Chapter 4: FINDINGS

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

Part 1: Overview

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

In a typical qualitative study, the presentation of findings depends significantly upon the *approach* of the research. Interpretation and subjectivity are relatively unavoidable and implicit in the qualitative research findings of this dissertation because my inquiry largely involved the reading of scholarly literature written by others, the self-reflective practice of personalized writing, and analysis of phenomenological writings by others. The majority of my interpretive analysis occurs in Chapter 5, although there are some interpretations and contextualizing that occur in this chapter. I believe it is impossible to dispassionately convey data findings in this chapter, although I inject my own opinions a minimum of times. As described in Chapter 3, I have used four different approaches in my inquiry to facilitate these findings:

- Auto-ethnographic writing was used to describe and reflect upon my experience as a faculty member in the field of film and digital media, and upon my knowledge and experience as a professional filmmaker, in light of the research problem and research question posed for inquiry in this dissertation.
- Qualitative research of relevant literature was used to discover theoretical perspectives concerning the recognition and evaluation of faculty work in higher education, and in the specific field of film and digital media. There was no precise match between my research question and an answer, nor did I ever expect one.
- Because there was no particular source that was completely relevant in all ways, meaning that no single source had all the answers to the questions that I am raising, my standard was one of presumed relevance. Presumed relevance is an open approach that freed me from the need for opaque answers, correctness, or authority; my open approach to the literature can be described as a quest for trustworthy information that enabled systemic connections to emerge — not trustworthy in the sense of correctness, popularity, or authority.
- Surveys (online) were used to collect qualitative and quantitative data from faculty members in the field of film and digital media, relevant to the research problem and research question.
- Phenomenological interviews were used to collect narrative data about the thoughts and feelings of faculty members who have experienced a performance evaluation process in a higher education setting.

Part 2: From an auto/ethnographic perspective

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

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

What is being communicated, what is out there that I have not yet deciphered? Unlike human beings, animals such as rats, monkeys or cobras are immersed in their world and probably do not reflect upon it. Animals live their lives in each moment, but are not able to transcend that setting. It is generally agreed that many kinds of animals can hear, interpret and communicate expressively, even with the use of elaborate codes and calls, and might possibly also be able to

think in sentences; but humans are comforted by a sense of probably being the only creatures with communication skills based upon real syntax; and the only ones possessing an inclination for expression through art. It is argued by scholars that one important distinction between humankind and animals (i.e. rats, monkeys, cobras, etc) is their lack of a theory of mind; the recognition that others have thoughts that are distinct from my own thoughts, and vice versa. I speculate that baboons or ostriches or pythons or rats, probably do not worry or know about what other baboons or ostriches or pythons or rats know; and it is not clear to me that other animals possess a sustained urge to share or distinguish their individualized knowledge. I can cautiously conclude that ostriches or baboons or pythons or rats differ from humankind in a large percentage of ways---but I do find that animals and humans share a curious range of similarities, such as in the ways that social hierarchies and interests are protected and sustained.

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

Part 3: Thematic analysis

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

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

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

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

Theme 1: Marginalized by a monolith of tradition and convention

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

As discussed from historical and theoretical perspectives in Chapter 1, the trilogy and the template of expectations pervade and are strongly intact in higher education, yet a wide gap has opened and revealed inconsistencies that have marginalized faculty in the field of film and digital media from their peers in other, more conventional disciplines. Data in this chapter demonstrates that Boyer's (1990) tolerant and inclusive view of scholarship and scholarly work by faculty is not commonly known by faculty in the field of film and digital media, thus not broadly advocated as their theoretical starting point in the struggle for change. In the basic economic terms of dollars and cents, one professor wrote, "those teaching film and video production are paid 90% of the salaries of those teaching film theory and criticism" (Respondent #4). A discrepancy in salary is just the tip of the iceberg that constitutes the problem.

One explanation that emerged from data that can be viewed as a contributing factor in the marginalization experienced by faculty in the field of film and digital media is their lack of seniority, matched with a corresponding lack of influence within the institutional power systems. One professor wrote:

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

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

Literature has confirmed that a problem of unequal status is not solely unique to faculty in the field of film and digital media, as it exists among faculty throughout higher education. Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) describe a “crisis of purpose” in colleges and universities as the mission of higher education has become increasingly skewed toward the priority of theoretical (text-based) research over other forms of scholarly work, such as artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media (p. viii). When faculty perceive that they are being marginalized in the hierarchy of power and influence, or that their intrinsically motivated work will not be recognized and that extrinsic rewards might not be reachable, their energies could be diverted away from types of research and creative work that do not fall neatly and

safely within the strictures of the traditional template---leading to an overall drop in productivity and a dissipation of energy (La Pelle, 1997). The academy has witnessed a decreasing level of publication productivity by faculty over the past few decades, and Boyer (1990) reports that 41 percent of faculty members have *never* published an article, monograph or book during their academic careers (Boyer, 1990; Braxton, Luckey and Helland, 2002).

Marginalization that is experienced by faculty members in the field of film and digital media production can be discerned in my own story. Applying for a promotion of rank was a frustrating and unsuccessful experience for me because the process was blatantly unfair. It was conducted non-transparently behind closed doors, based upon preconceived and unwritten criteria while being performed by colleagues with no knowledge or experience with alternative forms of faculty scholarship output. Despite ten years of positive evaluations for teaching, research and service at that university, and despite the fact that my work in the field of film and digital media had been internationally recognized and successful for its intended purposes (television broadcast, corporate client, commercial promotion, artistic expression), the inner circle of evaluators from outside my field but within my workplace responded by not changing their rigid and unbending old ways of thinking about what constitutes research and how its output should appear. Films and digital media were not considered, recognized or to be rewarded as research, period, by those who do more conventional forms of research activities. In that workplace, creative work is held up for scrutiny against a model that pertains strictly to written, text-based publications and scientific methods of inquiry. There were no written or specific criteria that remotely pertained to the creation or evaluation of work in video, film or any other form of art, and the university committee that was evaluating faculty work for promotion was composed of engineers, chemists and others who had zero knowledge about the

worth, process, purpose or nature of artistic work in my field. The inner circle of scrutinizers continue to have a very narrow idea of what constitutes research and faculty work (or what does not!), and filmmaking and its related fields are not on their list of what is or can be allowed. I thought my situation and my place of employment were uniquely awful, but then through rigorous inquiry I discovered that many others had similarly difficult experiences at other universities. Needless to say no one at my place of employment will ever be promoted unless they do scientific research and get it published in a prestigious journal---and this rigid expectation is what constitutes the problem situation.

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

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

As every scholar knows, having one's academic orientation and expertise described as *vocational* is dismissive, a big insult that implies a lower rung of scholarship within the walls of the ivory tower. The statement implies a theory-practice dichotomy, with an apparent elevated preference for theory over practice. The dichotomy is supported by the hierarchy of power in higher education and is enforced by traditional policies that have placed theory-makers above practitioners. In this context, I recall that in my own teaching load, I get only .66 credit hours for

teaching a studio practice-based class, while a theory-lecture class gets a full credit hour for each hour of teaching. A studio-based teacher has to teach 18 semester credit hours to constitute a full load, while a lecturer in a theory based class only has to teach 12 credit hours per semester. The result is a misunderstood, lower, and marginalized stature for faculty (and students) as they pursue the complex and ever-changing requirements for learning and professional practice in the field. To this same point, another professor adds:

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

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

A wide range of alternative approaches are observed in qualitative research, including (non-text) creative art forms (such as paintings, sculptures, musicianship, performance and in many others) are not deemed by the mainstream as scholarly work, are not recognized for their uniqueness and merits, and are not fairly evaluated for faculty rewards in many institutions of higher learning; nor has such work been firmly located upon the continuum of qualitative and quantitative research that was suggested by Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2007). There is even a wide range of writing output by faculty scholars in higher education that goes unrecognized as

scholarly work according to the traditional template, such as auto/ethnography, textbook writing or editing, journalistic writing in any form; scriptwriting, screenwriting or playwriting; grant proposal writing; poetic or a myriad other forms of creative, fiction or non-fiction writing; and many other forms of text-based publication. One faculty member, in reference to his particular problems with the performance evaluation process as a specialist faculty practitioner in screenwriting, wrote:

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

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

The marginalization of work in film and digital media is not limited to the academy. Within the industry and business of filmmaking, the commercial enterprise of making films for broadcast, and in the distribution and public presentation, there is marginalization of some forms of work that are on the borders or outside of expected conventions. Dick (2006) has produced a feature length independent documentary film titled, This Film Is Not Yet Rated, about the Motion Picture Association of America's (MPAA) rating system and its powerful yet insidious effect on American culture, business and filmmaking. As I have used an open approach to sources of data that inform this dissertation, Dick's (2006) film and subsequent writings about his film have provided a useful analysis that is relevant to the research problem and question of

this dissertation---it examines an example of what can happen in an insulated and non-transparent environment for evaluating creative work. The film is about the MPAA's mandate to enforce self-regulatory censorship in the film industry, and the bureaucratic monolith that is commonly referred to as the Hollywood studio system. Dick's (2006) film reveals that the MPAA is a secretive watchdog and gatekeeper that sustains the hegemony of the Hollywood studio system as a source of films worldwide. Bradshaw (2006), writing about Dick's (2006) film, refers to the MPAA as:

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

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

> I personally would think that it's really important that there be an extensive list of what's in a film so that people could make a decision on their own, children and adults really, in terms of sex, violence, drug use, thematic content. I would like to see a rating between R and NC-17 where art filmmakers can make films that aren't stigmatized. The process should be open. That won't hurt anybody. There should be written standards and

> certainly there should be some experts, child psychologists and media experts on the board. Everything they don't want should be changed, really (Bradshaw, 2006, p. 1).

Theme 2: The internal mobility of faculty

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

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

organizations, including academic institutions, the notion of advancement and internal mobility by the means of promotion exists within a well-established organizational structure.

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

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

- A position upgrade;
- Taking over old supervisor's job;
- Elevated to a higher level job in a different section;
- Chosen to fill a newly created position with greater responsibilities;
- A structural reorganization and was promoted;
- Receiving promotion but continued to perform the same duties as before;
- Lateral move to a different section; and
- Other

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

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

In an educational institution, like some other corporate or commercial organizations, the reward of promotion might be accompanied by a raise in pay, benefits, and responsibility, but

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

Data shows that success in a prior promotion application is an important determinant of future promotion, possibly demonstrating that promotion has a direct impact on job attachment. Ten of the thirteen faculty members who responded to the research survey for this project were successful in at least one previous application for promotion, with one faculty member "in the process of applying for promotion and awaiting a decision" (response to survey question # 11). Eight of the faculty respondents had successfully undergone a process of performance evaluation for promotion "more than one time" (question #5). Twelve of the thirteen respondents were submitting their application dossiers on the basis of a combination of creative and scholarly text-based work (survey question #6). It is noteworthy that 0% of faculty respondents to the survey

acknowledged a failed attempt for promotion or tenure. I must assume that at least one of the 300+ faculty members that were contacted had experienced a rejection or other failure in the gauntlet of promotion or tenure review, but no one with such experience responded to my survey. I have access to some data about failed attempts by faculty to secure promotion or tenure in court cases that have been appealed, and also by using my own experience as data.

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

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

Consequently, Asher (2007) raises the disturbing possibility that hiring, firing, retention and promotion are possibly based upon personal characteristics, upon qualities that are unquantifiable

such as potential ability, presumed dependability in performance, and personality attributes.

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

Theme 3: Attributes of faculty evaluation systems

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

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

i) Alternatives to traditional models of peer review
j) The non-teachable and evaluation

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

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

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

improvement?

a) Facilitating intrinsic motivation and thriving on evaluation

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

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

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

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

Several faculty participants expressed a view about the importance of clear, coherent and written criteria to "spell out" the performance evaluation process at his workplace, regardless of the arduous and highly ambitious expectations that are placed upon the faculty member in the field of film and digital media:

> We have a fairly comprehensive departmental document that spells out the expectations for tenure. Applicants must complete work at least equivalent to the scale of one feature length film. Then all the categories of participation are spelled out: there are different expectations for author/directors than for crew members, such as DPs and Editors (Respondent #8).

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

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

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

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

From my own perspective, the process of performance evaluation at the university level was so discouraging and non-transparent that I am doubtful about continuing my career in an academic workplace anymore. I am a good filmmaker and have a lot of professional experience, I have been recognized as an effective and motivating teacher of students, and I am very active in all kinds of service related activities, but those things do not really count that much during the evaluation because there is such narrow emphasis that prioritizes scientific research and

publication of (boring?) papers. I feel that the system is guarded by mean-spirited, anti-creative old men who do not care about anything that they did not already know about---meaning there is no chance for upward mobility for people like me who do not comply with what those in power presume that faculty are supposed to be doing.

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

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

La Pelle (1997) found that comments by participants in her research were envisioning performance evaluation as:

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

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

1992) maintained that the need for competence and self-determination is the psychological basis for intrinsic motivation.

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

b) An inexact process

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

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

performances. (p. 4-5).

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

Diamond and Adam (2000) argue that a system for evaluation and recognition of scholarship should emphasize the *approach* of scholarly inquiry rather than solely upon its *artifacts*, placing more value upon one's approach to an activity and not so much upon the activity or end-product itself (p 8). In that same vein, it can be inferred from Morse et al (2002) that constructive rather than evaluative (post-hoc) techniques should be used during faculty performance review---such as examining the sensitivity and reflexivity of the researcher (the approach) to the particular situation under investigation as a constructive strategy for determining validity. Research by Dweck (1986) found that highlighting performance goals (in a competitive reward structure), in contrast to learning goals, could promote defensive strategies

that interfere with the seeking of challenges and persistence in the face of difficulties. There are many theoretical propositions about what should constitute a performance evaluation process, but the problem and question for this dissertation remain, culminated in Chapter 5, is to determine a practical and theoretically grounded set of recommendations about what constitutes the best way(s), the most fair and relevant, for recognizing and evaluating the approach and artifacts of faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Many will expect that this research should result in a singular and ultimate model to replace the irrelevant template being used; but as articulated from the outset and demonstrated in Chapter 5, this simplistic solution is not possible nor the intention of this dissertation.

Most institutions of higher learning aspire to the values of a meritocracy, where advancement, rewards, esteem and stature are based upon demonstrated (yet inexact) evidence of merit, such as superior skills, innate talent, high test scores, and other perceptions of expertise in comparison or in competition with others. A meritocracy presumes itself to be based on rational thinking with predetermined criteria, resulting in a system that is just, productive and fair. It places high value on hard work, attitude, moral character and integrity---as determined by others. It is highly valued in higher education for precluding an inexact, nepotistic, arbitrary or unfair system for evaluation, advancement and other opportunities and rewards. According to McNamee and Miller (2004): “Americans not only tend to think that is how the system should work, but most Americans also think that is how the system does work” (p. 1). McNamee and Miller (2004) argue that meritocracy, the idea that societal resources are distributed exclusively or primarily on the basis of individual merit, is a myth. McNamee and Miller (2004) write: “It is a myth because of the combined effects of non-merit factors such as inheritance, social and cultural advantages, unequal educational opportunity, luck and the changing structure of job

opportunities, the decline of self-employment, and discrimination in all of its forms" (p. 4). A meritocratic system may not be entirely desirable (Young, 1961; McNamee and Miller, 2004). Young (1961) envisioned a society in which those at the top of the system ruled autocratically with a sense of righteous entitlement while those at the bottom of the system were incapable of protecting themselves against the abuses leveled against them from the merit elite above. Instead of a fair and enlightened society, the meritocracy became cruel and ruthless.

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

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

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

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

- True talent and entertainment abilities

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

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

SCORING IN LIFESTYLE & FITNESS IN SWIMSUIT

- The Lifestyle and Fitness in swimsuit is designed to see how well the contestant maintains a lifestyle of good physical health, whether she meets the public expectation of a titleholder, and whether or not she has the confidence needed to be a titleholder. The contestant's drive, energy, and presence are to be likewise considered.
- Each contestant is competing against herself and MUST receive a score in a *1 to 10 point range for all Single Night State and Local Competitions and Preliminary Nights of a State Multi-Night Competition (*OR* a 6 to 10 point range for the Final Night Of A State Multi-Night Competition), using whole numbers only. More than one contestant may receive the same score.

CRITERIA FOR SCORING LIFESTYLE & FITNESS IN SWIMSUIT

- Overall "first impression;" physical fitness; physical beauty; sense of confidence and composure; display of drive, energy and charisma; and does she meet the public expectation of a titleholder?

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

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

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

> …at many institutions, evaluation and tenure procedures, especially criteria, are deliberately vague. Sometimes this helps the faculty candidate, and sometimes not. It can lead to abuses, especially in the area of creative accomplishments when faculty and administrators are unfamiliar with the artistic venues and standards in a given discipline (Respondent #12).

Franke (2001) provides five recommendations that concern legal repercussions from a problematic turn of events in a performance evaluation. Franke (2001) writes: "On an ongoing basis, provide tenure-track faculty with honest evaluations of their work and prospects for tenure" (p. 2). Candid evaluations are the backbone of defensible decisions in performance evaluation. The department chair often plays the major role in evaluating faculty. Candidness and frankness in the context of performance evaluation, implying the value of honesty, is a word/concept that continues to re-emerge in the literature and in data interviews. Franke (2000) writes:

> The process requires the chair or other evaluator to (a) know the criteria for evaluation, (b) fairly assess the candidate's work according to the criteria, and (c) candidly and effectively communicate the evaluation to the individual…Uncertainties may arise, however, if the candidate is in an interdisciplinary program, the department has not coordinated any unique departmental criteria with institutional requirements, or the institution is raising its academic standards…If the candidate has room for improvement (as most of us do), or is irredeemable, the job can be harder. It is critical to rise to the challenge, because frank evaluations provide the candidate with feedback that is vital to his or her professional development and career planning. An effective evaluation will (a) cover the entire review period, not just the most recent few months; (b) apply clear requirements for reappointment and tenure; (c) provide specific examples illustrating the quality of the individual's performance; (d) offer appropriate constructive criticism and practical guidance; (e) avoid making guarantees or promises about the future; and (f) be written in plain English, not diplomatic argot. Should a lawsuit later be filed, candid

> evaluations also document the institution's care with the review process. Among the hardest cases for an institution to win are those in which a faculty member received a series of five or six glowing evaluations but was then denied tenure. Tenure denial should never be a surprise to the candidate, and frank evaluations play a key role in preparing the individual for a possible negative outcome (p. 2).

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

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

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

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

> Most tenure-track faculty receive a series of contracts…If, however, it appears during the probationary period that the candidate will not meet the standards for tenure, the better course is not to renew the individual's contract. Some faculty and administrators harbor the belief that it is preferable to deny tenure than not to renew a contract in the middle of

> the probationary period. Yet the earlier decision will be both fairer to the candidate and better for the institution. From a legal standpoint, a conscientious nonrenewal decision is at least as defensible as a tenure denial. On most occasions, it is more defensible, and the stakes are also far lower on both sides (p. 3-4).

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

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

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

establish stable procedures in advance of evaluating a candidate for tenure (p. 4-5). In virtually all tenure-denial lawsuits, the plaintiff points to inconsistency and deviation from established procedures. Franke (2000) suggests the benefits of simplifying the performance evaluation process by collapsing "some of its proliferating layers of review, appeal, grievance, review of appeal, and the like. Other institutions with tenure processes that have, over time, sprouted too many internal review steps would do well to consider some pruning" (p. 5). Franke (2000) also advises that successive reviews of a person need to make sense relative to one another. An effective evaluation will reflect both improving and declining performance, but "successive evaluations should not fluctuate markedly in the absence of changed performance. Inconsistency stands at the heart of most discrimination lawsuits, and juries seek proof that the institution treated tenure candidates fairly relative to one another" (p. 5).

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

d) The importance of relevant criteria

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

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

Mission, Goals, and Objectives of Institutions and Arts Units

- What are the mission, goals, and objectives of the entity being considered, and to what extent are they expressed in written statements and demonstrated in practice? What is the correlation of written and operational expressions of mission, goals, and objectives with faculty evaluation and reward systems?
- What internal or external factors and considerations are critical in establishing or changing the entity's mission, goals, and objectives, or in defining its sense of identity? How does this identity and the process of defining it affect faculty assessment?
- How will issues of stability or change affect formulation, operation, and adjustments to the faculty evaluation and reward system?
- What comparisons between units within an institution, or between a unit and the

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

Content and Characteristics Profile

- What approaches and perspectives for work *in* and *about* art are present in the entity to be considered?
- What are the relative weightings or priorities among them? *(This presence may be in terms of written literature, past and present practice, aspirations, plans, etc.)*
- What values, philosophies, or criteria are present with regard to concepts and issues such as originality, experimentation, simplicity and complexity, interdisciplinary work, faculty development, and collaboration?
- What do comparisons among findings thus far *(i–vi)* reveal about the logic, values, and futures issues associated with faculty evaluation and reward systems? *(The answers provide a context for the next questions.)*

Faculty Evaluation

- What are the stated or operational priorities with regard to various aspects of faculty work (i.e., teaching, creative work and research, and service)? To what extent does the faculty evaluation system consider the relationship between priorities and the resources needed to address them?
- How are faculty responsibilities and workloads defined and established? To what extent are there logical relationships among workloads, definitions of productivity, and expectations regarding teaching, creative work and research, and service? To what extent is consistency from faculty member to faculty member, or from unit to unit, a goal?

- Are the evaluation mechanisms able to deal adequately with the complexity of work in the arts? For example, the complex and subjective nature of new work, the distinctions and interrelationships between work *in* art and work *about* art, the need to work with the arts both in their own terms and in terms common to other disciplines.
- How is merit defined, determined, and indicated? To what extent is merit within the unit dependent upon and/or correlated to the mission, goals, and objectives of the institution as a whole, other units, or specific individuals?
- What opportunities are available to faculty in terms of support, time, and peer review?
- What criteria are used to judge faculty work? Are these criteria safe against the influence of image making techniques that may mask issues of merit? To what extent is public or professional image deemed important to the fulfillment of mission, goals, and objectives?
- Is the evaluation mechanism able to deal adequately with the values, priorities, and complexities that surround 'innovation'?
- What priorities do evaluation mechanisms express regarding equivalency, consistency, and diversity among various kinds of work and among disciplines and faculty members?
- What do the processes of forming, evolving, and operating evaluation and reward systems reveal about institutional values concerning standardization, evaluation techniques, and expertise?
- To what extent do the purposes, values, philosophies, and approaches discovered thus far reveal effective synergies within the institution as a whole, various units of the institution, search committees, and promotion and tenure committees?
- What are the issues to be considered in developing documentation policy? (For example: values, protocols, nature of the work to be documented, standards of measure, types of

documentation.)

Policy Questions and Issues

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

Summary: Comprehensive Correlations, Synergies, and Issues

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

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

> The more complex the goals to be expressed in art- or design-based logic become, the harder it is to write them down in words with clarity and specificity. But the basic truth is that the art and design field does have goals at all levels that are expressed in standards. And, whether or not specific goals can be expressed easily or at all in speech logic is not the determining factor in whether or not goals exist. There is no reason for the art and design fields to agree with critics who charge that there are no specific goals

for achievement (p. 5).

Diamond (1999) discusses the need for developing a quality institutional mission and vision statement upon which the priorities of a faculty reward system must be based. A mission statement can be a complete and clear set of criteria pertaining to the guiding principles of the institutional purpose(s), and framing what priorities are to be recognized and rewarded. A clearly articulated mission statement helps evaluators who are tasked to consider scholarship and professional work, perhaps coming with expertise in the field or specialization that is relevant to the faculty work under review. But there are a number of statements and policies, in addition to the mission or vision statements, that together combine to provide the working base of information that form the guidelines for the faculty reward system (Diamond, 1999). These include:

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

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

- Disciplinary statements
- Accreditation standards

Ideally, the goal is to develop statements and policies that are supportive and consistent. Conflicts, including litigation, can arise from poorly articulated policies, inconsistencies, or

contradictions among campus-produced documents (Diamond, 1999). Institutional statements will articulate priorities for a college or university, but sometimes these are not consistent or supported by the faculty reward system (Diamond, 1999).

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

- The faculty reward system should be sensitive to the differences among the disciplines
- The faculty reward system should be sensitive to differences among individuals

It is the responsibility of each individual committee member, and then the group as a whole, at the departmental, college and university levels, to strive and to successfully understand how to apply the best model that is appropriate to the scholarship being evaluated---not the other way around.

- The faculty reward system should include an assessment program that is appropriate, perceived to be fair, and workable
- The faculty reward system should recognize that most action takes place at the departmental level and the most specificity in documentation is required there
- The faculty reward system articulates the characteristics of scholarly work

Through the use of a survey (Appendix C) and interviews with faculty, collected data demonstrates faculty questions about the fairness and workability of existing, traditional templates for performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media. Additionally, some data has been gathered from faculty in other creative disciplines, fields and domains such as drama, writing, fine arts, photography and design that confirms concern. In response, Diamond (1999) further states:

> …it is best left to the individual institution, school, college, or department to determine which combination of features or characteristics is appropriate for their use…such a model eliminates the many problems associated with definitions of scholarship where disciplinary differences are most apparent (p. 9).

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

Data facilitates questions about the faculty handbook—an official document which includes policies, rules, and procedures that define the work conditions for faculty. Does the faculty handbook establish a contractual relationship between a faculty member and the institution, making it directly relevant to any discussion about the practice of performance evaluation? The issue has arisen in the context of breach of contract claims in matters relating to performance evaluation for tenure, promotion and other institution review (Franke, 2001). As raised by Franke (2001), the question is whether the faculty handbook is part of the employment contract between the professor and the institution. In one case, the Iowa Supreme Court ruled that the University did not breach its employment contract with a faculty member who was denied tenure. The court stated that "a faculty handbook may rise to an enforceable contract

under three conditions: (1) document must be sufficiently defined in its terms to create an offer; (2) document must be communicated to and accepted by employee so as to create acceptance; and (3) employee must continue working, so as to provide consideration" (Taggart v. Drake University, 549 N.W.2d 796, Iowa 1996). In another case, the Iowa state trial court ruled that a University faculty handbook:

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

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

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

> …fine arts have clearly established a precedent for the consideration of creative work as part of the evaluation process for promotion and tenure. Exhibitions of paintings, drawings, sculptures, photographs, etc. are accepted as evidence of professional

> contributions in the visual arts. Musical compositions and reviews of recitals and solo performances are accepted in the field of music. Creative writing, direction and design of plays, choreography, and dance performances are likewise accepted as evidence of faculty contributions in other creative fields. The same should be true of creative work by a film or video faculty member (p. 2).

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

1. Creative work in film and video can be disseminated and evaluated in ways that are similar to traditional scholarship, although the process of dissemination and evaluation is less well-developed and less well-understood by some within the academic community.
2. Completed creative work in film and video consists of products whose forms have a greater variety in length than is found in printed materials. A faculty member might be involved in the production of a feature-length dramatic film, a half-hour documentary, a three-minute animated work, or a work of some other type and length; many possibilities exist. The length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of the effort required to complete it. A short experimental video piece or a multi-media production might require even more time and effort to create than a relatively straightforward hour-long documentary.

3. Peer evaluation of film or video work should determine the probable difficulty of particular projects. The task of peer evaluators is analogous to that of judging the importance of a multi-year horizontal study in the social sciences; such a study might require many years of effort, yet result in an article of only modest length.
4. Just as instances of joint authorship occur in traditional scholarship, works in the field of film and digital media are frequently, although not always, collaborative endeavors. During performance evaluation it is extremely important to know what role a faculty member played on a particular production. In many cases, the faculty member will have had total responsibility for the production. In other cases, his/her role might have been that of writer, editor, etc. It is appropriate to give varying levels of credit for varying levels of responsibility. In cases of shared responsibility, it is best to rely on experts in the field to determine the relative importance of each individual's contribution.
5. Public showings of a film or video work to informed audiences should be considered dissemination of the work, equivalent to that of scholarly publication. This is similar to the traditional acceptance of a music recital performed for a knowledgeable audience as the equivalent of publication.
6. The quality of a film or video work may be partially indicated by any festival awards or prizes that have been bestowed upon it. Festival awards and prizes are evidence of a positive competitive judgment about the quality of the work. In evaluating the importance of a festival award or prize, it is important to consider the current reputation of a festival at which it was received. Many festivals have rigorous selection procedures for inclusion of films and digital media within their programs.

Selection of a faculty member's creative work for showing at a festival that has a good reputation can be considered indicative of the quality of the work.

7. Some academic associations schedule screenings based on a preconvention evaluation of submitted works, and selection for screening can be considered an indicator of quality, provided the current reputation and procedures of the association are known.
8. The merit of a film or video work may be indicated by its broadcast on television. It might be shown on commercial and/or public television, and might be aired on cable systems. Greater weight is often given to works selected for network presentation than to those carried only locally. In all cases, it is important to consider the level at which the work has had public exposure. It must be acknowledged that television showings are not equally accessible to all types of work.
9. Sometimes museums, media arts centers, and universities schedule invited presentations, often including oral presentations by the makers of a work in film or digital media. The prestige of such invitational showings varies, of course, depending upon the importance of the institution and the rigor of the selection process.
10. It should be noted that multiple showings of the same film are not the equivalent of reprints of a scholarly work. In the case of reprints of books or articles, the original printing is often still available through libraries. Reprinting of an article is primarily for the convenience of the readers of a particular periodical. There is generally no such easy access to media works; thus, in most circumstances each showing of a media work makes the production available to a new, previously inaccessible audience.

11. Film and video works may be disseminated through distribution agencies and companies, although most film and video distributors are commercial in nature, and the exclusion of a faculty member's work from such distribution is not necessarily an indication that it has little or no artistic or social value. It must be remembered that faculty works must compete for distribution with works produced by individuals whose careers are exclusively dedicated to creative film and video production.
12. Meaningful reviews of faculty creative work appear in scholarly and professional publications, library media publications, and even, in some cases, newspapers. In evaluating such reviews, as in the case of scholarly reviews, it is important to consider the reputation of the individual or institution contributing the evaluation.
13. Creative work should be fully accepted as part of the faculty evaluation process when such work is appropriate to both faculty specialization and teaching load. Just as the primary professional contributions of a faculty member teaching media history should be expected to be in the form of published scholarship, so the primary professional contributions of a faculty member specializing in a creative area should be expected to be in one or more of the areas of creative production.
14. Media production is inherently expensive. Thus it is not infrequent for a faculty member to be involved in seeking in support for creative work. This can be a time-consuming process, which requires clear written articulation of creative goals and methods. Credit should be given in the promotion and tenure process for the seeking of grants as well as for any grants received.
15. When a faculty member's creative work is presented at a university, a festival, or an association conference, it is usual for the faculty member to introduce the work and to

respond to any subsequent questions, comments, and criticisms. Although such a presentation is difficult to document, it should be considered the equivalent of the presentation of scholarly papers for peer critique in academic settings.

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

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

1. Screenwriting is a worthy artistic and academic endeavor in and of itself, and that scripts have intrinsic value whether or not they are produced as films, for television, or for other media form. The fate of a screenplay is not necessarily a reflection of its quality or the skill with which it is written.
2. The timelines of commercial productions are seldom aligned with schedules of the academic world. There are famous anecdotes about scripts being made into successful films ten, fifteen, and even twenty years after they were originally written. This is far in excess of the length of time professors of screenwriting have available in order to prove the value of their work before being subjected to the tenure and promotion process.
3. In relation to the question of quality versus quantity, the UFVA statement argues that the number of scripts a professor produces may be an irrelevant consideration. The

number of scripts often is not indicative of the effort, care, and talent needed to produce them. Of far greater importance is the challenge posed to the writer by the project, the degree of originality demonstrated, the depth of the work, and the skill with which it is executed. As with any artistic creative endeavor, a scriptwriter produces multiple drafts before arriving at a manuscript ready for submission and dissemination; thus "one" screenplay is the result of numerous versions.

4. The University Film and Video Association (UFVA, 2008) recommends that a panel of three to five faculty experts be used in all cases involving the promotion or tenure of screenwriting professors, with the possibility that "an industry professional might also be included on such a panel (p. 8).
5. As with all creative projects, the UFVA (2008) recommends that scripts must be *disseminated* and *evaluated* as part of the promotion and tenure process, without the contingency that the script being produced as a film. In order to achieve the threshold of dissemination, the possibilities for faculty screenwriting projects include the following:

- Distribution of scripts to peer screenwriting professors at other universities for reading and evaluation;
- Distribution of scripts to professional organizations that include script evaluation sessions and/or partial or complete script readings among their activities;
- Distribution of scripts to organizations for possible production;
- Readings by local and regional groups, provided selection of material is based on a jury or panel decision rather than mere proximity to the writer;

- Publication of scripts in whole or in part. Publication possibilities might include the following:
- Selection for existing or future print publications of the University Film and Video Association;
- Selection for other print publications;
- Selection for media publications of professional organizations;
- Internet publication where allowed by institutional regulations.

The UFVA (2008) statement adds:

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

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

- Peer reviews written by screenwriting professors at other colleges and universities----This might be completed for individual works or a body of writing.
- Peer review of scripts by the University Film and Video Association---The Association uses a blind selection process to select the scripts chosen for review at each annual conference. A peer reviewer produces a written review, and, in addition, the public discussion that follows the formal review can be recorded and/or transcribed.

- Screenwriting awards of merit by professional organizations---Using a blind review process, expert judges would normally select a limited number of scripts for recognition
- Reviews by industry professionals in situations in which institutions allow such reviews, and in the event that the industry professionals are sufficiently aware of the goals of the promotion and tenure process in academe.
- Optioning or actual production of scripts by recognized professional production companies; optioning indicates sufficient merit in a script to warrant a commitment.
- Published reviews in print or media format: These might include but would not be limited to print reviews that appear in the *Journal of Film and Video*, and reviews that appear in the DVD issues of the same periodical.
- Screenplay competitions that screenwriting professors are eligible to enter: In many instances, individuals who have already earned income as a professional writer may be ineligible to compete.
- Selection for competitive writing residencies, writing fellowships, and/or screenwriting awards or grants.

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

e) Criteria and the evaluation committee

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

Data from faculty in the field of film and digital media want the evaluation of their creative work to be performed by colleagues and experts that have awareness of the subjectivity of filmmaking in the thematic context of originality, innovation, application of aesthetic principles and technical skills and processes. Data demonstrates that many faculty members in the field of film and digital media share a perception that some evaluators in faculty performance evaluations do not have expertise with the specific and unique aspects of scholarship and activity in the field of film and digital media. Seven (of 13 total) respondents to the survey in this dissertation, faculty members in the field of film and digital media, indicated a negative perception of the faculty performance evaluation process in their workplace (Question #10), while only two respondents perceived that "the colleagues and administrators who are chosen by administrators to evaluate faculty performance in film and digital media" are qualified for the job

(Question #11). Negative perceptions are fueled by instances when aspects or examples of scholarship performance remain under-rewarded or unrecognized during a performance evaluation. For example, one professor wrote:

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

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

There is a potential risk that an uninformed evaluator could revert to reductive, dualistic, and pre-conceived views (self-other, good-bad, right-wrong, acceptable-not acceptable, and so

on) to supplant a void of knowledge if the evaluator is not familiarized or experienced with the specific and unique aspects of work in the field of film and digital media, a disturbing possibility raised by Asher (2007) in his research. One professor wrote:

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

Any scholar or artist would be insulted by such egregious disrespect toward their research work. Artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media has a beginning, middle and an end, it is time-based media, and the work was intended for viewing in a proper way. It can be logically deduced that if evaluators are reviewing faculty work in the field of film and digital media possess little appreciation or no direct knowledge, or have nil professional experience in the field of film and digital media, then the faculty member and the faculty work cannot receive a fair or efficient process of evaluation (Diamond, 1993). Further, when important aspects of work that are inherent to the development, production and exhibition of film and electronic/digital media projects remain unwritten, unknown, unnoticed, or undervalued by the faculty member and/or the evaluator, in comparison with the traditional template and its written procedures and criteria for recognizing text-based conventional scholarly output and performance, the faculty member can expect that the complex processes of work for developing and producing artistic, creative, scholarly or professional work in the field of film and digital media might possibly go un-recognized during the processes of performance evaluation in an academic setting. Angier (2010) writes:

> Researchers at Yale University divided 41 college students into two groups and casually asked the members of Group A to hold a cup of hot coffee, and those in Group B to hold iced coffee. The students were then ushered into a testing room and asked to evaluate the personality of an imaginary individual based on a packet of information. Students who had recently been cradling the warm beverage to judge the fictitious character as warm and friendly than were those who had held the iced coffee (p. 1).

Angier (2010) cites another study:

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

In yet another study, Angier (2010) reports:

> Study participants were asked to answer questionnaires that were attached to a metal clipboard with a compartment on the back capable of holding papers. In some cases the compartments were left empty, and so the clipboard weighed only 1.45 pounds. In other cases the compartments were filled, for a total clipboard package of 2.29 pounds. Participants stood with either a light or heavy clipboard cradled in their arm, filling out surveys. In one, they were asked to estimate the value of six unfamiliar foreign currencies. In another, students indicated how important they thought it was for the university committee to take their opinions into account when deciding upon the size of foreign study grants. For a third experiment, participants were asked how satisfied they were with (a) the city of Amsterdam and (b) the mayor of Amsterdam. In every study,

> the results suggested, the clipboard weight had its roundabout say. Students holding the heavier clipboard judged the currencies to be more valuable than did those with the lightweight boards. Participants with weightier clipboards insisted that students be allowed to weigh in on the university's financial affairs. Those holding the more formidable board even adopted a more rigorous mind-set, and proved more likely to consider the connection between the livability of Amsterdam and the effectiveness of its leader (p. 1-2).

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

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

Another professor wrote:

> If -- as a matter of scholarly inquiry -- I accept a commission or contract to make an orientation film for a local mental health agency, of what scholarly value is the opinion of the film's commissioner? the opinion of those who watch the film, depending on it for information that may facilitate their treatment? Evaluative practice (in my experience) has been for committees to disregard the benefit to intended audience in favor of awards

> and (supposedly) prestigious screenings. Furthermore, the popularity of a moving image (as, say, measured by YouTube viewings) is entirely off a personnel committee's radar (Respondent #4).

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

Reflecting upon my own experience, the university where I work vaguely considers a film to be equal with the publication of paper, and one film is equal to one paper. Whomever has done both, made a film and written a paper, will probably acknowledge that a film requires a lot more risk, work, time and external support than writing a paper does; but the policies were written by non-filmmakers and the reviewing committee members are not filmmakers or artists so most of those in seats of authority do not really care to understand this ambiguity. To make a 30-minute documentary or narrative film or any other style of film on location somewhere, to get it funded, shot and edited, then broadcast---and to have it be worth one measly paper seems unfair, in my opinion. At my place of employment, faculty need five papers to be considered for promotion, so that means five films need to be made in order to have one's application qualify for consideration. In my case, as I wrote to develop the idea for the project, I received *two* Ford Foundation grants to produce a documentary video for TV broadcast and social development in the Philippines. I doubt that any of the committee members have ever received one Ford grant, but I was successful in getting two, plus the Fulbright award. As anyone knows who has written successful grant proposals, especially when it is going to be submitted to an entity like the Ford Foundation, it is a difficult and exacting process that requires provable experience, expert skill and in-depth knowledge. Organizations such as the Ford Foundation are not providing funds for

proposals that have not been well written, well conceived and at risk of failure. Yet, all of the work I did in developing and writing the grant proposals had no value whatsoever in the performance evaluation process. Neither did the program's script. None of the pre-production work had any value. The only value the committee attached to the project was the fact that the completed 30-minute video was eventually accepted and exhibited at several film festivals and was broadcast on TV, although all of the exhibition and distribution only equated in value to one research paper.

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

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

Another faculty member writes:

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

The data demonstrates that many institutions place high value upon screenings and awards at film festivals or awards as form of peer review. The assumption is that a work in film

or digital media that has been externally accepted by an organization for public presentation must have been good because it has peer-acceptance. The perception of acceptance by established entities assumes a process that was conducted by experts with open minds and a broad base of knowledge, and that the process has been fair and correct. Yet, equating and linking public acceptance of the work with consensus of opinion and interpretation is inevitably at odds with the essential nature of creative, artistic and other original work(s).

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

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

Some examples of important work that does occur during the filmmaking process, yet at risk of non-recognition, including:

- A comprehensive and successfully funded grant proposal. Although the accomplishment of successfully securing grant funds would probably appear on a faculty resume or curriculum vitae, it might not be specifically and independently recognized according to the traditional template for performance evaluation, and thus have no positive value therein;
- The integration and application of necessary skills and knowledge for creating a script, storyboard, or story treatment. Such work may have emerged in an interdisciplinary collaborative creative environment that might not be recognizable to an evaluator with no knowledge or experience in filmmaking (Note: A treatment is a recognized term in the film industry for a detailed story narrative document that summarizes the story and indicates the stylistic approach of a proposed work in film or digital media).
- The multiple domains of discovery, application and integration that are used in the writing of a script or screenplay; and an extensive range of traditional research methods such as data/information gathering, literature review, synthesis of data/information, and critical analysis to inform the creative research might be deemed as absent, unimportant or irrelevant to an evaluator with no experience with the filmmaking process, but the fact is that a range of research methods for the development of s script or screenplay are rigorous and comparable in many ways to conventional research practices that are commonly found in social sciences or humanities research. It is only the final outcome of the research work that is what significantly differs.

- There are any others aspects of work in the pre-production development, production, post-production and exhibition of film and electronic/digital media work that are at risk of being overlooked, undervalued, or deemed irrelevant, unless clear and specific criteria are framing the performance evaluation process.

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

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

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

> graduate school rankings. Such institutions are major sources of graduate students in a variety of fields.

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

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

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

Diamond (1993c) has provided a list of basic requisites that apply to committee members:

- Committee members must understand fully the criteria used for the evaluation of each faculty member and the standards appropriate for the academic discipline and the specific activity involved (as greater diversity in assignments evolves, different criteria for promotion and tenure must be established).
- Committee members must understand the range of techniques and assessment tools needed to properly evaluate teaching (and other specific aspects of individual faculty work).
- Committee members must be willing to separate the criteria used for promotion and tenure in their own disciplines from those used in other fields when the faculty member under review is from another discipline.

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

g) The role of supervisors and administrators

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

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

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

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

> …controlling, distant, not really in charge, acting in their own self-interest, or not qualified…out to see how quickly he could move up the ladder, particular, very

> dominant, very much in charge, poorly skilled, reactive, a lousy manager, not very credible and ill-informed (p. 167).

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

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

Conway (1991) adds:

> On humanitarian and professional grounds, junior faculty should get a clear understanding of their status long before tenure is considered. It is the head's solemn duty to report to the candidate any bad news that comes out of the retention review…There is the legal question, but there is also your obligation as a human being and the unofficial mentor of this young colleague. Do you really want them to spend the next few years thinking there is nothing to correct? That what they have been doing is

> leading toward tenure? And meantime the faculty is anticipating a change and will conclude, when it fails to appear, that this person did not heed a warning and, hence, is unworthy of tenure. I have known of cases where a department head did not pass on the faculty's concerns. When tenure was eventually denied, the candidate was shocked, the faculty discovered their warnings were not transmitted, and the head's prestige and reputation suffered…your job, and that of your colleagues, is to promote the well being of the university. It is not to promote the sociability of the department (p. 43-48).

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

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

Engaging in philosophical dialogue with academic administrators is usually a luxury not granted to those of us at the borders, but it is often the senior administrators at our colleges and universities who have closer contact with those proposing policy objectives that may challenge

our way of doing things. Therefore, a faculty member should ask oneself, what are the philosophical and programmatic situations of senior administrators at my institution? Faculty are asked to respond and prove themselves---in writing---to chairs, deans, vice chancellors and provosts who oversee processes of performance evaluation in a conventional environment. In such cases, a faculty member is asked to demonstrate to these administrators or to university committees how requirements have been met. It is obvious that the faculty's task is not to question the assessment, but rather to show how everything that has been done is in compliance. Oftentimes, institutional administrators and committees choose not to get involved in the grand philosophical arguments with a faculty member. Rather, they are seeking merely to get through another cycle of performance evaluation or accreditation or other process with the least possible disruption.

h) The process of peer review: What is a peer review?

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

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

The fact is that a process of recognition and evaluation is not simple and not as straightforward as suggested by the UFVA (2008) recommendations. It involves and requires consideration of many factors, plus there are issues that stand in the way of change, and most of those obstacles are substantial. The following section is a critical and not favorable analysis of

peer review, expressing my concerns about the use of peer review/evaluation; of particular concern in the absence of criteria guidelines for a peer reviewer/evaluator to apply when making their opinion and judgment about works in the field of film and digital media.

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

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

work are based on peer review, prestigious publication, the extent a work was referenced by others, selection by librarians, and more. According to Ware (2008):

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

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

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

and decision-making process about research output or other professional performance by peers in the context of reappointment, promotion, tenure, and compensation.

i) The problems with peer review

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

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

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

The fundamental problem with peer review is the possibility that guardians (old guard committee members and administrators) of the old paradigm (the trilogy and the traditional template) are also the gatekeepers that are stymieing the fullest recognition of new forms of work and expression during a performance evaluation. Although formal and informal critiques by

peers and mentors are common to all forms of art, including filmmaking, the process of peer review/evaluation, if done by the old guardians of the status quo, can facilitate unfair, irrational and subjective decision-making. In this light, it is difficult to openly accept peer review as a solution in performance evaluation.

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

It has been suggested that peer review lacks accountability, can lead to abuse by reviewers, and may be biased and inconsistent, alongside other flaws. Horton (2000), wrote:

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

The peer review process can conceivably exacerbate collusion, or it can supress dissent against ANY style of work (mainstream, alternative, etc), or it can be preferentially biased for or against one stylistic, political, cultural view, personal opinion, technical treatment or approach to the subject matter, or favor any other subjective condition over another. Reviewers tend to be especially critical of conclusions that contradict their own views, and lenient towards those that accord with them (Martin, 1997).

Oftentimes, fairness is equated with consensus, and consensus of opinion about a creative work could likely be at odds with originality. Further, the personal qualities of the scholar (or artist) could be assumed as inherently interconnected to the perception of the original work in peer-review evaluations (Lamont et al, 2007). Judgments about the character and the personal qualities of scholars (or artists) remain intrinsic to academic recognition and perceptions about the value of the faculty work, and such judgments about personal qualities and characteristics can become ambiguously merged with judgments about originality. To illustrate this point, consider of the experimental film works of Stan Brakhage, Maya Deren, Man Ray and so many others, some famous and some not so famous. Consider the innovative and controversial documentary works by Michael Moore, Leni Riefenstahl, Les Blank, Sergei Eisenstein and Dziga Vertov, not to mention a world of narrative film works by so many others like Akira Kurosawa, Zhang Yimou, Luis Bunuel, Werner Herzog, Woody Allen, and thousands of others. The wonderful ambiguity that exists when trying to define creative works in film---inquiry whether this or that work is best classified as a documentary, experimental, narrative, or something beyond in nature---can not be resolved by a peer-review committee that decides the scope, nature, or *worth* of the work(s). As a chair of a graphic design and multimedia program once expressed to me: "At this college we do not make documentaries in our video classes. We are a design program so students (and faculty) should instead be making animations and storyboards and commercials and logos. Documentary filmmaking would be done somewhere else, not here" (email from a faculty colleague). A narrowly-conceived bias against a particular style of filmmaking---excluding a particular form or approach regardless of reason---is unsupportable and contrary to notions of academic freedom. In the case above, where documentary filmmaking is singled out as unacceptable in a program where video production

and other time-based media forms are taught, the only reasonable explanation can be that the chair, faculty and program are limiting the scope of learning according to their own ignorant, incapable and myopic limits as they exclude alternatives---to the detriment of students and faculty.

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

The most commonly held expectation and standard for faculty work is conformity with preconceived expectations, norms, and values; and peer reviewers find themselves tasked to determine *worth* in relation to those existing, known standards. As faculty work is being evaluated by critical gatekeepers (peer reviewers) tasked to recognize and evaluate the level of a work's worth by measuring its competence or mastery, in comparison with the met expectations of other works and conventional standards, it is possible that true originality will remain invisible to the reviewer/evaluator. *Original* work, by definition, deviates from all that has preceded it. The potential for contamination of the evaluation process through personal jealousies, unfairness that emerges from unfamiliarity with the scope and nature of work, and other forms of bias by

evaluators is always of concern, and explicit expectations of peer review leaves that possibility wide open. In this way it is possible to imagine that some of the greatest artists and thinkers in history (there are innumerable examples), including filmmakers throughout the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries, might not be able to successfully pass through the gauntlet of academic performance evaluation and achieve a promotion of rank from assistant to associate professor at xyz university. The peer-review process would be blind to the newness and originality of their work(s), and instead would decide their works were non-compliant with prior norms---a failure in comparison to that which was known or expected.

j) Alternatives to traditional models of peer review

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

> From a pragmatic viewpoint, most studies that have investigated reviewer blinding have failed to measure improvements in the quality of the review and, conversely, other studies have shown that making the reviewer's identity known to authors had no effect on quality. There is also a strong ethical argument against secrecy, namely that it is seen to be unfair for somebody making an important judgment on the work of others to do so in secret (Ware, 2008, p. 17).

When asked which options they thought were effective, however, respondents expressed a clear preference for double-blind review, but according to Ware (2008): "it was clear from the verbatim comments that the preference for double-blind review was largely a response to the potential for bias in single-blind review. The reasons given for this preference were primarily its objectivity and fairness" (p.18).

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

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

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

entirely off a personnel committee's radar."

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

k) The non-teachable and evaluation

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

The committed filmmaker has a high threshold for coping with a myriad of problems: 1) financial and creative risk-taking, 2) emotional indecision that is inherent to the process from start to finish, the 3) psychic pain of facing risk in the pursuit of an elusive reward, and 4) other

undue forms of suffering, necessary sacrifice and misery that constitute the daily life of many filmmakers. No coping mechanism for dealing with these real and serious problems can be taught; and the non-teachable nature of these important aspects of work done by filmmaker-artist-faculty members might also be (nearly) impossible to properly evaluate in an academic setting. A technique or a fact might be teachable, but Elkins' (2001) idea continues to resonate in my head---art cannot be taught, and if so then logic dictates that evaluation of art is nothing more than a subjective expression of taste.

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

the heroic behavior of a warrior is not teachable, just as the masked decision-making of a high-stakes poker champion, or the sharpshooting skills of an assassin are (probably) not teachable.

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

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

Theme 4: The nature of faculty work in film and digital media

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

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

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

a) How a film is made

Talent without skills, inspiration without knowledge, and creativity without technique count for little but lost potential. The first step in the education of a filmmaker is to recognize the view, attributed to Aristotle, that the universe exists independent of anyone's awareness of it, that the function of consciousness is to grasp reality, not to create it or to dictate its nature, and that the absolutism of existence is what ought to shape one's thoughts and actions (Durant, 1960). The possibility of creating or dictating reality might be perceived by some filmmakers as appealing, but it must be remembered that the entire process is an illusion that is ever-changing; therefore we can never dictate anything beyond an illusion of invention and control. Filmmakers

create the illusion of control, by engaging and interacting with the observable world by using a variety of intelligences (Gardner, 1983; 1989; 1991). From that point, one begins doing things to get it done in a holistic effort to communicate one's thoughts and ideas, in response to prior knowledge, a set of acquired and expert skills, and with the use of creative thinking. Filmmaking is a representation of an orderly system of interrelated systems within the context of creative thinking, a challenge that magnifies the importance of self-knowledge and self-leadership.

All films share some very basic and essential component parts and rules, all of which converge and are integrated in a whole. A *frame* is the term that describes the smallest unit of a motion picture *shot*, which is the smallest aesthetic unit of the sequence of *scenes* within the *film*. A *frame* is essentially a still photograph, and in the United States there are 24 individual still photographs per second (24 fps) being projected on the cinematic screen (in Europe the projection rate is 25 fps, and in video the USA standard is 30 fps while in EU it is 25 fps). The most basic definition of a *shot* is--from the total amount of frames, first the frame when the camera starts rolling until the last frame when the camera stops rolling---simple as that. The combined total of frames that result from the camera starting, rolling, then stopping, constitutes a shot[1]. Shots can be assembled or edited together to make a scene or sequence, or a shot can inclusively be a scene or shot.

[1] In motion picture filmmaking, in the USA, there are 24 frames per second that are shot in the camera. In Europe, there is a different frame rate of 25 frames per second. In video, the European standard is 25 frames per second (PAL), and in the USA the standard is 30 (or 29.97) frames per second (NTSC). Thus, each "frame" is essentially a still picture, whether it is shot on film or video, and the amount of frames per second that are projected gives the viewer the impression of movement and motion.

Alfred Hitchcock's "ROPE", a feature dramatic film, gives the impression that the film is only one long, continuous shot---although the film is actually made up of a few shots with editing being cleverly concealed[2]. The basic unit of a motion picture is a *shot*, and a movie is constructed through the linear assemblage of shots, one after the other, ad infinitum, or at least until the story is told and the images and audio exhausted.

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

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

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

A filmic *process* is fairly obvious to imagine---someone is crossing a street or picking up a book or tuning a violin, etc. Simply, a process is a step-by-step sequence or series of shots that depict someone and something doing something, from a beginning point to an end point. *Interaction* is a little more abstract, but basically can be defined as a situation that involves the exchange of information, ideas, and opinions, specifically including the response experience of actor(s) -reactor(s) during communication or interpersonal contacts. Interactions are diverse and limitless, perhaps two persons in a verbal exchange, or perhaps a baby with a bottle, or perhaps a cat with a string, ad infinitum. Interactions involve actor(s)-reactor(s), and those can be persons,

[2] "Rope" is a motion picture that was directed by Alfred Hitchcock.

things, or other independent variables. Basically, an interaction in filmmaking would demonstrate an observable relationship among objects, persons or other variables that do something to, or somehow affect, one another. Successfully filmed interactions usually demonstrate the active engagement of actor(s)-reactor(s) in the process of reciprocal action or exchange, resulting in new knowledge about the outcome of how one thing/person affects or acts upon encountering another.

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

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

[3] For example, if the process is making dinner, then how much detail should each shot contain? Should the farm where the meat and vegetables originate be included? Should the onions being chopped be included in the same shot as the salad being mixed? Important "frames" are selected and de-selected by the filmmaker who is attempting to demonstrate a process of work on film.

interpreter. For example, a shot of a person opening a bottle of wine can be interpreted though the camera's viewfinder, ultimately on film, as a process *and* an interaction, or merely a process, or merely an interaction---the wine bottle is handled and opened by the waiter, a close up shows the wine pouring out of the bottle into the glistening crystal glass, the wine taster savors the bouquet of the wine, the shimmering wine in the glass reflects the nearby candlelight, etc. Each of these shots could be framed or described as a process, from beginning to end, or as an interaction where relationships are explored within the action, or both at the same time. The bottom line is that process and interaction are basic facts in filmmaking, fundamental units in the effort to achieve and realize a completed work in this time-based form.

b) Four aspects, four phases, and four domains

Filmmaking is creative and interdisciplinary praxis that integrates many kinds of content or approaches---artistic, experimental and artistically expressive. Works can be commercially crafted for maximizing profits or entertainment value; educational, propagandistic or mis-informational, journalistic or anthropological in intent; a form of amusement for voyeuristic or emotional escape; a new commodity for business enterprise; socially relevant or commercially persuasive or politically expedient; dogmatic and didactic, elitist or mainstream, and so on. Although not taught as a holistic system in programs of study and practice at schools, filmmaking can be taught as a holistic system that relies upon a broad range of knowledge, skills

and opportunities. More specifically, filmmaking is an interconnected system of relationships and processes, an integrated set of actions that comprise four aspects[4]:

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

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

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

[4] When a filmmaker assumes responsibility for all aspects of the process this might be referred to as "auteur" filmmaking, work done by solo filmmakers in documentary, experimental, commercial and other forms.

[5] This might be referred to as "corporate" filmmaking, when individual specialists collaborate within one of the four aspects, perhaps in very different ways, on work toward a common goal, usually under the direction of a supervisor or set of supervisors.

essential to the entire process of work on any particular filmmaking project, and is requisite on all filmmaking projects of any kind. Without exception, the four aspects are facts in filmmaking.

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

The process of producing a film can be sub-divided into at least four sub-processes of work, and I will refer to these steps as the Four Phases. The *four phases*---the process of developing,

- Pre-Production. This is the time when ideas for story or program content are developed, researched, written into a script, treatment or other plan of work, money is raised, crews are assembled, and the project is initiated.
- Production. This is the time when the actual work with the camera, lights, audio recording equipment and other "capture tools" takes place. Production can occur in a studio, on location, with actors or any other on-camera talent, or any other place. It is the time when the raw elements, visual and/or audio[6], are made.
- Post-Production. This is the time when the raw elements are organized, assessed, selected and de-selected, assembled into sequences, mixed, polished, and constructed into a *rough cut*, *fine cut*, and eventually, a *final cut*, namely, a finely-constructed assemblage of shots that (at least) resembles what was planned and scripted during pre-production.
- Distribution/Broadcast. This is the time when the final cut is presented to audiences in any number of ways---television sets, theaters, internet access, classrooms, libraries, video shops, and much more. This is also the time when a range of agreements pertaining to the sales and marketing of the completed program are realized and consummated.

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

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

[6] Audio elements are recorded sounds. Sounds are not "audio" until recorded. Recorded sounds are audio.

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

upon providing job-training skills according to a specialist-reductionist model and this does not serve the creative or professional needs that are relevant to a practitioner engaged in the production of educational or social development media programming.

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

During the process of making a film, the filmmaker faces a mountain of unfavorable odds against getting any film made in the first place and those unfavorable odds are hovering everywhere until the end of the filmmaking process, only to start up again when a new process is commenced. A strategic and intentional lowering of risk factors that are required to develop, produce, fund, or finally complete the film, increases the likelihood that getting it done could

occur, however, it might reduce the filmmaker/artist's autonomy over the work, might compromise the ethical and moral values of the filmmaker/artist, and possibly reduces the chance that the creative work will be considered artistic work at all. It is a commonly held notion by many, including filmmaker/artists, to convolute the trappings of economic success with artistic success, and this is a matter that is confronted by any filmmaker who is on the road to success---do I work on THIS film project for the (great) money, or do I pursue that project which is closer to what my heart and soul are imploring me to do? The answer to the question is entirely personal and the process or basis for answering that question cannot be directly taught. The process of filmmaking is rife with risk no matter what kind of work is being done. Oftentimes, the audience's response to the work is to be surprised about the element of risk that was involved for the artist to get the work produced. The required high tolerance for pain and suffering that are inherently part of the filmmaker's efforts and inherent part of the process of filmmaking (monetary risk, psychological risk, physical risk, logistical risk, the risk of personality or ego clash, and many more) and the level of pain and suffering that are an everyday part of the filmmaker's life and work, are certainly higher in filmmaking when compared with many other professions and areas of scholarly work.

c) Research and the field of film and digital media

New approaches, methods and tools for conducting research have emerged that integrate existing and emerging fields of knowledge. New media, including the field of film and digital media, has enabled faculty scholarship, including scholarly research, to evolve by making connections with a constellation of new methods and resources. Research is a practice of formulating and presenting questions, theories, methods, data, analyses, and interpretations

during which inclusions and exclusions occur as the narrative of inquiry is constructed and communicated, and this range of work is being transformed by the emergence of new media. Marcus (1995) suggests the cinematic technique of montage as an alternative to academic writing for representing the various locations of culture and individuals within culture by creating conceptual relationships between visual ideas that would seem unrelated if depicted in isolation. Eisner (1997) has suggested that "we tend to seek what we know how to find" (p. 7), so as researchers are taught to use new media there will be a change in the structure of the questions asked through research inquiry and in the methods by which the questions are answered.

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

the convergence of text, video, film, animation, audio, photographs, and 2D and 3D

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

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

From the first efforts to use film to collect anthropological data (Mead and Bateson, 1952) to recent uses of collaborative digital video to construct contextual understandings of learning (Goldman-Segall, 1991; Pea, 2003) and beyond, film and video have an established history in research. Film, and video in particular, are time-based media that mirror, distort, reproduce, challenge, and transgress the various institutions, subjectivities, social discourses,

inequities, and psychic states that influence learning (Voithofer, 2005). Video (and by inference film, photography, and other forms of digital media) represents a convergence of technologies in which various media are combined and can be analyzed by design. Video (and perhaps any other form of electronic media) is arguably becoming its own language, a system of signs that not only represents a cross-section of reality but also acts as an epistemological tool to transform society (Voithofer, 2005). However, while some theorists have shown how structural elements such as shot selection, editing, lighting, camera angle, and audio design and mixing contribute to the meanings that are made (Bordwell and Thompson, 2003) with film or video, others have argued that these structures cannot be considered a linguistic system because a convention/technique like a close-up or cross-dissolve does not mean the same thing in every video or film (Metz, 1981).

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

Cinematic means of perception---connecting space and time, representing human

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

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

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

The selection of type in the design of a research text can communicate something about both the author and the content of a text.

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

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

A wide range of traditional research methodologies underpins the development and production of a film, video or other new media project. The development of a creative work requires the discovery of new knowledge, through the gathering of new information, review of literature, synthesis and analysis. Computer-based media production tools, no longer the

exclusive domain of production professionals, are becoming accessible, in price and ease of use, to a growing number of discourse communities. Taking a camera system and an audio recording system to a location requires a myriad of intellectual, practical, critically based, and aesthetic choices to be made, just as in traditional research methodology. But filmmaking and media production are more than simply recording what occurs before the camera or within range of the microphone, creative faculty through their choices of form reveal a pattern of context to the material that goes beyond mere recording. Thus, the intellectual foundation of discovery is the foundation of creative work.

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

> A visual anthropologist, less concerned with dramatic structure, flow, and progression, may bring multiple design resources to demonstrate how the visible world affects culture and communication in learning. An ethnographic filmmaker working in the digital realm may possesses knowledge of aesthetics and graphic design, producing network-delivered video and animating text and graphics to support the filmmaker's deep understanding of the use of video to construct a dramatic representation of the learning context. The educational psychologist might draw upon design discourses about teaching and learning that would suggest where to point the camera and what to include during the editing

> process. The video documentation produced from the design resources of people in each of these fields could, of course, look quite different as a result of different producer training and concerns. However, because each of these individuals is increasingly more likely to use a computer for documentation and presentation, a common set of design resources, constrained by the interface metaphors and technical discourses of the production software, infuses the process of documentation and representation in each of the disciplines. The computer presents epistemological constraints as it offers opportunities for representation (p.7).

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

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

Diverse research methods, including conventional and traditional methods, underpin the development and production of a film or other media project, just as there can be diverse methods used to develop and produce a doctoral dissertation research project (Jacobs, 2008) or

any other qualitative research project (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). The landscape of qualitative research methods is diverse and faculty work in film and digital media is widely varied. Films and digital media productions vary in duration, style, treatment and approach, story structure, purpose, budget limits, equipment limits, diverse cultural contexts, aesthetic sensibilities, dissemination plans and opportunities, and other ways. While published scholarly paper usually examine esoteric areas of specialist interest and are intended for a narrowly defined readership audience, there are clearly-delineated standards and expectations in regard to length, format, structure, terminologies, presentation, and purpose. Homogeneity does not describe the outcome of creative works in film or digital media. Each work can vary in significant and detailed ways, depending on the purpose, budget and other factors that surround the filmmaker and his/her story. Conventions, aesthetics, and limitations are always changing, are hugely diverse, and certainly are not homogenous---yet a wide variety of works, including important aspects of whole works, remain un-recognized or rewarded. Two professors, writing about the marginalization of narrative films by faculty, comment:

> As is, most universities do not know how to characterize narrative film production as scholarship. As a result, academics are not being encouraged to produce narrative films. This is especially tragic for film programs that specialize in narrative film production (Respondent #13).
>
> In fact, this often disconnects the student (who in a film history course deconstructs big-budget studio films) from the work of media production teachers (who cannot contribute to the making of that sort of film and at the same time earn tenure) (Respondent #4).

Describing the mismatched relationship of traditional scholarship and filmmaking, writing, Respondent #4 wrote:

> The schedule of work for a filmmaker and a 'traditional' scholar is mismatched. While scholars might arrange a trip to a foreign archive to coincide with spring or summer breaks, there is really only one time of year a filmmaker can shoot script-specified exteriors in the snow (Respondent #4).

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

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

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

> Further complicating the judging of a scholarly filmmaker is the fact that he often makes money in the exercise of his discipline. This, like oft-disparaged 'entertainment' value, makes his work suspect. Films perceived as 'purely entertaining' are suspect, for they may appear to be motivated by profit rather than inquiry. In fact, the filmmaker's inquiry may be into a new technique in the employ of an entertaining theme, but such inquiry

> may have to be explained to colleagues, often in a paper presentation. Fortunately, there is some precedent outside the humanities for the professor-as-paid-consultant (the disciplines of business and engineering come to mind), but association with those traditions can create problems of its own (Respondent #4).

Some films or digital media works are the result of one person working in isolation from others during all aspects of the production (Collins, 2003). In other cases, a filmmaker will be collaborating with others, perhaps highly specialized professionals, or students or persons from a wide spectrum of social strata, on the development, production and postproduction of the film or media production. The various key roles on a film require the productive collaboration of a team of others. The roles of Executive Producer, Producer, Director, Cinematographer, or Editor on an independent medium-scale or relatively large-scale film or media production would be analogous to a researcher in traditional scholarly research who leads of team of assistants on a project. Leadership, motivation, communication and many practical issues converge in the effort to manage a team that is working together on a creative work in film or media production. It is important that evaluators have a clear understanding of the precise role(s) that the faculty member contributed in the creative work being evaluated, and assess the work on the basis of the role(s) performed as demonstrated in the completed work.

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

Discovery, integration of prior knowledge from a wide variety of disciplines, and the application of a sophisticated set of technical and interpersonal skills are required for scholarship activity in the field of film and digital media, during the development and production phase of

the work throughout the post production/editing phase, and including the inevitable presentation and critical reflection of work to audiences. Although scholarship and professional work in film and digital media might not be perceived or recognized for satisfying the traditional template's expectation for text-based output, the fact is that artistic, creative, scholarly, and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can demonstrably and commonly be rooted in conventional and alternative scholarship approaches (Boyer, 2000; Williams-Rautiola, 2001).

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

Based upon my own experience as a filmmaker, and as an observer in research for this dissertation, I observe that discovery, integration of prior knowledge from a wide variety of disciplines, and the application of a sophisticated set of technical and interpersonal skills is required of the scholar-filmmaker at all times, during the development and production phase of the work, throughout the post production/editing phase and including the ultimate presentation and critical reflection of work to audiences. The broadness of this scope and nature of work is what must be considered for evaluation, not just the tiniest of facts about the finality of the work. Filmmakers must integrate pre-conceptualized aural and visual strategies, with the content (script

or other treatment or production plan) to creatively illuminate the conclusions of research (Williams-Rautola, 2001), in artistic-aesthetic, communicative, and coherent ways.

Theme 5: The evaluation of faculty work in film and digital media

Theme 5 is divided into seven thematic sub-sections (5a through 5g).

a) Many dimensions of standards: Measuring individual attainment
b) On our own terms
c) Evidence to be submitted for performance evaluation
d) The professional portfolio
e) The range of work in pre-production
f) Broadcast and distribution of film and digital media
g) Film festivals, competitions, other special events

> *Four years ago, the administration began accepting media projects that were presented at conferences, submitted for awards, or publicly sold as scholarship* (Respondent #1).

The evaluation of works of art, even by professionals, is highly subjective, especially with respect to contemporary work. Therefore, there is a built-in respect for individual points of view. At the same time, in all of the arts disciplines, there is recognition that communication through works of art is impossible unless the artist possesses a significant technique in his or her chosen medium. All aspects of a film or media production work, including the technical, creative, business and legal aspects, should be acknowledged during a performance evaluation, but this has not been the case as demonstrated by a range of data. Faculty work in film and digital media is an integrated whole---involving technical, creative, legal and business expertise. Corporate, commercial, and industrial productions usually rely on a group of specialists, to lesser and greater degrees and in various ways, to realize the intended work; while auteur filmmakers work alone, or perhaps in very small teams, approaching the four requirements (technical, creative, legal and business) as an integrated whole that would otherwise be accomplished by several persons working in collaboration.

Broadness, not vagueness, in the scope and nature of work must be considered during a performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media; not just the artifacts that represent the finality of work. The unique and specific aspects of work in the particular field of film and digital media should guide the evaluation criteria and process. Wait and Hope (2009) contribute a useful analogy:

> If you want to use a computer, you have to work with that computer according to the nature of the programs it contains. In other words, you have to work with the computer on its terms and not yours. In a way, different fields of study and practice are analogous to the computer in the sense that they have their own systems. They have their own mechanisms, their own pathways, their own structures of information. If you want to work with any given field in any kind of sophisticated way and actually help it improve, you have to learn a tremendous amount about that field. It is impossible to make suggestions about improvements to the internal workings of a computer system unless you know in great detail how such systems work and what various options are for certain kinds of decisions (p. 12).

Filmmakers integrate pre-conceptualized aural and visual strategies to develop the plan, treatment and content for creatively illuminating the conclusions of research, in an artistic, aesthetic, communicative, and unique way. In the following section I describe some examples of evidence that represent any of the phases of work that are inherent in the process of making work in film and digital media. I argue that many aspects of work can and should be recognized during a performance evaluation of faculty performance in film and digital media.

a) Many dimensions of standards: Measuring individual attainment

Standards imply a working formulation of ideas about the attributes of successful work. Standards or expectations can be expressed in many ways---for example, levels of technique, degrees of breadth and depth, types of knowledge application, and so forth (Wait and Hope, 2009). Wait and Hope (2009) provide a list of attributes and characteristics of individual achievement in an effort to define achievement and quality:

Characteristics and Attributes of Individual Achievement

- Basic professional-level knowledge and skills
- Personal vision evident in work
- Conceptual acuity and creative virtuosity at multiple levels of complexity
- Imagination and ability to channel imagination to reach artistic goals
- Technical virtuosity
- Conceptual and technical command of integration and synthesis

At the individual level a tremendous amount of educational time and energy is spent developing and honing skills of self-evaluation to the highest possible level. This is absolutely critical in the creation of a work of art or design where evaluation is constant throughout the entire creative process, and especially in the final product itself. In fact, virtuosity in constant adjustment is a significant goal. Wait and Hope (2009) write:

> Now we would suggest that to some extent meeting the standards set by NASAD and by individual institutions enables development of work with these attributes by practicing professionals. However, the attributes are not manifested in the same way. Their actual realization is subject to preferences or individual aspirations and standards of quality that are internal to the kind of work being done and to the development of each artist or

> even each work of art or design (p. 9-10).

What makes all of this extremely difficult for those on the outside to understand is that there is almost never a pure correlation between knowledge and technical skills on one hand and artistry on the other. So performance evaluations move from what is easy to measure to what is difficult to measure, and ultimately to matters of personal aesthetic preference.

b) On our own terms

Artists and designers of any ilk need to make effective evaluations and assessments on a daily basis. They are critically aware of the things that they know and do. The problem that faculty face in performance evaluation, according to Wait and Hope (2009), is the artist-faculty's inability to convincingly express to others "what we do"---what he/she knows, what is done, and what can't be done (p. 12). Wait and Hope (2009) suggest that art and design professionals work their whole lives to improve their powers of self-assessment and add:

> …the problem is not that we do not know how to make assessments and evaluations, but rather that we are not as adept as we need to be in explaining to others what we do, how it works, and why it works. We also need to improve our abilities to debate effectively when our explanations are rejected. (p. 1).

Wait and Hope (2009) advise that faculty in art and design fields, including film and digital media, think more deeply about communication, with the goal of maintaining assessment on terms useful and productive for the art and design profession. Artistic work involves making choices and combining those choices in the creation or presentation of a work of art or design. To some degree, works of art or design are developed for a particular place, purpose, or time---

reinforcing the notion of uniqueness and specificity in the artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media, proposed earlier in this chapter. Wait and Hope (2009) express concern about acceptance of an institutional ideology that merely emphasizes procedures, but offer no specific approach in return. Wait and Hope, (2009), as recommended in Chapter 5, do emphasize the need to consider ways and means of keeping assessment on our own terms, meaning that the process and criteria is determined in-house by those who know and have done the kind of work under review. As discussed and recommended in Chapter 5, the absence of assessment on our own terms is a particular contextual problem that those of us at the borders are facing at this time (Wait and Hope, 2009).

c) Evidence to be submitted for performance evaluation

The arts disciplines use a wide variety of evaluation mechanisms, including critiques or peer review by one person or more, public presentations such as screenings or concerts or exhibitions, both formative and summative evaluation, and others. Mechanisms include, but are not limited to:

- Auditions
- Portfolio and document reviews
- Examinations
- Juries
- Master classes
- Competitions
- Performance, or studio exhibitions
- Technique lessons and classes

- Rehearsals
- Public screenings and exhibitions
- Public performances

The more advanced the artist (faculty member or student), the more that evaluation of technical proficiency recedes in favor of the artistic attributes.

The first and foremost point that must be understood about the recognition and evaluation of work in the arts is that achievement and quality come from the work of an individual, or a group of individuals. Individuals vary in the range, scope, and depth of their backgrounds, abilities, education, talents, and vision. The work in the field of film and digital media, and the arts as a whole, needs many people fulfilling different functions at high levels of excellence. In addition to creation and performance, individual achievement and quality by faculty members is essential in teaching, scholarship, research, the arts therapies, the management and support sectors of the arts, and so forth. Each of these areas requires a deep understanding of what the arts are, in essence, and how they work as a mode of thought and action.

The promotion and tenure review/evaluation has three basic parts: 1) the documentation the faculty member provides, 2) the materials the committee collects, and 3) the review of the material by the committee (Diamond, 2002). Diamond (2002) writes: "A well-prepared faculty member can go a long way in making his or her case by providing a strong context and solid documentary materials for the committee to consider" (p. 17). Boyer (1990) and others (Gray, Adam, Froh, and Yonai, 1994) have described alternatives to the three-part model of teaching, research, and service, the following sections are based on the notion that it is a faculty member's responsibility to demonstrate the approach, significance and quality of the work being submitted for evaluation, with the hope that fair and relevant criteria will be used by informed, qualified,

and experienced evaluators.

d) The professional portfolio

At the beginning of this paper, I started by trying to articulate what are some of the most fundamental aspects of work in the field of film and digital media. I did this, in part, because many of these practical notions and theoretical concepts are taken for granted—or overlooked entirely---to the point that a faculty member may be unaware of how much to incorporate into a dossier for review and evaluation. What is obvious to the faculty member who works in the field is not obvious to others. I hope it was helpful to articulate the scope and nature of these activites and theoretical foundations, and point out the constant assessment in which filmmakers already engage as they do their work on a daily basis---in teaching, research and service. Only when the faculty appreciates with full awareness what has been done, can that faculty member convincingly demonstrate the vitality, uniquness and specificity of one's approach. According to Wait and Hope, (2009) "we must make what is obvious to us more obvious to others" (p. 12).

Having identified in Chapter 4/Theme 4 what can be known for sure about the process of work in film and digital media, and what cannot, and/or the areas or levels where there is likely to be evaluation consensus and where there is not, the faculty member will then be in the position to explain what has been done with honesty and integrity, defeating false correlations that outcomes ideologists are prone to seek (Wait and Hope, 2009).

Seldin and Wiley (2009), Lynton (1992), Diamond (1993b) and many others discuss the need for a professional portfolio of faculty work that consists of a broad range of documentation, including a descriptive and reflective essay about the individual faculty's activities, to be prepared and submitted by the faculty for review and evaluation. Diamond (1993b) writes:

> The portfolio plan provides an opportunity for faculty to represent their work so as to differentiate exceptional and innovative teaching, software and curriculum development, and significant research from the more commonplace activities that all faculty perform (p. 11).

Lynton (1992) adds: "if each scholarly activity is, in some sense, a voyage of exploration and discovery, it can be fully appreciated and evaluated only if once can follow the scholar on that journey (p. 30). Diamond (2002) recommends that the professional portfolio:

> …stress two dimensions: 1) the quality of the work, and 2) the significance of the work. In many instances, faculty provide promotion and tenure committees with detailed information as to the quality and quantity of their effort; however, they do not present a case for the value of their work, describing the impact or emphasizing in what ways and for whom the work has significance (p. 25).

Diamond (1993b) also recommends that the faculty write a descriptive and reflective essay that includes:

> …specifics of the situation and the context of for the activity; the objective of the activity; the choice of the specific content and methodology; the results of reflection-in-action in terms of unique and unexpected features encountered, adaptations made, inferences drawn, and lessons learned by the scholar, and the outcomes in terms of learning by the audience (p. 11).

In contrast, there are faculty scholars who question the need or purpose that requires a faculty in film and digital media to write without motivation about their creative work. One professor wrote:

> Thus, the filmmaking scholar is in a kind of 'double jeopardy.' He might have to make the film, then present or explain it in some venue. Most are not opposed to that (what artist doesn't love to talk about his own work?), but a publishing scholar would not be expected to write a book and to make a presentation on the process of printing it. Indeed, it's silly to imagine writing an article, then writing a second article about the act of authoring the first. The requirements of promotion in the world of theory are fulfilled by project alone, sans apologia (Respondent #4).

e) The range of work in development and pre-production

During development and pre-production, the film is designed and planned. The development and pre-production stage is when the story is identified, perhaps emerging from original research; or a book, play, another film, a true story, original idea, newspaper story, or other. A synopsis, grant proposal, film treatment, multiple versions of the script, and various other documents will emerge during development and pre-production. During development and pre-production contracts will be negotiated, money will be raised, and collaboration plans will be formulated. A screenwriter may rewrite the script several times to improve dramatization, clarity, structure, characters, dialogue, and overall style---or to adapt to ever-changing circumstances that affect the production of the film. A distributor of the completed work may be contacted at an early stage to assess the likely market and potential financial success of the film. Once all parties have met and the deal has been set, the film may proceed further into the pre-production period. By this stage, the film should have a clearly defined marketing strategy and target audience.

The rigorous processes of work during pre-production including research and its several different forms of writing, pre-visualization design that is required as the foundation for the completion of scholarly filmmaking, and many other aspects are oftentimes overlooked, not recognized, underestimated or not allowable for submission in many institutions. However, it is clear that scholarly filmmaking is a form of creative scholarship where Boyer's four domains converge and form a fertile convergence of discovery, application, integration and teaching. For example, to develop and write a script for a 30 minute documentary program that is intended for television broadcast would require extensive research, perhaps employing a range of methods and approaches to develop the program's content (discovery); a thorough review of previously produced written and media-based works on the same or similar topics (discovery and integration); an organized plan of action for the meaningful collaboration of technical experts and creative individuals for excellence in filming on-camera processes, interactions and interviews (integration and application); creative choices made that determine the stylistic approach and treatment of the completed work (application); and the myriad of ways that the completed work will reach its target audiences and general public (teaching, outreach).

Unlike conventional scholarly work that probably has a very narrowly defined intended audience that is reached solely through the reading and publication of highly-specialized peer-reviewed professional journal articles, film and media arts have a very different, equally valuable, purpose as the work finally reaches its intended audience. The big difference is that film work might have an audience of millions of people in a variety of contexts; conventional research might only reach an elite few. Faculty for evaluation should remember to include in the dossier some or all of the following:

- A copy of the grant proposal (if available) that was successfully evaluated for project funding. Grant funding applications can be very comprehensive documents and should be given equivalent value as a journal-paper.
- A treatment and script (if possible) of the completed work. The program script is a well-research and pre-visualized document that should be given equivalent value as a journal-paper.
- A narrative document about the process of developing and producing the creative work, including precise descriptive information about the faculty member's role on the production. What was your role? What did you do on this project? If the creative work was produced by an auteur, a sole filmmaker in isolation who did all the technical and creative work, then it is important to identify this fact, and describe the scope and nature of the work.
- It might be useful to include an itemized budget and a general list of the kinds of technical equipment used to produce the creative work. This information will contextualize the scale, limits, and other practical factors that frame the creative work.

f) Broadcast, sales and distribution of film and digital media

> Further complicating the judging of a scholarly filmmaker is the fact that he often makes money in the exercise of his discipline…Films perceived as 'purely entertaining' are suspect, for they may appear to be motivated by profit rather than inquiry (Respondent #4).

Broadcast, sales and distribution are the final stages in the process of film and digital

media production; making the completed project/program available (or for the filmmaker to independently distribute/broadcast the work in a large variety of ways) to a distributor that markets the completed program to a variety of markets---educational, commercial, broadcast, regional, others---on DVD, Blu-ray disc, VHS tape and other exhibition formats; or to service provider that offers a direct download of the completed work(s). The completed work is duplicated as required for distribution, sales and broadcast. Press kits, posters, and other advertising materials are published and the film is advertised. Distribution companies might release a large budget film with a launch party, press releases, interviews with the press, press preview screenings, and film festival screenings. Today, many films have their own website. A feature film might be distributed/exhibited at selected cinemas with the DVD typically being released a few months later; while other projects, documentaries and short films, might be distributed directly to DVD markets. The distribution rights for the film and DVD are sold for specific markets as indicated in a contractual agreement between the distributor and the filmmaker---for example, broadcast television in a specific regional market (i.e. drive-in theaters in the southern states of the USA, etc), library distribution, cable TV broadcast, public television broadcast, foreign market broadcast, educational markets, or worldwide distribution. The distributor and the production company share profits according to a pre-agreed percentage---usually with the filmmaker getting the short end of the deal---for example, a 60%-40% split would be considered a good deal by many filmmakers (with their share being the 40%). Most distributors consider factors such as film genre, the target audience, the historical success of similar films, the actors who might appear in the film, and the track record of the director and other key personnel. Not all films make a profit from the theatrical release alone, so film companies take DVD sales and worldwide distribution rights into account.

g) Film festivals, competitions, special events

An important and significant means for reaching the general public, aside from commercial television broadcast or theatrical distribution, is through exhibition at film festivals or special events. Festivals and special events vary in scope and nature, but many are international in scope while others are national, regional or local. A majority of festivals are accepting and inviting creative work only after rigorous peer-evaluation based by a special panel of peer-experts, with acceptance being based on the festival's special theme or exemplary achievement in various categories of specialization. Sometimes the events are competitive with cash or in-kind prizes being awarded, and oftentimes the opportunities that arise afterwards from successful participation are numerous for the dossier of the filmmaker and for potentially broadening the scope of distribution of the film work itself. Festivals are excellent opportunities for peer-review, from the selection process to media promotion and publication. A faculty member who has work that has been selected in a local, regional or international film festival should be recognized for this achievement. Each film festival is separate and distinguishable from other festivals. Selection of the same work to multiple festivals should not be considered redundant. Instead, this is clear evidence that the creative work is being more broadly disseminated, thus, the work should be rewarded more greatly if selected on multiple occasions to participate in different festivals.

Information about the contest or festival should be submitted with the faculty member's dossier. Information such as the description of event, its inception date and location, number of entries (if known) that were included in the event, the number and kinds of works that were selected for prizes or in the same category as the faculty member's work(s), venues where work

was screened, etc. Evidence can be in the form of brochures, flyers, website pages, and other pertinent forms. Some suggestions for consideration and inclusion in the faculty's application file for promotion:

- Examples of the selection criteria used for the festival (if possible); was it a blind-peer review process or other kind of process?
- All reviews, particularly unsolicited reviews, about the creative work that is being submitted in an effort to demonstrate the value of the work
- A high-quality copy of the work that was exhibited in the festival or contest
- Evidence that the creative work that was selected for inclusion in a film festival or competition was included in a permanent collection by the organization that is sponsoring the festival. This is an example of continued public access to the creative work. The cost of acquisition is approximately equivalent to the purchase of a book or journal subscription by a library, and demonstrates the interest of an organization in owning the creative work for its permanent collection.

Theme 6: Post evaluation considerations

Franke (2001) writes: "When an institution denies tenure, honesty is the best policy. Otherwise, everyone may end up in court" (p. 1). Franke (2000) argues that evaluation processes should be "thoughtful and just" and "like hiring decisions, tenure and promotion decisions should be handled in a fair, equitable and timely fashion (p. 1). Courts tend to grant higher education institutions a great deal of deference in their academic decision-making, but data shows that courts will rule against colleges and universities where there is evidence of discrimination, arbitrary decision making, or failure to follow established institutional

procedures. Courts typically also order the disclosure of materials from other tenure reviews for comparative purposes. Franke (2001) writes:

> During the 1980s, federal judges resolved most tenure-denial cases. Common wisdom among lawyers at the time was that judges would tend to credit the testimony of university administrators, since both the judges and administrators were highly educated white males and most of the plain-tiffs were women, minorities, or both. Congress changed the legal landscape rather dramatically in 1991, putting employment-discrimination cases in federal court into the hands of juries. The number of employment-discrimination cases has subsequently skyrocketed, from 8,400 in 1990 to 23,700 in 1998 (the most recent year for which figures are available). Although precise numbers for tenure-denial cases are unavailable, they, too, have increased significantly. The common wisdom today holds that jurors are suspicious of institutions and tend to favor the 'little guy.' The confluence of these developments has given rise to very participatory tenure processes, an active litigation docket, full disclosure of tenure-review evidence, and decisions made by juries. The mixture is potent (p. 2).

Several aspects of the tenure-evaluation process become important in tenure-denial lawsuits. Franke (2001) recognizes the importance of treating unsuccessful candidates as a "professional colleague" and not one "airbrushed out of a Kremlin photograph" (p. 24). Franke (2001) recognizes the responsibility of the institution:

> …to take many steps to help the individual with what may be a difficult transition. If the institution provides assistance and expressions of concern, it may reduce the anger and

> desire for revenge that some unsuccessful candidates feel. Caring for unsuccessful candidates is a humane and decent thing to do. It is a good way to prevent some lawsuits (p. 20).

Franke (2001) provides a range of good advice for how institutions can handle unsuccessful post-evaluation situations:

- Deliver the bad news with compassion. Franke (2001) asks institutions to consider *how* candidates are notified with bad news, asking "how would you feel if you received this letter" (p. 20)?

- Encourage colleagues to interact professionally with the unsuccessful candidate after the denial of tenure. Franke (2001) writes: "social isolation can exacerbate the unsuccessful tenure candidate's sense of failure" (p. 21).

- Finally, Franke (2000) advises that after the institution has denied tenure to a candidate, help the individual move on with his or her career.

  Franke (2000) writes:

  > Some faculty members who have been denied tenure report that, after the decision, colleagues ostracized them. Others say they had the opposite experience, that colleagues expressed outrage about the injustice and strongly encouraged them to challenge the outcome. Most often, an approach of supporting the candidate in moving along with his or her career best serves everyone's interests (p.5).

  Franke (2000) adds:

> In shunning a candidate, colleagues may increase the individual's sense of hurt and failure. Common courtesies can reduce some of the sting of the experience. Assistance with locating another position also goes a long way toward helping the individual move beyond the tenure denial. On the other hand, encouraging someone to challenge the outcome may lure him or her into the expensive and protracted form of martyrdom known as civil litigation. Advice from the AAUP staff may give useful perspective to candidates who have been denied tenure (p. 5).

Franke (2001) has developed a checklist on caring for unsuccessful candidates that is included in this dissertation as Appendix M.

Part 3: Other Considerations

Scholars of an alternative ilk, such as those faculty in the field of film and digital media, will likely ask, will my work have an *emotional* or *intellectual* impact (Richardson, 1995; 2000)? Intrinsic interest and impact that may be generated upon experiencing a personalized, artistic, creative or scholarly work in film or digital media constitutes an important value that should not be arbitrarily dismissed by an evaluator, although from the perspective of convention the values of interest or impact are not generally prioritized. In the making of a film or digital media work there is a symbiotic and constant interplay between theory and practice (praxis). Taking a camera system and an audio recording system into a location, and mastering the use of these equipment systems for the purposes of creative expression, meaningful observation, and other purposes relating to scholarship and professional work, requires a myriad of intellectual,

practical, aesthetic, culturally- and critically-based choices to be made, just as in traditional research methodology there are a myriad of conscious and sub-conscious choices that are continuously made. Technique, aesthetics, budget, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation levels on individual and group levels, creativity and problem solving on many levels, and complex systems of self- and team-leadership are all converging simultaneously in a collaborative creative environment when a film is being made. Just as conventional research can be defined and described as more than discovery (Boyer, 1990), the making and completion of film and digital media works are more than simply recording (discovering?) what occurs before the camera or within range of the microphone.

Filmmaking is a technical craft, but it is also a business activity with ramifications in most other areas of knowledge--for example, law, social relations, technology, cultural and political history, and with a very deep connection to creativity and creative thinking. Films and media productions vary in duration, style, treatment and approach, story structure, purpose, budget limits, equipment limits, diverse cultural contexts, aesthetic sensibilities, dissemination plans and opportunities, and other ways. While published articles that are intended for a specific discipline and for a narrowly defined readership audience might (or might not) have standardized expectations in regard to length, presentation, and purpose, the same cannot be said for creative works. Each film will vary in the ways listed above and more, depending on the purpose, budget and other factors that surround the filmmaker and his/her story. Conventions, aesthetics, and limitations are always changing, hugely diverse, and certainly not homogenous. It is essential that the assessment of creative work be performed by colleagues and experts who have at least some awareness of such subjective points related to filmmaking such as originality, innovation, application of aesthetic principles and technical skills and processes.

In some cases, one person works alone, independently from other technical or creative collaborators (Collins, 2003). The rigorous challenge of working on all aspects of a film or media production work, including the technical, creative, business and legal aspects, should be acknowledged as an integrated whole that would otherwise be accomplished by several persons working in collaboration. Rather than to perceive the *auteur* approach as less-than-professional, small-scale and limited, the filmmaker working in isolation should be recognized as at the height of discovery, integration and application. The isolated filmmaker was perhaps working in a remote location with minimal support for logistics and scant resources, without the benefit of consultant interactions or other help. (Collins, 2003). In this case, the evaluator must develop distinct and unique sets of criteria that acknowledge the massive effort and challenge that faces the auteur filmmaker (Bukalski, 2000)

In other cases, a filmmaker will be collaborating with others, perhaps highly specialized professionals, or students or persons from a wide spectrum of social strata, on the development, production and postproduction of the film or media production. The various key roles on a film require the productive collaboration of a team of others. The roles of Executive Producer, Producer, Director, Cinematographer, or Editor on an independent medium-scale or relatively large-scale film or media production would be analogous to a researcher in traditional scholarly research who leads of team of assistants on a project. Leadership, motivation, communication and many practical issues converge in the effort to manage a team that is working together on a creative work in film or media production. It is important that evaluators have a clear understanding of the precise role(s) that the faculty member contributed in the creative work being evaluated, and assess the work on the basis of the role(s) performed as demonstrated in the completed work.

Part 4: Summary

The credibility of a performance evaluation system rests on its ability to produce sound evaluations that are relevant to the unique characteristics of the work being reviewed. A sound process for recognizing and evaluating faculty work and performance also leads to the fairest and most defensible outcomes. At the level of supervisors and administrators, reflection and constructive dialogue with all concerned parties about potential weaknesses in faculty-evaluation systems may facilitate improvement that strengthens process of deliberation, and increase the likelihood of avoiding, or prevailing in, litigation over the denial in problematic cases. At the level of the faculty member, awareness and diligence in making one's self aware of the expectations and priorities of faculty work at the particular institution, plus keeping vigilant about gaps and predictable problems that can emerge at any point in the process are important will be helpful self-protective measures; in addition to doing the best one can in all aspects of performance in teaching, research, and service under the specific circumstances one finds in the workplace where one is located.