

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.