public foundations and associations are at least equivalent in scope to the better-known opportunities in mainstream commerce and entertainment media. The empowerment of students with a consciousness that their filmmaking and media production talents and skills have absolute relevance in the contexts of social development and education is an important shift that ought to occur in institutions of higher learning. The big difference between working in a commercial or entertainment media context with a social development or educational media context is that the practitioner might have to be more holistically oriented and trained—meaning that the filmmaker should have a range of expert skills in camera, lighting, audio recording, editing and writing because it is most likely that a crew of specialized experts would not be affordable or desirable for such smaller scale work. At this point most institutions of higher learning in filmmaking are primarily focused
upon providing job-training skills according to a specialist-reductionist model and this does not
serve the creative or professional needs that are relevant to a practitioner engaged in the
production of educational or social development media programming.

At best, the scope and nature of learning in filmmaking within the University is centered
upon the technical and creative challenges, with near-nil attention to the business and legal
aspects, unless of course those non-production areas were your specialization. For example, at
UCLA’s Film School, where I attended as an undergraduate and graduate film student, just as in
most film schools like NYU or USC and so many others, one learns technical stuff in a technical
class (camera, audio recording, lighting, directing, scriptwriting, etc), and business stuff in a
business class (production management, fundraising, etc), and so on. There is very little, perhaps
nil, integration of the four aspects, the basic facts of reality in the formalized study of
filmmaking, in school programs of study. In fact, when looking, for example, at the New York
University’s curriculum and program of study in filmmaking at the Master’s level, a student is
obligated to select a major from Cinematography, Editing, Directing or Producing. The fact of
integration that is characteristic of the filmmaking process is reduced to four specialized fields.
This paradigm is well suited to an intended career in commercial and entertainment media
production in a corporate context, but is entirely counter-productive for holistic, independent
auteur-based filmmaking where the filmmaker is both artist and producer combined.

During the process of making a film, the filmmaker faces a mountain of unfavorable odds
against getting any film made in the first place and those unfavorable odds are hovering
everywhere until the end of the filmmaking process, only to start up again when a new process is
commenced. A strategic and intentional lowering of risk factors that are required to develop,
produce, fund, or finally complete the film, increases the likelihood that getting it done could
occur, however, it might reduce the filmmaker/artist’s autonomy over the work, might compromise the ethical and moral values of the filmmaker/artist, and possibly reduces the chance that the creative work will be considered artistic work at all. It is a commonly held notion by many, including filmmaker/artists, to convolute the trappings of economic success with artistic success, and this is a matter that is confronted by any filmmaker who is on the road to success---do I work on THIS film project for the (great) money, or do I pursue that project which is closer to what my heart and soul are imploring me to do? The answer to the question is entirely personal and the process or basis for answering that question cannot be directly taught. The process of filmmaking is rife with risk no matter what kind of work is being done. Oftentimes, the audience’s response to the work is to be surprised about the element of risk that was involved for the artist to get the work produced. The required high tolerance for pain and suffering that are inherently part of the filmmaker’s efforts and inherent part of the process of filmmaking (monetary risk, psychological risk, physical risk, logistical risk, the risk of personality or ego clash, and many more) and the level of pain and suffering that are an everyday part of the filmmaker’s life and work, are certainly higher in filmmaking when compared with many other professions and areas of scholarly work.

c) Research and the field of film and digital media

New approaches, methods and tools for conducting research have emerged that integrate existing and emerging fields of knowledge. New media, including the field of film and digital media, has enabled faculty scholarship, including scholarly research, to evolve by making connections with a constellation of new methods and resources. Research is a practice of formulating and presenting questions, theories, methods, data, analyses, and interpretations
during which inclusions and exclusions occur as the narrative of inquiry is constructed and communicated, and this range of work is being transformed by the emergence of new media. Marcus (1995) suggests the cinematic technique of montage as an alternative to academic writing for representing the various locations of culture and individuals within culture by creating conceptual relationships between visual ideas that would seem unrelated if depicted in isolation. Eisner (1997) has suggested that “we tend to seek what we know how to find” (p. 7), so as researchers are taught to use new media there will be a change in the structure of the questions asked through research inquiry and in the methods by which the questions are answered.

Media is the plural form of the word, medium, and the terms signifies a tool or means of communicating and getting something done. Bolter and Grusin (1999) define a medium as “that which appropriates the techniques, forms, and social significance of other media and attempts to rival or refashion them in the name of real” (p. 66). The term, new media, provokes one to question the myths and conventions of existing media while defining the semiotic systems, interpretive communities, and normative epistemologies of a new medium (Voithofer, 2005; Gitelman and Pingree, 2003). However, in using the phrase, new media, it is important to avoid a reductive claim that a new medium subsumes its predecessors as completely obsolete (for example, books or radio); and heralds the new technology as having greater capacity to mediate reality than existing media do (e.g., a virtual field trip to an art museum is heralded as a more accurate representation of the museum experience than a book about a current exhibit) (Voithofer, 2005 p. 5). New media, in contrast with more established media, can be described as follows:

- the convergence of text, video, film, animation, audio, photographs, and 2D and 3D
graphics that are combined (i.e., authored, linked), stored (i.e., organized, manually and automatically indexed), and presented (i.e., searched, retrieved, and displayed through a graphical interface or metaphor) on some form of video monitor (e.g., personal computer, laptop, personal digital assistant, cellular phone) and that are transferred over distributed wired and wireless electronic networks (Voithofer, 2005, p. 6).

Digital video software, at the heart of what constitutes new media (for example, software such as Apple’s Quick-Time, Microsoft’s Media Player, and Real’s RealPlayer) not only includes the capacity to reproduce sound and video but also are containers for multiple media that include several video, audio, text, and animation tracks, all of which can be displayed in various combinations based on input from the individual playing the movie or on the conditions set by the producer, or both. Further, according to (Voithofer, 2005), new media software might include the following experiences on a computer: analyzing the video of a classroom interaction; listening to an Internet radio report; seeing the arrival of an e-mail from a faculty advisor; hearing an instant message alert from a family member; and glancing at an open Web page depicting a useful range of information, etc. Each of these windowed worlds invokes places that the new media researcher’s body has been in, is in, and may be in and situates time in the past, present, and future (Voithofer, 2005).

From the first efforts to use film to collect anthropological data (Mead and Bateson, 1952) to recent uses of collaborative digital video to construct contextual understandings of learning (Goldman-Segall, 1991; Pea, 2003) and beyond, film and video have an established history in research. Film, and video in particular, are time-based media that mirror, distort, reproduce, challenge, and transgress the various institutions, subjectivities, social discourses,
inequities, and psychic states that influence learning (Voithofer, 2005). Video (and by inference film, photography, and other forms of digital media) represents a convergence of technologies in which various media are combined and can be analyzed by design. Video (and perhaps any other form of electronic media) is arguably becoming its own language, a system of signs that not only represents a cross-section of reality but also acts as an epistemological tool to transform society (Voithofer, 2005). However, while some theorists have shown how structural elements such as shot selection, editing, lighting, camera angle, and audio design and mixing contribute to the meanings that are made (Bordwell and Thompson, 2003) with film or video, others have argued that these structures cannot be considered a linguistic system because a convention/technique like a close-up or cross-dissolve does not mean the same thing in every video or film (Metz, 1981).

Media-specific research and analysis that relies upon video (or film, digital media, photography, etc) should address its changing role from a recordkeeping medium to a knowledge-building tool (Voithofer, 2005). A significant aspect of research and analysis that is video/new media-specific is to understand how media production and its outcomes affect the way that knowledge is framed, through the physical and visual interface that is offered to both the author and the viewer (Voithofer, 2005). Manovich (2001) contends that digital devices are being used to transmit increasingly diverse forms of culture, and that computer interfaces are also cultural interfaces that shape and delimit the creation and experience of one’s social worlds. Manovich (2001) notes that interfaces operate as representations of existing cultural forms and media, emphasizing some, such as the desktop and film, at the expense of others. Manovich (2001) observes:

Cinematic means of perception---connecting space and time, representing human
memory, thinking and emotion---have become a way of work and a way of life for millions in the computer age. Cinematic aesthetic strategies have become basic organization principles of computer software. The window into a fictional world of cinematic narrative has become a window into a datascape (p. 86).

The design of a printed book or research report benefits greatly by not being simply a pile of words or data on a page, but material elements designed to shape the reading experience---and this is a major area where digital media can impact the way that research is conducted by scholars. For example, a significant component in the interface of research is the type that is selected, and yet this is often narrowly considered in the design of research (Voithofer, 2005). Design, a praxis that is grounded in the discourses of research, media production, and new literacies, suggests a cycle of planning, creation, reflection, and adjustment for the construction of research, media, and knowledge. The language of design in research, media and knowledge involves making new uses of existing resources, including research methods, theoretic frameworks about learning and knowing, aesthetic conventions, narrative structures, media genres, theories of curriculum, and semiotic grammars (e.g., video, interface, hypertext). Voithofer, 2005 writes:

Typefaces have meanings that emerge from particular historical periods, regions, schools of thought, aesthetic conventions, and theories of meaning and readability. While the connection has been largely lost, type possesses an embodied origin beginning as the representation of bodily gestures.

The selection of type in the design of a research text can communicate something about both the author and the content of a text.
Various visual media including photographs, video, and electronic texts, are increasingly being employed by qualitative researchers as cultural productions to represent sites of social interaction and as examples of ethnographic knowledge. According to Voithofer (2005) visuals can be used “as more than illustrative, archival, or documentary data to study issues of status, place (i.e., schools), and surveillance” (p. 5). Cautioning against using visuals to re-inscribe empirical certainty, and rejecting the grafting of existing research methods onto visuals, Pink (2001) argues that new methodologies are necessary for visual analysis. Marcus (1995) suggests the cinematic technique of montage as an alternative to academic writing for representing the various locations of culture and individuals within culture by creating conceptual relationships between visual ideas that would seem unrelated if depicted in isolation.

Artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media, commonly lumped by conventional terminologies into the category of new media, is probably more comprehensive in scope than conventional research output, as it reaches beyond the domain of discovery to the domains of application, integration and/or public outreach/teaching (Williams-Rautola, 2001). Williams-Rautola (2001) argues that creative work is intellectually demanding in similar ways to that of traditional research, including the collection of data, analysis, and synthesis of data and content, and with its inherently intellectual foundations in discovery, application and integration. There is also distinction and a comparison that can be made between traditional research and the creative endeavors that are common in media production.

A wide range of traditional research methodologies underpins the development and production of a film, video or other new media project. The development of a creative work requires the discovery of new knowledge, through the gathering of new information, review of literature, synthesis and analysis. Computer-based media production tools, no longer the
exclusive domain of production professionals, are becoming accessible, in price and ease of use, to a growing number of discourse communities. Taking a camera system and an audio recording system to a location requires a myriad of intellectual, practical, critically based, and aesthetic choices to be made, just as in traditional research methodology. But filmmaking and media production are more than simply recording what occurs before the camera or within range of the microphone, creative faculty through their choices of form reveal a pattern of context to the material that goes beyond mere recording. Thus, the intellectual foundation of discovery is the foundation of creative work.

It is now possible, for instance, for an educational psychologist, an ethnographic filmmaker, and a visual anthropologist to capture and create multiple media representations of classroom learning by using the same media capture and authoring tools. How these discourse community members might document learning (research) through the use of digital video or other medium would depend in part on their unique and overlapping design resources (Voithofer, 2005). Voithofer (2005) observes:

A visual anthropologist, less concerned with dramatic structure, flow, and progression, may bring multiple design resources to demonstrate how the visible world affects culture and communication in learning. An ethnographic filmmaker working in the digital realm may possesses knowledge of aesthetics and graphic design, producing network-delivered video and animating text and graphics to support the filmmaker’s deep understanding of the use of video to construct a dramatic representation of the learning context. The educational psychologist might draw upon design discourses about teaching and learning that would suggest where to point the camera and what to include during the editing
process. The video documentation produced from the design resources of people in each of these fields could, of course, look quite different as a result of different producer training and concerns. However, because each of these individuals is increasingly more likely to use a computer for documentation and presentation, a common set of design resources, constrained by the interface metaphors and technical discourses of the production software, infuses the process of documentation and representation in each of the disciplines. The computer presents epistemological constraints as it offers opportunities for representation (p.7).

Searching for and exposing such constraints while engaging in collaborations across multiple design communities reveals the importance of designing new media technotexts (Voithofer, 2005).

Williams-Rautola (2001) describes new understandings, levels of awareness and knowledge-building that are possible in the process of work in new media, arising for students who may benefit from artist-researchers who teach, through the complex application of learned principles, new insights, and shared experiences that frequently emerge during the challenges of production and completion of film and media work. The problem in this regard is how can these new understandings be measured and evaluated by outside review? An implementation of Boyer’s (1990) view on the part of the institution, one that appreciates and values the convergence of discovery, integration, application and teaching, is one starting point. Another challenge is to measure the activities that might include new understandings for evaluation.

Diverse research methods, including conventional and traditional methods, underpin the development and production of a film or other media project, just as there can be diverse methods used to develop and produce a doctoral dissertation research project (Jacobs, 2008) or
any other qualitative research project (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The landscape of qualitative research methods is diverse and faculty work in film and digital media is widely varied. Films and digital 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 scholarly paper usually examine esoteric areas of specialist interest and are intended for a narrowly defined readership audience, there are clearly-delineated standards and expectations in regard to length, format, structure, terminologies, presentation, and purpose. Homogeneity does not describe the outcome of creative works in film or digital media. Each work can vary in significant and detailed ways, depending on the purpose, budget and other factors that surround the filmmaker and his/her story. Conventions, aesthetics, and limitations are always changing, are hugely diverse, and certainly are not homogenous—yet a wide variety of works, including important aspects of whole works, remain un-recognized or rewarded. Two professors, writing about the marginalization of narrative films by faculty, comment:

As is, most universities do not know how to characterize narrative film production as scholarship. As a result, academics are not being encouraged to produce narrative films. This is especially tragic for film programs that specialize in narrative film production (Respondent #13).

In fact, this often disconnects the student (who in a film history course deconstructs big-budget studio films) from the work of media production teachers (who cannot contribute to the making of that sort of film and at the same time earn tenure) (Respondent #4). Describing the mismatched relationship of traditional scholarship and filmmaking, writing, Respondent #4 wrote:
The schedule of work for a filmmaker and a ‘traditional’ scholar is mismatched. While scholars might arrange a trip to a foreign archive to coincide with spring or summer breaks, there is really only one time of year a filmmaker can shoot script-specified exteriors in the snow (Respondent #4).

The scope and nature, the approach and method, and the ultimate outcomes of work in film and digital media are unique and distinct from traditional and conventional expectations that prioritize scientism and publication. The end result is that faculty members in film and digital media are discouraged from doing what they would like to do as researchers, are not encouraged to apply what they know and do to what they are tasked to teach in the classroom, and are marginalized by a performance evaluation system that is not suited for its intended purpose. One professor wrote:

Together, these issues steer teaching filmmakers to make smaller, grant-funded documentary or art films, limiting their involvement and influence to ‘worthy’ genres seldom selected by the filmmakers themselves (Respondent #4).

Another professor argues that certain forms of scholarly filmmaking is monetarily rewarded outside of academic settings, just like the work and consultancies done by peers in other disciplines, but that marginalization and unfair treatment for those in the field of film and digital media persist:

Further complicating the judging of a scholarly filmmaker is the fact that he often makes money in the exercise of his discipline. This, like oft-disparaged ‘entertainment’ value, makes his work suspect. Films perceived as ‘purely entertaining’ are suspect, for they may appear to be motivated by profit rather than inquiry. In fact, the filmmaker's inquiry may be into a new technique in the employ of an entertaining theme, but such inquiry
may have to be explained to colleagues, often in a paper presentation. Fortunately, there is some precedent outside the humanities for the professor-as-paid-consultant (the disciplines of business and engineering come to mind), but association with those traditions can create problems of its own (Respondent #4).

Some films or digital media works are the result of one person working in isolation from others during all aspects of the production (Collins, 2003). 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.

d) Boyer (1990) and faculty work in film and digital media

Discovery, integration of prior knowledge from a wide variety of disciplines, and the application of a sophisticated set of technical and interpersonal skills are required for scholarship activity in the field of film and digital media, during the development and production phase of
the work throughout the post production/editing phase, and including the inevitable presentation and critical reflection of work to audiences. Although scholarship and professional work in film and digital media might not be perceived or recognized for satisfying the traditional template’s expectation for text-based output, the fact is that artistic, creative, scholarly, and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can demonstrably and commonly be rooted in conventional and alternative scholarship approaches (Boyer, 2000; Williams-Rautiola, 2001).

Work in the field of film and digital media emerges from observation to creative and technical choices in form, technique, and style; from the conventional domain of discovery to application to integration to the sharing of knowledge (Boyer, 1990). New understandings, new levels of awareness and knowledge-building that are not possible in the process of scholarly activity in other disciplines, can arise in the field of film and digital media. New insight, interpretation, knowledge and richly-shared experiences can emerge through collaboration, teaching, and the complex application of learned principles during the challenges of production, completion and presentation of artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media (Williams-Rautiola, 2001).

Based upon my own experience as a filmmaker, and as an observer in research for this dissertation, I observe that discovery, integration of prior knowledge from a wide variety of disciplines, and the application of a sophisticated set of technical and interpersonal skills is required of the scholar-filmmaker at all times, during the development and production phase of the work, throughout the post production/editing phase and including the ultimate presentation and critical reflection of work to audiences. The broadness of this scope and nature of work is what must be considered for evaluation, not just the tiniest of facts about the finality of the work. Filmmakers must integrate pre-conceptualized aural and visual strategies, with the content (script
or other treatment or production plan) to creatively illuminate the conclusions of research (Williams-Rautola, 2001), in artistic-aesthetic, communicative, and coherent ways.
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 activities 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, uniqueness 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.
Chapter 5: CONCLUSION

This chapter is divided into four parts:

Part 1: Rationale
Part 2: From theme to theory
Part 3: Recommendations from theory and outcomes
Part 4: Concluding Thoughts

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest implications and make specific recommendations for actions by all concerned parties; and to suggest topics for future research.

Part 1: Rationale

This qualitative and auto/ethnographic study has explored a broad range of factors that have emerged from a wide range of data sources, demonstrating that the research problem is being perpetuated and that solutions are needed. A wide range of data---the introduction to the problem in Chapter 1, literature was reviewed in Chapter 2, interviews and personalized writing in Chapter 4. I have demonstrated that artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media is not being adequately recognized or rewarded as scholarship.

This fact serves as the rationale in this chapter for presenting an alternative perspective that facilitates change.

Part 2: From theme to theory

Six themes emerged from data, delineated in Chapter 4. Those have been consolidated into three theories in this chapter.

Theory 1: The importance of *difference* among the disciplines
Theory 2: The importance of recognizing attributes that are *unique and specific* to the field of film and digital media.
Theory 3: The importance of considering the faculty member’s welfare *before and after* the
The three theories expose fundamental problems that are experienced by faculty in the field of film and digital media when facing the gauntlet of performance evaluation. The three theories listed below constitute an important aspect of my response to the research question of this dissertation---what work and activities by faculty in film and digital media should be recognized and rewarded as scholarship during a performance evaluation in an academic setting? (Recommendations are at the end of this chapter, completing my response to the research question). The three theories that address the research problem are:

**Theory 1: Recognizing *difference* among the disciplines.**
Faculty members in the field of film and digital media are marginalized in institutions of higher learning by a monolith of tradition and convention that fails to recognize *difference* among the disciplines, and a significant extent of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media remains unrecognized, undervalued, or dismissed during performance evaluation.

**Theory 2: Recognizing attributes that *unique and specific* to the field of film and digital media.**
Attributes of an institutional system for recognizing and evaluating faculty performance in film and digital media should include relevant criteria that honors and makes eligible all processes of work in the field of film and digital media for recognition and evaluation. To achieve that objective, it is important that a performance evaluation should be conducted by knowledgeable, qualified and experienced committee members using written and relevant criteria for the intended purpose; and that the evaluation itself should welcome a broad range of evidence
demonstrating *approach and artifacts*.

**Theory 3: Considering the faculty member’s welfare before and after the evaluation.**

Significant and complex problems affect faculty before and after a performance evaluation, particularly when formal criteria are vague or irrelevant, or when the result of an evaluation is unsuccessful for the faculty, and the human factors affecting the faculty member must be considered.

The following sections analyze each theory in the context of its relevance to the research problem, with careful attention paid to the research question, relevant literature, the methods for inquiry that were used, and the auto/ethnographic approach that was employed to write this dissertation.

**Part 2/Theory 1: Recognizing *difference* among the disciplines.**

There is a *difference* in the scholarship activities of faculty members in film and digital media, in comparison with the traditional and conventional expectations of activities for faculty members in other fields and disciplines. Even within the field of film and digital media itself there is a great *difference* in the scope and nature of work that emerges. There is an historical pattern of applying mismatched criteria during performance evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, but there is no logical, epistemological, or ethical basis for the continuing marginalization of alternative approaches, forms, and methods of work. The difference of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media from other approaches must be recognized and evaluated on the unique and specific
merits. As one professor wrote:

> I do believe valuing creative expression is crucial and often misunderstood in our field (film and digital media), especially by those with orientations to publication and scientific research (Respondent #9).

What is the meaning of *difference*, and what are the differences between a text-based work and a creative work in film or digital media? *Difference* is the antonym of equality and sameness, and difference is determined by comparison. But, a complete comparison of objects, things, or ideas is almost impossible---being limited to mere, random and subjectively selected attributes. There is an eternal murkiness and an irreconcilable postponement of finality, in an effort to finalize the concept of difference that is based upon perceptions of equality, because there are no words to adequately express the vast terrain of *difference*. I argue that change and *difference* are interconnected, and that change and equality (or sameness) are not.

To make an analogy with mathematics---two objects are equal only if they are precisely the same in every way. Equality, denoted by the equals sign, "=" indicates a binary relationship where two (or more) objects are precisely the same. For example, "x = y" means that x and y are equal. However, in artistic, scholarly or professional work that is time-based in nature there will never be mathematical equality, not within the field itself and certainly not in comparison with works outside the field. The analogy of fitting a square peg into a round hole is appropriate. Any attempt to apply criteria that is relevant for one will not be relevant for the other, and such an attempt is unfair, unwise, and imbalanced.

In some cases, in the field of film and digital media, rather than developing unique and appropriate criteria for the purpose of recognizing the differences in faculty scholarship and
evaluating the work for its *approach and artifacts* (Diamond and Adam, 2000), data in Chapter 4 shows that some institutions have arbitrarily decided to concoct a scheme to *equate* a publication with a film, as if a film and a research paper are equal, comparable and measured on one all-encompassing scale; as if they are two forms of the same thing. This scheme is contradiction with all notions that define *difference* in scholarship and faculty activities. Chapter 4 describes an institution that decided to implement a scheme (unwritten) to *equate* one text publication with one film or video, but only if the film/digital media work had been publicly exhibited in a film festival. No other aspect of the faculty’s work on that project was recognized for evaluation, but the one-to-one formula prevailed on the absurd basis that public exhibition of one film somehow equated with one journal article publication.

Faculty in the field of film and digital media who responded to the survey have described the external perception of their work with many negative terms, including: “*suspect* for being motivated by profit rather than inquiry, *undervalued*, often *disparaged*, *disregarded*, *dismissed*, *vocational*, and entirely *off a personnel committee’s radar.*” Data indicates a glaring gap that separates work by faculty in film and digital from their peers in other disciplines. Common sense dictates there is a significant, perceived and empirical *difference* between text-based research methods that reflect the traditional and conventional expectations of scholarship---whether qualitative and quantitative---in comparison with the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, despite some similarities and some comparable aspects.

Each successful work of creative expression (sometimes called art), including a film or other media production, is a microcosmic universe held together by its own internal logic, or illogic (NASAD, 1990). Unique characteristics of a film or media production can be identified
and compared with conventional research output according to a new model, but the internal logic of one work probably will not be the same internal logic of another, even when the two works are crafted by the same artist using the same tools, techniques and subject. A creative work in film or media production, like any other form of scholarship output, is certainly intended to contribute to the knowledge base in the field, but the work is likely to be intended as a creative, symbolic expression that abstractly represents that knowledge to others, namely, audiences. Using an analogy from the field of linguistics, it is arguable that all forms of language are symbolic attempts to abstractly communicate, and the visual and aural communication that is done in film and media production emerges in this way as a new language for expression.

The performance evaluation process in the field of film and digital media is inconsistent, irrelevant, and inappropriate for its intended purpose, and this fact compels a call for change that recognizes difference. Important scholarly work by faculty is being dismissed, unrecognized and unrewarded. In the words of one faculty member, “The development process, as arcane and opaque as it may appear to us, is completely off the radar of most academics” (Respondent #3). Referring to post-production work that goes unrewarded, one professor wrote:

With the proliferation of film festivals and competitions, there needs to be some clearer guidelines for what represents a significant (in terms of tenure) screening or award…Similarly, some forms of digital distribution need to be taken into account; and again, some digital distribution/exhibition is more valuable than others (Respondent #11).

A significant range of the qualitative, alternative and creative work by faculty in the field of film and digital media remains largely unrewarded, marginalized or obstructed by the narrowness of the traditional template---and largely because there is scant respect for difference
and minimal clarity about what is constituted as scholarly work when it deviates from normative expectations. Faculty work in film and digital media poses particularly difficult challenges in higher educational settings because it is highly collaborative and integrative in scope and nature, the result of diverse yet interrelated efforts and activities in a plethora of contexts. It is not imitative of conventional faculty scholarship activities, nor does it prioritize a need for replication, empirical truth, verifiability and other values from scientism. Simply, it is different and cannot be comfortably reconciled or easily judged by using a template that is intended for more measuring conventional kinds of qualitative or quantitative inquiry.
Part 2/Theory 2: Recognizing attributes that *unique and specific* to the field of film and digital media.

Artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film or digital media has *unique and specific attributes* that cannot be recognized and must not be evaluated by using the same criterion as text-based research publications. Data shows that the criteria for recognizing and evaluating text-based research output has been arbitrarily, inconsistently and incoherently applied to the recognition and evaluation of many forms of creative work, a process that moves forward without any logical basis for its continuation. The result is a mismatch of expectations, values, priorities, and outcomes---and potential conflict.

Successful work in film and digital media is that which achieves goals that have been set at the beginning or in the course of development, rather than following strictly a set of universal principles or rules. A goal is often based on certain conceptualizations or processes that are created or selected by the creator of the work, and these are combined with techniques and mediums to create the end product, an artistic, scholarly or professional work in film or digital media (Wait and Hope, 2009). An understanding of the goal and intent of the work by the faculty member who created the work enables an evaluation against the best things that can be known about the work. The evaluation should be interested in the unique and specific mode of thought that motivated the work and the faculty member who created the work; or upon the development of knowledge, skills, experiences, habits of mind, and so forth that has led to its highly sophisticated achievement (Wait and Hope, 2009, p. 7).

The most commonly found templates that are used for assessing or evaluating qualitative research in higher education are neither relevant nor appropriate for the intended purpose; and discrepancies in the criteria of the traditional template are fueling unresolved conflicts in
institutional settings. As discussed in the previous chapter, data from this study demonstrates that many institutions of higher learning have not recognized that artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media should co-exist alongside text-based research publications in the pantheon of what is considered to be faculty scholarship.

A new paradigm for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media should honor the approach and artifacts (or products) of work, rather than the conventional notion that emphasizes artifacts over approach (Diamond and Adam, 2000, p. 6-8; Matusov and Hampel, 2008). This shift in priorities, in comparison with the specialist-practitioner ontology of scientism, places greater value on the interconnectedness and interdependence of systems and processes. It rejects a traditional and conventional ontology of performance evaluation that strictly prioritizes artifacts over approach (Diamond and Adam, 2000; Matusov and Hampel, 2008).

The evaluation of individual achievement in an arts discipline such as the field of film and digital media should prioritize the unique and specific characteristics of individual achievement, reflecting and explaining the nature of achievement and quality beyond basic thresholds for entry level; even though they are present at entry level, at least to a fundamental degree. Developing these capabilities is the work of a lifetime, and there is virtually no limit to the levels of achievement and quality that can be reached. Because the specifics associated with each characteristic vary among disciplines and specializations, the list can be addressed in terms associated with departmental programs, and areas of specialization. The characteristics can be used to address the specific work of individual faculty members (and students too as the model is applicable to the evaluation of student work)—what they have achieved and their potential, evaluated in terms of specific accomplishments at a particular time.
Borrowing from models that pertain generally to the evaluation of artistic work in its many forms, important attributes and characteristics of unique, specific and individual achievement in film and digital media should prioritize:

1) Basic knowledge and skills in the discipline and any area of specialization, including fundamentals of the field in terms of practice, history, analysis and their applications in various areas of specialization.

2) The faculty member’s success in developing a personal vision and/or purpose (sometimes called artistic voice) that is evident in terms of work produced in the discipline or specialization. Verbal articulation of the vision or purpose is virtually immaterial if the vision is not manifested in the work produced. Vision or purposes are realized in terms of content or process in one or more of the following fields: artistic, humanistic, scientific, pedagogical, therapeutic, and so forth. Visions or purposes can change from work to work.

3) Borrowing from Bloom (1956), conceptual acuity and ability to:
   - create, sustain, realize, and evolve personal vision and purposes;
   - identify and achieve specific and associated ideas and/or goals at various levels of scope and complexity;
   - work creatively with relationships among ideas, structure, and expression;
   - understand multiple perspectives;
   - create using the process of discovery inherent in making a work.
   - use imagination as a means of creation and discovery with regard to specific content or subject matter and as a means for communicating through the art form what is created or discovered;
• channel imagination to reach specific artistic goals;
• apply imagination to all aspects and levels of a work in ways that enhance its communicative power.

5) Technical ability to:
• create, sustain, realize, and evolve a personal vision and/or purposes;
• realize specific works or projects or elements of concepts at an advanced or professional level;
• analyze one’s own work with sophistication using various methods and perspectives.
• Ability to combine knowledge and skills, personal vision and/or purpose.

6) Conceptual acuity and clarity, imagination, and technical ability to function independently in the creation and production of high level work in the area of specialization, including but not limited to the capability and capacity to:
• define, analyze, and solve problems;
• make effective choices;
• evaluate critically and effectively work in process;
• critique and learn from work of others;
• understand and work with layers of structure and meaning;
• combine, integrate, and synthesize elements into works with internal conceptual and structural integrity.

A new and appropriate evaluation system for this group of scholars should be consistent with the four domains of Boyer (1990). Boyer’s (1990) panoramic view of scholarship is relevant to research activities by faculty---extending from traditional and conventional notions of
discovery-based inquiry to the application and integration of skills and knowledge, to the sharing of knowledge through teaching. Boyer’s (1990) notion of scholarship facilitates a view of service by faculty as socially involved and socially responsible, in contrast to the common and narrow notion that is limited to committee participation and a few other mundane campus-based activities. The range of possibilities offered by the four domains of Boyer (1990) are relevant to the artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, but require the implementation of unique and specific criteria for measuring, assessing and evaluating such work in performance review.

As argued by Boyer (1990) and applied to the unique and specific field of film and digital media, the practice and outcomes of work in film and digital media emerge in similar ways as that which is common in conventional practice and outcomes---from the discovery of new knowledge and the gathering of new information to a review of existing data (including literature), to the building of greater understanding of other forms of expression that have expressed what is known. Discovery in film and digital media is a form analysis and synthesis with the use of a script, camera, microphone and montage. The process of work in film and digital media is constantly reliant upon the application and integration of many kinds of knowledge and skills, for technical, artistic, professional, and other purposes. Faculty who collaborate with others on the development and production of work in film and digital media are engaged in application and integration of knowledge and skills for social, educational, developmental, and organizational purposes. The fourth of Boyer’s (1990) domains, the sharing of knowledge through teaching, can also be meaningfully compared with the public exhibition, broadcast or presentation of a work in film and digital media.
Artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can emerge in the context of Boyer’s (1990) four domains of scholarship, and can include any of the following kinds of work:

- Films, videos and other electronic/digital media productions for creative and artistic expression;
- Creative or artistic works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that emerge from a range of research methods or approaches—conventional, unconventional, personal, self-reflective, or multidisciplinary;
- Creative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that are intended for advocacy and outreach purposes for a particular cause, including public awareness, organizational development or other intra-organizational communication, and other purposes;
- Creative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media intended for television broadcast or theatrical distribution;
- Creative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that are intended for educational applications in schools, libraries, media centers and other relevant venues where media programming serves to enhance learning, training and other forms of information dissemination;
- Creative and innovative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that are specifically intended for broadcast or presentation on the internet for commercial, entertainment or other purposes;
- Creative and innovative multimedia works for commerce, entertainment, and promotional purposes in a variety of contexts;
• Scholarship action in a broad of contexts that is produced and distributed in film, video and/or electronic/digital media for the benefit of local and global audiences.

The diverse outputs listed above can emerge from any of Boyer’s (1990) four domains (Discovery, Application, Integration, Teaching), and can effectively meet the three-point model of Schulman and Hutching (1998) for defining the scope and nature of scholarship activity by faculty; further, work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can satisfy the six-point criteria of Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) for defining and assessing the quality of scholarship in the four domains of Boyer (1990); and the six-point criteria of Diamond (1993) that pertain to the recognition of faculty work as scholarship is also consistent with the scope and nature of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media (see Chapter 2 Literature Review).

A reductionist or Newtonian view assumes that filmmaking is composed of specialized functions, that the technical, creative, business and legal aspects are important yet distinct from each other; that the specialist areas of practice and knowledge are to be performed by different persons with different sets of responsibilities—and that in the end the parts will fit together to form a whole under the guidance of a singular leader. In many ways this view does reflect a reality in professional and educational arenas, being true and consistent with the way that most of the conventional work in film and digital media that we commonly experience through television, in cinemas or elsewhere in the mainstream media—particularly the works that emerge in corporate, commercial, industrial and entertainment contexts. It is also common to find that specialization is advocated and taught in many schools and programs of higher learning in the field of film and digital media, following the specialist-practitioner model that encourages specialized mastery as a pre-requisite for participation with other specialist-practitioners to
accomplish shared goal(s). The problem is that notions of reductionism and specialization are not entirely useful for describing, recognizing or evaluating the scope and nature of work in the field of film and digital media.

In the context of specialization, an analogy from music is helpful, where musicians in an orchestra, for example, a violinist or timpanist or clarinetist, very likely will have minimal knowledge of the trumpet, oboe or contrabass, or some other instrument in the ensemble if it is not their own specialty. Together, music emerges from this group of harmonized specialists, most commonly under the direction of a leader (conductor, concertmaster, or other). These each musician-specialist is able to peacefully co-exist as an expert practitioner within the team, yet doing so without any detailed knowledge of the other. A similar model of self-reliant specialist-practitioners working in co-operation with other self-reliant specialist-practitioners is a norm in conventional forms of filmmaking practice, although it is evident that collaboration is not commonly recognized, fairly evaluated, or equitably rewarded in the university setting during a performance evaluation. As described in Chapter 4, in the words of one professor:

Film production's collaborative nature, however, might invite the filmmaking scholar to a position of responsibility as, say, a gaffer. While lighting is essential to the medium, the gaffer's credit seldom satisfies a tenure committee as a sufficiently creative contribution. Leadership positions in Directing, Writing and -- to lesser degrees -- Cinematography, Editing, and Production Design are thought by publishing scholars to be more analogous to their own academic tasks, and are thus more likely to be rewarded as scholarly (Respondent #4).

Institutional paradigms for performance evaluation subscribe to reductionism, isolating and focusing upon an important function in a specialized area. The assumption is that the
filmmaking process has leaders and followers, and that a leadership role can be recognized and rewarded, but that other roles have decreasing value. A further assumption is that systemic integration is beyond the grasp or capacity of sole individual, so holistic approaches to the process of filmmaking are also not rewarded, and not considered to be as valuable as a specialist approach to the process. The conventional model for defining and evaluating work in the field of film and digital media arbitrarily places greater value on some aspects of the work responsibility, yet diminishes the value placed upon other work.

A traditional and conventional approach to performance evaluation of scholarly work in any field will commonly focus on the dualistic vocabulary of morality, with dualisms such as good-bad, fair-unfair, right-wrong, did-did not, will-will not, and many more. Using moral terms in a performance evaluation can easily lead to bias, errors in judgment, conflict and lots of other bad results as a work is subjectively judged on moral terms. Simply discussing how good or bad, how right or wrong, or how beautiful or ugly a work of art or scholarship may or may not be, does not compel reflection upon the merits of what the work is, what are its unique and specific attributes. The continuing application of irrelevant and narrowly conceived criteria is unfair and will remain so until change has emerged.

Gatekeepers in higher education expect a symbiotic relationship of originality, compliance and mastery over that which previously existed. It is logical to assume that the uniqueness, merit and worth of truly original work could remain unrecognized or undervalued because, by definition, an original work would deviate greatly or entirely from all that preceded it. The potential for contamination of the evaluation process for original work through unawareness or unintended unfairness from preconceived bias by evaluators, caused by unmet expectations for mastery and referential linkages, is also always of concern.
Faculty perceptions of the performance evaluation process in institutions of higher learning, specifically in the field of film and digital media, have been described with the following terms:

…deliberately vague, a double jeopardy, difficult, silly to imagine, an uncomfortable fit, a major battle, limiting, problematic, off the radar of most academics, a yearly or biennial torture, leading to abuses when faculty and administrators are unfamiliar within the given discipline, not encouraged, tragic, an exception to the rule, disregarded, disconnected” (combined data from several Respondents).

In the words of one faculty member who responded to the survey, institutional policies for performance evaluation are “mismatched” with the scope and nature work of faculty in film and digital media; that the approach to work in film and digital media is expected to “mimic” that of publications; and that the number of films expected for promotion or tenure is often “unrealistic,” and that faculty themselves in the field are “seldom able to select the kinds of work that they would like to do”---if they want the work recognized and rewarded in the academic setting (Respondent #4).

The non-recognition of the unique and specific attributes of work in the field of film and digital media opens up several problem areas that are facing its faculty. The attributes of faculty evaluation systems should include relevant criteria, and a qualified and experienced evaluation committee should be using written and relevant criteria for the intended purpose. The data demonstrates these problem areas remain unresolved. The problematic nature of faculty performance evaluation emanates from the fact that reductionism, scientism, and the traditional template continue to prevail in many institutions, almost entirely disallowing the fair and relevant recognition, evaluation and reward of alternative forms of faculty work. Artistic,
scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media has unique and specific attributes but these fall off the margins when traditional and conventional modes of measurement and evaluation are applied.

If and/or when an institution does consent to allow and consider faculty work in the field of film and digital media, surely those works will be scrutinized and measured by selected faculty colleagues and administrators who serve on an internal committee panels inside the particular College, perhaps also by upper administrators whose expertise is entirely outside of the College, perhaps also by outside expert judge-evaluators from other institutions, and perhaps also by faculty colleagues outside the College who serve as promotion committee members. The unfortunate fact as demonstrated in data presented in Chapter 4 is that not all the persons who may be evaluating the work of their filmmaking peers or colleagues are informed, knowledgeable or experienced enough to evaluate the scope, nature and possibilities of artistic, scholarly or professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. As an analogy, I am sure that chemists would not want a sculptor to evaluate the worth of their research, so why does it continue that chemists are evaluating our work in film and digital media? Because the academy is a bastion of a traditional and conventional ontology of scientism, it is also entirely possible that none of the persons in the evaluation process have considered, and certainly not challenged, the notion that a new definition of scholarship is feasible, necessary and ready for implementation.

Data has shown that many faculty members in the field of film and digital media share a perception that some evaluators in a faculty performance evaluation do not have expertise with the specific and unique aspects of scholarship and activity in the field of film and digital media. Further, this negative perception is exacerbated by an absence of written criteria that clarifies the
scope and nature for performance evaluation. This negative perception is supported in instances when aspects or examples of scholarship performance remain under-rewarded or unrecognized during a performance evaluation (Diamond, 1993, 1995, 1999). Evaluators could be tempted to revert to reductive, dualistic, and pre-conceived views (self-other, good-bad, right-wrong, accepted-not accepted, and so on) to supplant their void of knowledge when they are not familiarized or experienced with the specific and unique aspects of work in the field of film and digital media. It can be demonstrated that if evaluators are not provided with relevant criteria upon which to judge in a proper and complete way the artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media, then unfounded or irrelevant assumptions will emerge and render the performance evaluation process as non-constructive (Holt, 2003).

Some faculty evaluator-reviewers who have minimal to nil knowledge or appreciation of those relevant strategies might not understand the scope and nature of creative processes for developing and making a film, video and related creative media work, including the key events and processes for disseminating the creative work for public viewing, and many others aspects. Therefore, it is essential that those who are tasked with the responsibility of evaluating creative scholarship in any field, including film and digital media production, be thoroughly familiarized with the scope and nature of work under review. Further, institutions must reconsider their organizational systems for evaluation of faculty work, and at the same time it is essential that the faculty member prepare a complete dossier that defines, describes, explains and justifies the work for the understanding of evaluators (Bukalski, 2000; Bloom, 1956).

During the process of evaluation at those institutions that are willing to accept a dossier of faculty work that emerges in creative ways, including filmmaking, the work might be subject to evaluation upon unwritten or improvised criteria. When the intellectual foundations of
creative work in film and electronic/digital media are not known or not considered, important aspects of the whole work that are inherent to the development, production and exhibition of the creative work remain unnoticed, undervalued and unrewarded, in comparison with scholarly work that exists in more conventional forms. For example, a lengthy and comprehensive grant proposal, program treatment, or many versions of a program script may go unrewarded. These elements of work may have emerged in a collaborative creative environment, the result of an extensive range of traditional research methods such as data/information gathering, literature review, synthesis of data/information, and critical analysis---but according to the tradition and conventional approach, none of that work would have any value. If an institution does not have clear and specific criteria that pertain directly to creative work output in film and electronic/media, the broad range of scholarship that relates to that creative work would have nil value in a conventional review of faculty performance. Instead of being considered as the scholarly output of an scholarly researcher, the value of the work that occurs during pre-production of a film and/or electronic/digital media project---such as grant writing and research, pre-production scripting---oftentimes largely based on traditional research methods, and other complex research---none of this work would be valued on its own merit. The only thing that might matter, if at all, is the existence and public presentation of the final film, and data shows that even the threshold of public exhibition is vaguely defined in most institutions. This problem is symptomatic of the conventional notion that good research is deemed credible only when the faculty writes and publishes the research findings and conclusions in a particular manner. The narrowness of this demand negates the unique and specific attributes of work in film and digital media.
Many grant proposals are hefty examples of intellectual rigor and action that is done thorough both a traditional and creative approach to action research, covering a range of relevant perspectives including program content, business and legal aspects, production management plans, and more. The grant proposal for a film project is similar in scope to a full business plan for any private enterprise, with an orientation toward creative expression and the sound management of funds. Further, a film or digital media work that is produced for the specific benefit of a commercial or non-commercial client---for example, a social development agency, a public charity, an association with any specialized purpose, or other institution with a specific in-house need or interest for the production of media programming that benefits the public outreach efforts of the organization---would have no value in the context of faculty performance evaluation for research, for no other reason than this kind of activity is not considered to be scholarly according to the traditional and conventional template for faculty work. An erroneous comparison might be made in any area such as Sociology, Ethnic Studies or Cultural History---for example, a faculty in one of those disciplines or fields might write a cookbook, perhaps a cookbook about a particular culinary culture---and perhaps this cookbook is commercially published and the professor makes a profit from the project. The common reality is that the cookbook would not be considered to be equivalent as a form of scholarship, instead, it would be considered a commercial project with no academic or research relevance. However, what happens if the historian who writes the cookbook is interested in the sociology of culinary culture (for example, Yemeni culinary culture), writes a cookbook about traditional Yemeni cuisine, produces a film about Yemeni culinary culture that is based upon his research? At this time, in my observation, the professor would receive no value for any of the above actions, unless there was a scholarly paper that is published in a peer-reviewed journal for professionals
in the field. The inconsistency, discrepancy and vagueness of the response in academe to the question what is good research is sorely apparent and blatantly unfair.
Part 2/Theory 3: Considering the faculty member’s welfare before and after the evaluation

As described in Chapter 4, there are several important considerations that must not be neglected before and after the evaluation, particularly when criteria are irrelevant or lacking, or in the case of an unsuccessful outcome for the faculty from the evaluation process.

The post evaluation experience for faculty, particularly in the case of an unsuccessful performance evaluation, is a serious matter. The following recommendations are offered as ways to promote good will and alleviate a cascade of problems and pressures for faculty that are faced with a negative outcome in a performance evaluation.

The most important considerations were described by Franke (2001) and supported by other data collected in this inquiry, including:

• Deliver the bad news with compassion, always considering the golden rule---“how would you feel if you received this letter” (Franke, 2001, 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, the institution that has denied tenure to a candidate should help the individual move on with his or her career (Franke, 2001).

The importance of these ethical considerations should never be minimized or overlooked.
Part 3: Recommendations from theory and outcomes

The issue is not whether we should change, but whether any particular change proposed will make an improvement. The literature is replete with calls to move from frameworks to blueprints at every level. There are assumptions about what is happening and comparisons being drawn, but I am compelled to confront the notion promoted by avid proponents of the conventional system---that the unique and specific nature of work in film and digital media unique situations in not a form of scholarship and therefore recognition and rewards are limited, or not possible.

The heart of this doctoral dissertation is its theoretical conclusions and recommendations that have emerged from research data. The outcome of three theories were described in the previous section, derived from careful study of data---the literature, from surveying and interviewing of participants in this research, and personal reflection in the form of auto/ethnographic writing. Recommendations herein state who needs to pay attention to the research outcomes, with each recommendation relating back to the research problem and providing at least partial response to the research question. Ideally, it is anticipated that some or all of the recommendations will generate a new round of questions and topics for future study.

Part 3 consists of thirty-four recommendations (#1-34) that emerge in response to the research problem, research question and the need for change. The recommendations herein are intended for faculty members, for academic leaders in the field of film and digital media, and administrative policy makers in institutions of higher learning. The following section moves from general recommendations to increasingly specific recommendations for consideration by all concerned parties in a performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media, at departmental, college, and university levels.
General recommendations

**Recommendation #1**: The entire process of performance evaluation for the purpose of promotion of rank should be dumped. Advancement of faculty rank should be based on time served within the college or university, not on abstracted notions of scholarship and merit. By instituting this change (advancement on the basis of years of service), an illusion of meritocracy (and institutional stability) can be preserved, but its emphasis is shifted away from the impossibility of objectively measuring the merit, worth or value of faculty work in any particular field, and prioritizes the practical role that a faculty member serves at their place of employment as a teacher, researcher and provider of service. As Participant #4 wrote:

> Our university does not grant tenure; instead, contracts have to be renewed at intervals between 2-8 years, depending upon education level and how many previous contracts one has completed (Respondent #1).

Advancement in higher education has been demonstrated to be *passive* because there is no substantive change in the job being performed by a faculty member who has been promoted or tenured, although there is a convoluted expectation that advancement is *active* (Pergement and Veum, 1995). To reconcile this discrepancy, this recommendation links a promotion of rank to the retention process. This recommendation remains consistent with Boyer (1990), that all domains and aspects of faculty work should be recognized (see recommendation #3). If a faculty member has been successfully evaluated for employment retention year after year then that same faculty member should be entitled to be promoted. A faculty member’s promotion or tenure could still offer a raise in pay and other active benefits, but the process of achieving advancement and reward would be linked to time served and upon criteria that are relevant to the job being performed. The idea of a meritocracy in the evaluation of research and other
performance by faculty academia is delusional, at least when it comes to the appraisal of works of art such as that which emerges in the field of film and digital media, so the pretense of objectivity should be abandoned and replaced my a more neutral and fair solution.

**Recommendation #2:** Consider the advantages of a non-meritocratic institutional structure that has sustained discrepancies, inequalities, and inadequacies in the process of performance evaluation. Discard the myth of meritocracy by re-defining and expanding the notion of scholarship in higher education as inclusive of alternative approaches, methods and outcomes. While the desirability of meritocracy is arguable from negative and positive perspectives, perpetuation of the myth of meritocracy as superior and objective is overtly harmful because it discounts the most important causes of inequality that persist in the process of performance evaluation. It leads to unwarranted prominence of those already in the inner circles of power, while also sustaining the unwarranted marginalization of those who are not.

**Recommendation #3:** A new model for re-defining scholarship activity should rely upon Boyer (1990):

- The scholarship of discovery---original research that includes work that is creative in nature and purpose;
- The scholarship of integration---the synthesis of knowledge, skills and approaches;
- The scholarship of application---collaborative scholarly activites with others; collaborative sharing of professional and disciplinary expertise in diverse social, commercial, governmental, industrial and other developmental settings, within and beyond the institutional setting of higher education;
• The scholarship of teaching---the sharing and transformation of knowledge for the benefit of learners in any context (Diamond, 2002).

It is also recommended that the definition of scholarly activity be expanded to include:

• Conventional and alternative forms research activity that lead to the production of intellectual, artistic, and creative works (output) in all of the arts, including the field of film and digital media;

• Recognition of forms of writing for publication, presentation, performance, educational purposes, creative expression and other purposes, including auto/ethnographic and other forms of personalized writings;

• Work and activities by faculty that communicate across disciplines, between programs and departments, among institutions, and within the community.

Diamond (2002) wrote: “While the documentation of research and publication has become fairly standardized since the 1980s, demonstration of quality work in other domains in just beginning to receive attention” (p. 18). Many alternatives to the traditional and conventional three-part model of teaching, research and service have been identified and described in this dissertation (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1991; Gray, Adam, Froh and Yonai, 1994; Hutchings and Schulman, 1999).

**Recommendation #4:** The recognition and evaluation of faculty work should be de-centralized and brought under local review and authority. Individual academic units should be given the responsibility of determining if a specific activity, work and approach are within the work of the discipline and the priorities of the institution, school, college, department and profession. Central administrators or central committees should have no authority to make determinations about the recognition and evaluation of unique and specific attributes of faculty work. Each
department within each institution should decide by design or default the extent to which it will pursue *quality* in terms of (a) external perceptions and/or (b) fulfillment of internal purposes and agendas associated with field and disciplinary advancement, and with fostering individual achievement. It is recommended that we eschew aspirations for standardization, both institutional and national, and seek a more modest objective: to develop and provide a resource for applications that focus upon local expertise and local concerns.

**Recommendation #5:** An institution’s published, formal documents should articulate the unique and specific attributes for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Formal documents or statements can include:

- Institutional mission and vision statement
- Departmental mission and vision statement
- Faculty handbook that is consistent with university bylaws

**Recommendation #6:** The process of performance evaluation should be cost effective and time-efficient. Faculty submitting a dossier for review should clearly and easily know what is the extent of effort and products that are expected of them, and what documentation is required, and what is the schedule of deliverables and decision making that pertains to the performance evaluation processes.

**Recommendation #7:** If the meritocratic process of performance evaluation is sustained, then committee members (in tandem with administrative authority) should assist faculty by providing proven examples or models that guide faculty through the entire process—-from the outset of
employment, through the years of employment leading up to the application for performance evaluation, and throughout the entire process until completion (also see recommendations #31-33). This recommendation is particularly important if the activity is one that falls outside of the traditional areas of research and publication, such as work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

**Recommendation #8:** Because so much of the source of quality in artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media is individual, it is extremely problematic to assume that what works in one case will work automatically in another. In pedagogical approaches, there are no universal certainties. Therefore, if the meritocratic process of performance evaluation is sustained, then a new model for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in any discipline, including the field of film and digital media, should honor the approach and artifacts of work, rather than the conventional notion of artifacts *over* approach (Diamond, 2002). Borrowing from the theoretical models provided by Diamond and Adam (1993) and Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997), the criteria for recognizing approach and artifacts in faculty work in the field of film and digital media should focus on the following:

- The approach and activity require a high level of discipline-related expertise
- The approach and activity break new ground or is innovative
- The completed work has significance or impact
- The completed work can be peer reviewed by experienced and knowledgeable colleagues
- The approach and completed work demonstrate clear goals
- The completed work was adequately prepared
- The approach and completed work demonstrate appropriate methods
The completed work demonstrates significant results in its completed form

The completed work was effectively presented

The approach and completed work are supported by reflective critique, both by the faculty who made the work and audience members

If the meritocratic process of performance evaluation is to be sustained at a particular institution, then a complex mathematical model should be used to judge the performance of faculty members. The model used to judge Olympic gymnasts is an example of what can be used. In the Olympics, gymnasts are no longer judged according to the perfect 10 as the ultimate goal. Now, gymnastic competitors get two scores—one each from two different panels of judges. There is an A score with its own judges, and a B score with its own judges. The A judges allocate a score that measures the difficulty of a move. The way to maximize one’s A score is to “cram the toughest possible moves into your routine and pack them as tightly together as you can manage” (Ellenberg, 2008, p. 2). The A score starts a zero points and is incrementally increased, step-by-step, according to the difficulty of the moves and the routine. Each move has a known and highly precise point value and it is the job of the judge to notice and additively attach value to each move. The B score starts at the top of the scale rather than at the bottom, and counts every mistake by deducting points for each miscue (Ellenberg, 2008). Each mistake or miscue has a specific value, and these amounts are subtracted from a total of 10. The final tally is the sum of the A score and the B score.

The downside of this approach is a plethora of problems, and these problems outweigh any advantage that this approach might suggest. It is difficult to imagine an artist being motivated to make creative decisions about the writing, shooting or editing of a film on the basis
of accruing points—gee, this shot, this transition or this effect will be worth a bundle of points!

But, if the meritocratic process of performance evaluation must be perpetuated at an institution, then a point-based measuring tool is probably a fair and objective solution.

**Recommendations specific to the field of film and digital media**

In the specific context of recognizing and evaluating the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, Tomasulo (2008) and Bukalski (2010) have provided the most guidance. The following is a composite group of recommendations that have emerged from data.

**Recommendation #9:** Artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and video can be disseminated and evaluated in similar ways as some forms of conventional scholarship, although an understanding of this work is less well-developed and less well-understood by some within the academic community. The process of recognition and evaluation should emphasize the specific and unique aspects of work. Each type of work and each individual work exhibit specific intent, content, methodology, and product. Individual or group decisions during performance evaluation about these four elements should be based upon the ways that creativity, inquiry, and investigation were used to produce work in various artistic, scholarly, pedagogical, or other specializations within the field of film and digital media.

**Recommendation #10:** Completed creative work by faculty in film and video consists of products of research whose forms have a greater variety in length than is found in printed
Recommendation #11: It should be recognized and appreciated that in performance evaluation it is extremely important to know what role a faculty member played on a particular production. In many cases, the faculty member had total responsibility for the production. In other cases, his/her role might have been that of writer, editor, cinematographer, art director, sound designer, etc. It is appropriate to give varying levels of credit for varying levels of responsibility. In cases of shared responsibility, it is best to rely on experts in the field to determine the relative importance of each individual’s contribution.

Recommendation #12: All artists, scholars and designers in the field of film and digital media know that mere technical fluency is not sufficient for true quality. However, it is recommended that the performance evaluation include the formation of a list of characteristics that define individual achievement and general notions of technical quality associated with high-level individual work in the artistic domain—prioritizing and allowing for the recognition of fundamental knowledge and skills, and conceptual frameworks associated with disciplines and specializations relating to the field of film and digital media. A list forms the partial basis for describing attributes, capabilities, capacities, and the nature of work that are present when knowledge and skills are being applied in an advanced and sophisticated way, such as the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. The specifics associated with each characteristic vary among disciplines and specializations within the field. The 22-point list of production criteria by Tomasulo (2009) and the series of policy
statements by NASAD (undated) could be a starting point for determining an overview of the steps of work in the process of producing work in film and digital media.

Borrowing from portions of Tomasulo’s (2008) 22-point list of measurable (quantifiable) outcomes for recognizing and evaluating the technical and creative aspects of student work in film and digital media, and using the four aspects/four phases model set forth in Chapter 4, the following criteria can be recommended (depending on the job performed by the faculty member on a particular project) in the following categories for performance evaluation:

Screenwriting
- Originality of premise
- Clarity of narrative
- Character development
- Dialogue
- Storytelling technique
- Shot design
- Acting performances

Production
- Cinematography
  - Shot composition
  - Lighting
  - Focus
  - Camera movement and support
- Production design
  - Wardrobe, hair and makeup
  - Set design
- Audio
  - Dialogue recording
  - Production recording

Post Production
- Editing
  - Pacing
  - Editing for geography and space
  - Conveying information
- Special effects
- Sound design
  - Music
  - Sound mix (dialogue, music, sound effects)

A point-allocation scheme could be developed for adding and deducting points based on the
breadth and specificity of what is evidenced in the faculty’s work. Score A could be an additive list that measures the difficulty, from relatively easy to astonishing—giving point value to a particular shot, its set decoration, the lighting of a scene or the compositing of a sequence; while score B could be a tally of mistakes or other problems—such as a focus problem, shaky camera, boom microphone in the shot, etc. What if the faculty member whose work is being evaluated has done several jobs on a particular project—directing, writing, producing, cinematography, editing, audio recording, etc.?—then a separate sheet for each job title should be done by each judge. The subjectivity that emerges when we try to develop an objective model or implement meritocracy in performance evaluation is obvious, and not highly recommended. An alternative approach would be to emulate the model used for a beauty pageant, but I believe that this option has been fully discounted in Chapter 4. The questions that have challenged and shown the conceptual weaknesses behind large-scale assessment systems should not be overlooked or easily dismissed. Systems that would replace substance with a false kind of objective, numeric evaluation are not a viable solution in the context of work in film and digital media because they would replace doing with counting.

As artists and designers in the field of film and digital media grow in sophistication, technique becomes more complex. Methods of intellectual pursuit, including analysis and interpretation are combined with the various techniques, artistic mediums, and methods of production, blended with them, integrated and synthesized at ever increasing levels of sophistication. Methods and techniques combine and integrate to become units, patterns, and entireties so that one acquires the ability easily to combine techniques, concepts, and process in a virtually infinite number of variations of art and design work. Often, those techniques become building blocks of still larger patterns, so that an artistic structure and an aesthetic architecture
emerge. Physical and intellectual skills gradually work in larger and larger conceptual and creative units. This reflects the same set of principles surrounding parts and wholes (Wait, M. and Hope, S., 2009).

**Recommendation #13:** Media production is inherently expensive. Thus it is not infrequent for a faculty member to be involved in seeking in support for creative work. This can be a time-consuming process, which requires clear written articulation of creative goals and methods. Credit should be given in the promotion and tenure process for the seeking of grants as well as for any grants received.

**Recommendations pertaining to scriptwriting in the field of film and digital media**

**Recommendation #14:** Screenwriting is a worthy artistic and academic endeavor in and of itself, and that scripts have intrinsic value whether or not they are produced as films, for television, or for other media form. The fate of a screenplay is not necessarily a reflection of its quality or the skill with which it is written.

**Recommendation #15:** The possibilities for publication of scripts are extremely limited relative to the number of scripts completed each year. In no case should a college or university require that a script be published in order to validate its use as an accomplishment in promotion and tenure cases.

**Recommendation #16:** The timeline of a commercial production is seldom aligned with the schedule expectations of faculty work in the academic world. Sometimes scripts are made into
successful films ten, fifteen, and even twenty years after they were originally written. This is far in excess of the length of time professors of screenwriting have available in order to prove the value of their work before being subjected to the tenure and promotion process.

**Recommendation #17:** Far more important than the *number* of scripts written by a faculty member, emphasis for recognition should be placed upon the challenges of the project as posed by its writer, the degree of originality demonstrated, the depth of the work, and the skill with which it is executed. As with any artistic creative endeavor, a scriptwriter produces multiple drafts before arriving at a manuscript ready for submission and dissemination; thus “one” screenplay is the result of numerous versions.

**Recommendations for recognizing and evaluating the dissemination of work**

**Recommendation #18:** Public showings of a film or video work to informed audiences should be considered dissemination of the work, equivalent to that of scholarly publication.

**Recommendation #19:** The quality of a film or video work may be partially indicated by any festival awards or prizes that have been bestowed upon it. Festival awards and prizes are evidence of a positive competitive judgment about the quality of the work. Selection of a faculty member’s creative work for showing at a festival that has a good reputation can be considered indicative of the quality of the work.
**Recommendation #20:** Selection for screening by an academic associations based on a preconvention evaluation can be considered an indicator of quality, provided the current reputation and procedures of the association are known.

**Recommendation #21:** It should be recognized that museums, media arts centers, film festivals, association conference and universities schedule public presentations. The prestige of such invitational showings varies, of course, depending upon the importance of the institution and the rigor of the selection process. Although such a presentation is difficult to document, it should be considered the equivalent of the presentation of scholarly papers for peer critique in academic settings.

**Recommendation #22:** When a faculty member’s creative work is presented in a public venue or other venue or event, it is usual for the faculty member to orally (perhaps also in writing) introduce the work and to respond to any subsequent questions, comments, and criticisms. As highly educated and experienced professionals in the field, faculty members in film and digital media know how to make effective oral presentations that contextualize evaluations and assessments, and are aware of the things that they know and do. The recommendation is to learn effective ways to articulate and present this knowledge in convincing ways for those who don’t know what we know and can’t do what we do.

Improvement is always possible, but the fact that improvement is possible does not mean that we do not know what we are doing. All art and design professionals work their whole lives to improve their powers of self-assessment. In fact, if expert judgment were still trusted in our society and among policy-makers associated with higher education, there would be no need for
this paper. The problem is well-stated by Wait, M. and Hope, S., (2009):

It is not that we do not know how to describe our work, or how to make assessments and evaluations, but rather that we are probably 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. Our purpose is to help us all think more deeply about communication, with the goal of maintaining assessment on terms useful and productive for the art and design profession. This is becoming increasingly problematic in these difficult times for all of American higher education. Therefore, maintaining assessment on our terms requires an increased focus and effort by all those with an interest in the future of our profession (p. 2)

**Recommendation #23:** The merit of a film or video work may be indicated by its broadcast on television. Greater weight is often given to works selected for network presentation than to those carried only locally. In all cases, it is important to consider the level at which the work has had public exposure. It must be acknowledged that television showings are not equally accessible to all types of work.

**Recommendation #24:** It should be understood that multiple showings/screenings of the same film are not the equivalent of reprints of a scholarly work. There is generally no such easy access to media works; thus, in most circumstances each showing of a media work makes the production available to a new, previously inaccessible audience. Recognition should be given to work that is shown in multiple locations, consider the reputation of the multiple venue(s) in which the work is being screened.
**Recommendation #25:** Film and video works may be disseminated through distribution agencies and companies, although most film and video distributors are commercial in nature, and the exclusion of a faculty member’s work from such distribution is not necessarily an indication that it has little or no artistic or social value. It must be remembered that faculty works must compete for distribution with works produced by individuals whose careers are exclusively dedicated to creative film and video production.

**Recommendation #26:** The evaluation process should recognize all meaningful reviews of faculty creative work that appear in scholarly and professional publications, library media publications, and even, in some cases, newspapers. These constitute an important and serious form of peer review that should be recognized. In evaluating such reviews, as in the case of scholarly reviews, it is important to consider the reputation of the individual or institution contributing the evaluation.

**Recommendation #27:** It should be acknowledged and appreciated the possibility that appropriate means of dissemination and evaluation have not yet been devised for certain types of creative or artistic works. Multi-image pieces and some types of experimental work in film and digital media fall into this category. In such cases, it is necessary to rely on professional peer evaluations to establish the value and importance of faculty creative work.

**Recommendation #28:** Disseminated scripts must be evaluated as part of the promotion and tenure process, without the contingency that the script being produced as a film. In order to
achieve the threshold of dissemination, the possibilities for faculty screenwriting projects can include any of the following:

- Distribution of scripts to peer screenwriting professors at other universities for reading and evaluation;
- Distribution of scripts to professional organizations that include script evaluation sessions and/or partial or complete script readings among their activities;
- Distribution of scripts to organizations for possible production;
- Readings by local and regional groups, provided selection of material is based on a jury or panel decision rather than mere proximity to the writer;
- Publication of scripts in whole or in part. Publication possibilities might include the following:
  - Selection for existing or future print publications of the University Film and Video Association;
  - Selection for other print publications;
  - Selection for media publications of professional organizations;
  - Internet publication where allowed by institutional regulations.
  - Peer reviews written by screenwriting professors at other colleges and universities----This might be completed for individual works or a body of writing.
  - Peer review of scripts by the University Film and Video Association---The Association uses a blind selection process to select the scripts chosen for review at each annual conference. A peer reviewer produces a written review, and, in addition, the public discussion that follows the formal review can be recorded and/or transcribed.
- Screenwriting awards of merit by professional organizations—Using a blind review process, expert judges would normally select a limited number of scripts for recognition.

- Reviews by industry professionals in situations in which institutions allow such reviews, and in the event that the industry professionals are sufficiently aware of the goals of the promotion and tenure process in academe.

- Optioning or actual production of scripts by recognized professional production companies; optioning indicates sufficient merit in a script to warrant a commitment.

- Published reviews in print or media format: These might include but would not be limited to print reviews that appear in the *Journal of Film and Video*, and reviews that appear in the DVD issues of the same periodical.

- Screenplay competitions that screenwriting professors are eligible to enter: In many instances, individuals who have already earned income as a professional writer may be ineligible to compete.

- Selection for competitive writing residencies, writing fellowships, and/or screenwriting awards or grants.

Recommendations for peer review

**Recommendation #29:** Faculty serving on review committees should focus on the quality of the product(s), and not whether or not the activity should be considered as scholarly. Committees should not be considering a need to categorize faculty activities. The system and criteria for performance evaluation at the departmental, college and university levels should be fair, clearly articulated, written, easy to understand, consistent (yet unique and specific) across the disciplines, openly available for review by all concerned parties, and recognizing of *difference*;
and no one particular field, discipline or group of disciplines, or particular group of faculty members or administrators, should determine or dictate what scholarship should be for another disciplinary field or group.

**Recommendation #30:** Peer evaluation of film or video work should be focused upon determining the probable difficulty of a faculty member’s particular project that is under review.

**Recommendation #31:** A panel of three to five faculty experts be used in all cases involving the promotion or tenure of screenwriting professors, with the possibility that an industry professional might also be included on such a panel.

**Recommendations for the post evaluation period**

**Recommendation #32:** Bad news from an unsuccessful performance evaluation should be delivered with compassion, honesty, and always considering the feelings of the message’s recipient.

**Recommendation #33:** Colleagues should be encouraged to interact professionally with the unsuccessful candidate after the denial of tenure, to preclude the possibility that a faculty member would be socially isolated with a sense of failure in a time of need.

**Recommendation #34:** The institution that has denied a candidate’s tenure or a promotion should openly encourage and provide constructive, productive, and available mechanisms that directly and significantly help the individual to move on with his or her career.
**Part 4: Concluding Thoughts**

In closing, I do not believe that there is a single formula, approach, package, or template that will satisfy the need for fairly and fully recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media in every instance. All the data show clearly why a total reliance on quantifiable data, sometimes mischaracterized as assessment, is not consistent with the nature of evaluation in the arts, including work in the field of film and digital media. I cannot suggest just one way of doing a performance evaluation process that is better than all the other ways. A “best practice” should cover the range of recommendations presented herein, rather than focusing on a specific formula or approach.

There are conventional, highly developed evaluation systems in academic settings which function at all sorts of levels. These have intended to be consistent with the nature and expectations of faculty work and its many specializations. The proponents of conventional practice may not reflect an understanding of what is done in the field of film and digital media, or see validity in it because it is not consistent with science, social science, or humanities based views of how knowledge and skills are organized and taught, or how they are evaluated. But no one can say that those of us at the borders, we in the field of film and digital media, working within the general domain of art and design, do not have systems and approaches that work in terms of defining who we are as professionals, the broadness of scope in what we do, and the aesthetic/creative, technical, business, and legal nature of our field. Our unique and specific process of work and the nature of outcomes from our work prove the validity of our approach, and this combined whole should be the basis of an evaluation.

In performance evaluation of all faculty work, not limited to work in the field of film and digital media, it is necessary to consider complete wholes that may contain many parts or
elements. These parts may be evaluated separately, but the most critical thing is how the parts work together to produce a composite result. While it is important to have fully functioning parts, this does not mean that functioning parts will automatically create a functioning whole, much less an outstanding result. The composite result should be judged in terms of its unique and specific characteristics, and not overlook the importance of the work’s intent. Intent is to be determined and articulated by the faculty member who developed and produced the work. Intent can be expressed in specific terms, and the approach of a particular work can be done in any one of many successful ways. The artistic aspects of work in film and digital media have an infinite number of possibilities, and the faculty artist makes particular choices among them. The nature of successful evaluation in artistic matters depends on understanding the relationships between the goals, conceptualizations, processes, and products of the creator in great depth, and then being able to evaluate the creator’s success at developing connections between the goal, processes, and eventual product. Since there is an infinite number of goals, many of which may evolve as one creates, and since decisions about them are made by individuals, an effective performance evaluation requires deep knowledge and sophistication. It is for all these reasons that the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media rely primarily on individual evaluation rather than standardized assessment.

If the two polar extremes of the continuum proposed by Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2007) were to be broadened to allow the inclusion of alternative forms of artistic, scholarly and professional work, an increasingly vast landscape would open in the middle of the continuum, enabling a synthesis of approaches, a meeting of the traditional/conventional with the creative/alternative/innovative to occur. Artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can be located in the middle of the continuum, rather than
being placed on the extreme polar opposite from conventional research output---although until now such work is not recognized on its merits and its faculty practitioners are marginalized in conventional workplaces. A question for further study would be to demonstrate how the breadth and variety of art works and performances, including musical compositions, creative writings, paintings and others works of art can also be located firmly on the continuum.

Each institution, meaning its administrators and its faculty, are tasked to collectively answer for themselves the three following questions in the context of performance evaluation:

• Which characteristics or attributes will be evaluated?
• How will data be collected during evaluation?
• Who will do the evaluation?

If these questions are answered with clarity and honesty; considering difference among the disciplines, the unique and specific attributes of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, and is respectful and honest towards all concerned parties and interests, then the research problem and research question raised herein have been resolved.

Borrowing from an indigenous perspective it is clear that an important, fundamental and underlying notion that guides my inquiry and advocacy about change in the ways of recognizing and evaluating faculty work is the need for respect---a growing need for respect of the self---in the context of the individual person, in the context of community, and in the context of community as a plural entity of individuals. We need a growing and improved level of respect that honors excellence that is achieve in diverse ways, reaching beyond conventional notions of research and the limits of the status quo. In this light, common notions of hierarchical advancement and promotion, linear progress, the quest for more money and other value systems in our modern culture are only superficial indicators of group membership and group respect, a
means of rewarding competence, and acknowledgement that otherness is accepted by the insider group (Janis, 1982). Once the unmet need for a useful model emerges, underpinned by the value of true respect, including respectful acknowledgement of otherness, the research problem, the research question and its ramifications will disappear into history.

The notion of change and the patterns of resistance to change continue to affect the problem situation and are never far away from the research problem itself. The historical norm in organizations and institutions of higher learning is to prioritize equilibrium, yet this norm is also perceived to be constantly under threat by forces seeking to unbalance or disrupt the desired state of equilibrium. Despite the perception that equilibrium equates with stasis, the true nature of equilibrium is itself forever changing and is at odds with systemic nature of change (Buckley, 1968). Prioritizing the a state of equilibrium and stasis as necessary and ideal explicitly disallows change, and thus explains why institutions find it difficult to change.

Boyer (1990) and subsequent scholarly works have challenged faculty and administrators on a personal, professional and institutional level to rethink their scholarly identities and aspirations. A more broadly framed concept of research, where new forms of communication, creative expression and outreach are integrated and valued, must be implemented, specifically in the context of faculty promotion of rank, tenure review and in applications for faculty rewards at institutions of higher learning. Broadly-based and more coherent, relevant and pertinent consideration and evaluation of creative work and scholarly teaching by faculty in film and digital media fosters greater collaboration between faculty and administration, and more meaningful engagement of faculty with students and the community. Further, a new paradigm for consideration and evaluation of creative work will facilitate greater intrinsic motivation for creative work in the future in the context of teaching, leading to more possibilities for
interdisciplinary collaboration. Transparent and relevant criteria for evaluating and rewarding of creative work by faculty in film and digital media, and all other areas of fine arts, would encourage faculty to know that the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching in filmmaking and media production practice, including scholarly teaching, can be considered as a complex and interrelated activity with value. A more integrative and holistic approach by faculty will result in the production of more creative resources for students and the public, in the forms of publication, broadcast, other public exhibition or performance, intra-organizational communication, or other conventional and non-conventional forms of scholarly outreach.

Institutions worldwide, with some notable exceptions, are applying outdated and relatively irrelevant criterion, thwarting most possibilities for fair and proper consideration or successful advancement of faculty who are engaged in creative work output as a necessary and logical form of expression. Irrelevant criterion that relate to work(s) in film, digital media and other forms of Fine Arts practice have led administrators to unrealistic expectations and an underestimation of faculty’s creative work, a lose-lose situation for all concerned parties. There is confusion on all sides, resulting in creative faculty being hamstrung by an inconsistent application of rights and standing in the university and college setting, and a perceived disparity of opportunity amongst peers. Such disparity exacerbates the possible perception of non-advancement in career growth and provokes greater de-motivation toward research by highly motivated faculty members that would otherwise aspire to and qualify for promotion under more reasonable circumstances. Change is necessary at this time.
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