

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.