THOSE OF US AT THE BORDERS:
RECOGNITION AND EVALUATION OF FACULTY WORK IN THE ACADEMIC FIELD OF FILM AND DIGITAL MEDIA

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

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

studied.

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.

2) Research problem and its four underlying issues

The second section of Part 1 is composed of four sub-sections.

a) Scholarship and Faculty Work
b) At the boundaries of contemporary scholarship: A New Template
c) Pondering "C" Words: Change, Collaboration and Creativity
d) Recognizing and Evaluating Faculty Work in Film and Digital Media

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 an 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; Csikzsmentmihaly, 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 a 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 posses 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 multi-media; 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 ideals 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.