

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 an 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 be 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).