

Chapter 5: CONCLUSION

This chapter is divided into four parts:

Part 1: Rationale

Part 2: From theme to theory

Part 3: Recommendations from theory and outcomes

Part 4: Concluding Thoughts

The purpose of this chapter is to suggest implications and make specific recommendations for actions by all concerned parties; and to suggest topics for future research.

Part 1: Rationale

This qualitative and auto/ethnographic study has explored a broad range of factors that have emerged from a wide range of data sources, demonstrating that the research problem is being perpetuated and that solutions are needed. A wide range of data--- the introduction to the problem in Chapter 1, literature was reviewed in Chapter 2, interviews and personalized writing in Chapter 4. I have demonstrated 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. This fact serves as the rationale in this chapter for presenting an alternative perspective that facilitates change.

Part 2: From theme to theory

Six themes emerged from data, delineated in Chapter 4. Those have been consolidated into three theories in this chapter.

Theory 1: The importance of *difference* among the disciplines

Theory 2: The importance of recognizing attributes that are *unique and specific* to the field of film and digital media.

Theory 3: The importance of considering the faculty member's welfare *before and after* the

evaluation.

The three theories expose fundamental problems that are experienced by faculty in the field of film and digital media when facing the gauntlet of performance evaluation. The three theories listed below constitute an important aspect of my response to the research question of this dissertation---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? (Recommendations are at the end of this chapter, completing my response to the research question). The three theories that address the research problem are:

Theory 1: Recognizing *difference* among the disciplines.

Faculty members in the field of film and digital media are marginalized in institutions of higher learning by a monolith of tradition and convention that fails to recognize *difference* among the disciplines, and a significant extent of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media remains unrecognized, undervalued, or dismissed during performance evaluation.

Theory 2: Recognizing attributes that *unique and specific* to the field of film and digital media.

Attributes of an institutional system for recognizing and evaluating faculty performance in film and digital media should include relevant criteria that honors and makes eligible all processes of work in the field of film and digital media for recognition and evaluation. To achieve that objective, it is important that a performance evaluation should be conducted by knowledgeable, qualified and experienced committee members using written and relevant criteria for the intended purpose; and that the evaluation itself should welcome a broad range of evidence

demonstrating *approach and artifacts*.

Theory 3: Considering the faculty member's welfare *before and after* the evaluation.

Significant and complex problems affect faculty before and after a performance evaluation, particularly when formal criteria are vague or irrelevant, or when the result of an evaluation is unsuccessful for the faculty, and the human factors affecting the faculty member must be considered.

The following sections analyze each theory in the context of its relevance to the research problem, with careful attention paid to the research question, relevant literature, the methods for inquiry that were used, and the auto/ethnographic approach that was employed to write this dissertation.

Part 2/Theory 1: Recognizing *difference* among the disciplines.

There is a *difference* in the scholarship activities of faculty members in film and digital media, in comparison with the traditional and conventional expectations of activities for faculty members in other fields and disciplines. Even within the field of film and digital media itself there is a great *difference* in the scope and nature of work that emerges. There is an historical pattern of applying mismatched criteria during performance evaluation of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, but there is no logical, epistemological, or ethical basis for the continuing marginalization of alternative approaches, forms, and methods of work. The difference of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media from other approaches must be recognized and evaluated on the unique and specific

merits. As one professor wrote:

I do believe valuing creative expression is crucial and often misunderstood in our field (film and digital media), especially by those with orientations to publication and scientific research (Respondent #9).

What is the meaning of *difference*, and what are the differences between a text-based work and a creative work in film or digital media? Difference is the antonym of equality and sameness, and difference is determined by comparison. But, a complete comparison of objects, things, or ideas is almost impossible---being limited to mere, random and subjectively selected attributes. There is an eternal murkiness and an irreconcilable postponement of finality, in an effort to finalize the concept of difference that is based upon perceptions of equality, because there are no words to adequately express the vast terrain of *difference*. I argue that change and *difference* are interconnected, and that change and equality (or sameness) are not.

To make an analogy with mathematics---two objects are equal only if they are precisely the same in every way. Equality, denoted by the equals sign, "=", indicates a binary relationship where two (or more) objects are precisely the same. For example, " $x = y$ " means that x and y are equal. However, in artistic, scholarly or professional work that is time-based in nature there will never be mathematical equality, not within the field itself and certainly not in comparison with works outside the field. The analogy of fitting a square peg into a round hole is appropriate. Any attempt to apply criteria that is relevant for one will not be relevant for the other, and such an attempt is unfair, unwise, and imbalanced.

In some cases, in the field of film and digital media, rather than developing unique and appropriate criteria for the purpose of recognizing the differences in faculty scholarship and

evaluating the work for its *approach and artifacts* (Diamond and Adam, 2000), data in Chapter 4 shows that some institutions have arbitrarily decided to concoct a scheme to *equate* a publication with a film, as if a film and a research paper are equal, comparable and measured on one all-encompassing scale; as if they are two forms of the same thing. This scheme is contradiction with all notions that define *difference* in scholarship and faculty activities. Chapter 4 describes an institution that decided to implement a scheme (unwritten) to *equate* one text publication with one film or video, but only if the film/digital media work had been publicly exhibited in a film festival. No other aspect of the faculty's work on that project was recognized for evaluation, but the one-to-one formula prevailed on the absurd basis that public exhibition of one film somehow equated with one journal article publication.

Faculty in the field of film and digital media who responded to the survey have described the external perception of their work with many negative terms, including: “*suspect* for being motivated by profit rather than inquiry, *undervalued*, often *disparaged*, *disregarded*, *dismissed*, *vocational*, and entirely *off a personnel committee's radar*.” Data indicates a glaring gap that separates work by faculty in film and digital from their peers in other disciplines. Common sense dictates there is a significant, perceived and empirical *difference* between text-based research methods that reflect the traditional and conventional expectations of scholarship---whether qualitative and quantitative---in comparison with the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, despite some similarities and some comparable aspects.

Each successful work of creative expression (sometimes called art), including a film or other media production, is a microcosmic universe held together by its own internal logic, or illogic (NASAD, 1990). Unique characteristics of a film or media production can be identified

and compared with conventional research output according to a new model, but the internal logic of one work probably will not be the same internal logic of another, even when the two works are crafted by the same artist using the same tools, techniques and subject. A creative work in film or media production, like any other form of scholarship output, is certainly intended to contribute to the knowledge base in the field, but the work is likely to be intended as a creative, symbolic expression that abstractly represents that knowledge to others, namely, audiences. Using an analogy from the field of linguistics, it is arguable that all forms of language are symbolic attempts to abstractly communicate, and the visual and aural communication that is done in film and media production emerges in this way as a new language for expression.

The performance evaluation process in the field of film and digital media is inconsistent, irrelevant, and inappropriate for its intended purpose, and this fact compels a call for change that recognizes *difference*. Important scholarly work by faculty is being dismissed, unrecognized and unrewarded. In the words of one faculty member, “The development process, as arcane and opaque as it may appear to us, is completely off the radar of most academics” (Respondent #3). Referring to post-production work that goes unrewarded, one 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...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).

A significant range of the qualitative, alternative and creative work by faculty in the field of film and digital media remains largely unrewarded, marginalized or obstructed by the narrowness of the traditional template---and largely because there is scant respect for *difference*

and minimal clarity about what is constituted as scholarly work when it deviates from normative expectations. Faculty work in film and digital media poses particularly difficult challenges in higher educational settings because it is highly collaborative and integrative in scope and nature, the result of diverse yet interrelated efforts and activities in a plethora of contexts. It is not imitative of conventional faculty scholarship activities, nor does it prioritize a need for replication, empirical truth, verifiability and other values from scientism. Simply, it is different and cannot be comfortably reconciled or easily judged by using a template that is intended for more measuring conventional kinds of qualitative or quantitative inquiry.

Part 2/Theory 2: Recognizing attributes that *unique and specific* to the field of film and digital media.

Artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film or digital media has *unique and specific attributes* that cannot be recognized and must not be evaluated by using the same criterion as text-based research publications. Data shows that the criteria for recognizing and evaluating text-based research output has been arbitrarily, inconsistently and incoherently applied to the recognition and evaluation of many forms of creative work, a process that moves forward without any logical basis for its continuation. The result is a mismatch of expectations, values, priorities, and outcomes---and potential conflict.

Successful work in film and digital media is that which achieves goals that have been set at the beginning or in the course of development, rather than following strictly a set of universal principles or rules. A goal is often based on certain conceptualizations or processes that are created or selected by the creator of the work, and these are combined with techniques and mediums to create the end product, an artistic, scholarly or professional work in film or digital media (Wait and Hope, 2009). An understanding of the goal and intent of the work by the faculty member who created the work enables an evaluation against the best things that can be known about the work. The evaluation should be interested in the unique and specific mode of thought that motivated the work and the faculty member who created the work; or upon the development of knowledge, skills, experiences, habits of mind, and so forth that has led to its highly sophisticated achievement (Wait and Hope, 2009, p. 7).

The most commonly found templates that are used for assessing or evaluating qualitative research in higher education are neither relevant nor appropriate for the intended purpose; and discrepancies in the criteria of the traditional template are fueling unresolved conflicts in

institutional settings. As discussed in the previous chapter, data from this study demonstrates that many institutions of higher learning have not recognized that artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media should co-exist alongside text-based research publications in the pantheon of what is considered to be faculty scholarship.

A new paradigm for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media should honor the *approach and artifacts* (or products) of work, rather than the conventional notion that emphasizes artifacts *over* approach (Diamond and Adam, 2000, p. 6-8; Matusov and Hampel, 2008). This shift in priorities, in comparison with the specialist-practitioner ontology of scientism, places greater value on the interconnectedness and interdependence of systems and processes. It rejects a traditional and conventional ontology of performance evaluation that strictly prioritizes artifacts *over* approach (Diamond and Adam, 2000; Matusov and Hampel, 2008).

The evaluation of individual achievement in an arts discipline such as the field of film and digital media should prioritize the unique and specific characteristics of individual achievement, reflecting and explaining the nature of achievement and quality beyond basic thresholds for entry level; even though they are present at entry level, at least to a fundamental degree. Developing these capabilities is the work of a lifetime, and there is virtually no limit to the levels of achievement and quality that can be reached. Because the specifics associated with each characteristic vary among disciplines and specializations, the list can be addressed in terms associated with departmental programs, and areas of specialization. The characteristics can be used to address the specific work of individual faculty members (and students too as the model is applicable to the evaluation of student work)--what they have achieved and their potential, evaluated in terms of specific accomplishments at a particular time.

Borrowing from models that pertain generally to the evaluation of artistic work in its many forms, important attributes and characteristics of unique, specific and individual achievement in film and digital media should prioritize:

- 1) Basic knowledge and skills in the discipline and any area of specialization, including fundamentals of the field in terms of practice, history, analysis and their applications in various areas of specialization.
- 2) The faculty member's success in developing a personal vision and/or purpose (sometimes called artistic voice) that is evident in terms of work produced in the discipline or specialization.

Verbal articulation of the vision or purpose is virtually immaterial if the vision is not manifested in the work produced. Vision or purposes are realized in terms of content or process in one or more of the following fields: artistic, humanistic, scientific, pedagogical, therapeutic, and so forth. Visions or purposes can change from work to work.

3) Borrowing from Bloom (1956), conceptual acuity and ability to:

- create, sustain, realize, and evolve personal vision and purposes;
- identify and achieve specific and associated ideas and/or goals at various levels of scope and complexity;
- work creatively with relationships among ideas, structure, and expression;
- understand multiple perspectives;
- create using the process of discovery inherent in making a work.
- use imagination as a means of creation and discovery with regard to specific content or subject matter and as a means for communicating through the art form what is created or discovered;

- channel imagination to reach specific artistic goals;
- apply imagination to all aspects and levels of a work in ways that enhance its communicative power.

5) Technical ability to:

- create, sustain, realize, and evolve a personal vision and/or purposes;
- realize specific works or projects or elements of concepts at an advanced or professional level;
- analyze one's own work with sophistication using various methods and perspectives.
- Ability to combine knowledge and skills, personal vision and/or purpose.

6) Conceptual acuity and clarity, imagination, and technical ability to function independently in the creation and production of high level work in the area of specialization, including but not limited to the capability and capacity to:

- define, analyze, and solve problems;
- make effective choices;
- evaluate critically and effectively work in process;
- critique and learn from work of others;
- understand and work with layers of structure and meaning;
- combine, integrate, and synthesize elements into works with internal conceptual and structural integrity.

A new and appropriate evaluation system for this group of scholars should be consistent with the four domains of Boyer (1990). Boyer's (1990) panoramic view of scholarship is relevant to research activities by faculty---extending from traditional and conventional notions of

discovery-based inquiry to the application and integration of skills and knowledge, to the sharing of knowledge through teaching. Boyer's (1990) notion of scholarship facilitates a view of service by faculty as socially involved and socially responsible, in contrast to the common and narrow notion that is limited to committee participation and a few other mundane campus-based activities. The range of possibilities offered by the four domains of Boyer (1990) are relevant to the artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, but require the implementation of unique and specific criteria for measuring, assessing and evaluating such work in performance review.

As argued by Boyer (1990) and applied to the unique and specific field of film and digital media, the practice and outcomes of work in film and digital media emerge in similar ways as that which is common in conventional practice and outcomes---from the *discovery* of new knowledge and the gathering of new information to a review of existing data (including literature), to the building of greater understanding of other forms of expression that have expressed what is known. *Discovery* in film and digital media is a form analysis and synthesis with the use of a script, camera, microphone and montage. The process of work in film and digital media is constantly reliant upon the *application* and *integration* of many kinds of knowledge and skills, for technical, artistic, professional, and other purposes. Faculty who collaborate with others on the development and production of work in film and digital media are engaged in application and integration of knowledge and skills for social, educational, developmental, and organizational purposes. The fourth of Boyer's (1990) domains, the sharing of knowledge through *teaching*, can also be meaningfully compared with the public exhibition, broadcast or presentation of a work in film and digital media.

Artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can emerge in the context of Boyer's (1990) four domains of scholarship, and can include any of the following kinds of work:

- Films, videos and other electronic/digital media productions for creative and artistic expression;
- Creative or artistic works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that emerge from a range of research methods or approaches--conventional, unconventional, personal, self-reflective, or multidisciplinary;
- Creative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that are intended for advocacy and outreach purposes for a particular cause, including public awareness, organizational development or other intra-organizational communication, and other purposes;
- Creative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media intended for television broadcast or theatrical distribution;
- Creative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that are intended for educational applications in schools, libraries, media centers and other relevant venues where media programming serves to enhance learning, training and other forms of information dissemination;
- Creative and innovative works in film, video and/or electronic/digital media that are specifically intended for broadcast or presentation on the internet for commercial, entertainment or other purposes;
- Creative and innovative multimedia works for commerce, entertainment, and promotional purposes in a variety of contexts;

- Scholarship action in a broad of contexts that is produced and distributed in film, video and/or electronic/digital media for the benefit of local and global audiences.

The diverse outputs listed above can emerge from any of Boyer's (1990) four domains (Discovery, Application, Integration, Teaching), and can effectively meet the three-point model of Schulman and Hutching (1998) for defining the scope and nature of scholarship activity by faculty; further, work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can satisfy the six-point criteria of Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff (1997) for defining and assessing the quality of scholarship in the four domains of Boyer (1990); and the six-point criteria of Diamond (1993) that pertain to the recognition of faculty work as scholarship is also consistent with the scope and nature of work by faculty in the field of film and digital media (see Chapter 2 Literature Review).

A reductionist or Newtonian view assumes that filmmaking is composed of specialized functions, that the technical, creative, business and legal aspects are important yet distinct from each other; that the specialist areas of practice and knowledge are to be performed by different persons with different sets of responsibilities---and that in the end the parts will fit together to form a whole under the guidance of a singular leader. In many ways this view does reflect a reality in professional and educational arenas, being true and consistent with the way that most of the conventional work in film and digital media that we commonly experience through television, in cinemas or elsewhere in the mainstream media---particularly the works that emerge in corporate, commercial, industrial and entertainment contexts. It is also common to find that specialization is advocated and taught in many schools and programs of higher learning in the field of film and digital media, following the specialist-practitioner model that encourages specialized mastery as a pre-requisite for participation with other specialist-practitioners to

accomplish shared goal(s). The problem is that notions of reductionism and specialization are not entirely useful for describing, recognizing or evaluating the scope and nature of work in the field of film and digital media.

In the context of specialization, an analogy from music is helpful, where musicians in an orchestra, for example, a violinist or timpanist or clarinetist, very likely will have minimal knowledge of the trumpet, oboe or contrabass, or some other instrument in the ensemble if it is not their own specialty. Together, music emerges from this group of harmonized specialists, most commonly under the direction of a leader (conductor, concertmaster, or other). These each musician-specialist is able to peacefully co-exist as an expert practitioner within the team, yet doing so without any detailed knowledge of the other. A similar model of self-reliant specialist-practitioners working in co-operation with other self-reliant specialist-practitioners is a norm in conventional forms of filmmaking practice, although it is evident that collaboration is not commonly recognized, fairly evaluated, or equitably rewarded in the university setting during a performance evaluation. As described in Chapter 4, in the words of one professor:

Film production's collaborative nature, 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).

Institutional paradigms for performance evaluation subscribe to reductionism, isolating and focusing upon an important function in a specialized area. The assumption is that the

filmmaking process has leaders and followers, and that a leadership role can be recognized and rewarded, but that other roles have decreasing value. A further assumption is that systemic integration is beyond the grasp or capacity of sole individual, so holistic approaches to the process of filmmaking are also not rewarded, and not considered to be as valuable as a specialist approach to the process. The conventional model for defining and evaluating work in the field of film and digital media arbitrarily places greater value on some aspects of the work responsibility, yet diminishes the value placed upon other work.

A traditional and conventional approach to performance evaluation of scholarly work in any field will commonly focus on the dualistic vocabulary of morality, with dualisms such as good-bad, fair-unfair, right-wrong, did-did not, will-will not, and many more. Using moral terms in a performance evaluation can easily lead to bias, errors in judgment, conflict and lots of other bad results as a work is subjectively judged on moral terms. Simply discussing how good or bad, how right or wrong, or how beautiful or ugly a work of art or scholarship may or may not be, does not compel reflection upon the merits of what the work is, what are its *unique and specific attributes*. The continuing application of irrelevant and narrowly conceived criteria is unfair and will remain so until change has emerged.

Gatekeepers in higher education expect a symbiotic relationship of originality, compliance and mastery over that which previously existed. It is logical to assume that the uniqueness, merit and worth of truly original work could remain unrecognized or undervalued because, by definition, an original work would deviate greatly or entirely from all that preceded it. The potential for contamination of the evaluation process for original work through unawareness or unintended unfairness from preconceived bias by evaluators, caused by unmet expectations for mastery and referential linkages, is also always of concern.

Faculty perceptions of the performance evaluation process in institutions of higher learning, specifically in the field of film and digital media, have been described with the following terms:

...deliberately vague, a double jeopardy, difficult, silly to imagine, an uncomfortable fit, a major battle, limiting, problematic, off the radar of most academics, a yearly or biennial torture, leading to abuses when faculty and administrators are unfamiliar within the given discipline, not encouraged, tragic, an exception to the rule, disregarded, disconnected”
(combined data from several Respondents).

In the words of one faculty member who responded to the survey, institutional policies for performance evaluation are “mismatched” with the scope and nature work of faculty in film and digital media; that the approach to work in film and digital media is expected to “mimic” that of publications; and that the number of films expected for promotion or tenure is often “unrealistic,” and that faculty themselves in the field are “seldom able to select the kinds of work that they would like to do”---if they want the work recognized and rewarded in the academic setting (Respondent #4).

The non-recognition of the unique and specific attributes of work in the field of film and digital media opens up several problem areas that are facing its faculty. The attributes of faculty evaluation systems should include relevant criteria, and a qualified and experienced evaluation committee should be using written and relevant criteria for the intended purpose. The data demonstrates these problem areas remain unresolved. The problematic nature of faculty performance evaluation emanates from the fact that reductionism, scientism, and the traditional template continue to prevail in many institutions, almost entirely disallowing the fair and relevant recognition, evaluation and reward of alternative forms of faculty work. Artistic,

scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media has unique and specific attributes but these fall off the margins when traditional and conventional modes of measurement and evaluation are applied.

If and/or when an institution does consent to allow and consider faculty work in the field of film and digital media, surely those works will be scrutinized and measured by selected faculty colleagues and administrators who serve on an internal committee panels inside the particular College, perhaps also by upper administrators whose expertise is entirely outside of the College, perhaps also by outside expert judge-evaluators from other institutions, and perhaps also by faculty colleagues outside the College who serve as promotion committee members. The unfortunate fact as demonstrated in data presented in Chapter 4 is that not all the persons who may be evaluating the work of their filmmaking peers or colleagues are informed, knowledgeable or experienced enough to evaluate the scope, nature and possibilities of artistic, scholarly or professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. As an analogy, I am sure that chemists would not want a sculptor to evaluate the worth of their research, so why does it continue that chemists are evaluating our work in film and digital media? Because the academy is a bastion of a traditional and conventional ontology of scientism, it is also entirely possible that none of the persons in the evaluation process have considered, and certainly not challenged, the notion that a new definition of scholarship is feasible, necessary and ready for implementation.

Data has shown that many faculty members in the field of film and digital media share a perception that some evaluators in a faculty performance evaluation do not have expertise with the specific and unique aspects of scholarship and activity in the field of film and digital media. Further, this negative perception is exacerbated by an absence of written criteria that clarifies the

scope and nature for performance evaluation. This negative perception is supported in instances when aspects or examples of scholarship performance remain under-rewarded or unrecognized during a performance evaluation (Diamond, 1993, 1995, 1999). Evaluators could be tempted to revert to reductive, dualistic, and pre-conceived views (self-other, good-bad, right-wrong, accepted-not accepted, and so on) to supplant their void of knowledge when they are not familiarized or experienced with the specific and unique aspects of work in the field of film and digital media. It can be demonstrated that if evaluators are not provided with relevant criteria upon which to judge in a proper and complete way 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).

Some faculty evaluator-reviewers who have minimal to nil knowledge or appreciation of those relevant strategies might 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. Therefore, 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).

During the process of evaluation at those institutions that are willing to accept a dossier of faculty work that emerges in creative ways, including filmmaking, the work might be subject to evaluation upon unwritten or improvised criteria. When the intellectual foundations of

creative work in film and electronic/digital media are not known or not considered, important aspects of the whole work that are inherent to the development, production and exhibition of the creative work remain unnoticed, undervalued and unrewarded, in comparison with scholarly work that exists in more conventional forms. For example, a lengthy and comprehensive grant proposal, program treatment, or many versions of a program script may go unrewarded. These elements of work may have emerged in a collaborative creative environment, the result of an extensive range of traditional research methods such as data/information gathering, literature review, synthesis of data/information, and critical analysis---but according to the tradition and conventional approach, none of that work would have any value. If an institution does not have clear and specific criteria that pertain directly to creative work output in film and electronic/media, the broad range of scholarship that relates to that creative work would have nil value in a conventional review of faculty performance. Instead of being considered as the scholarly output of an scholarly researcher, the value of the work that occurs during pre-production of a film and/or electronic/digital media project---such as grant writing and research, pre-production scripting---oftentimes largely based on traditional research methods, and other complex research---none of this work would be valued on its own merit. The only thing that might matter, if at all, is the existence and public presentation of the final film, and data shows that even the threshold of public exhibition is vaguely defined in most institutions. This problem is symptomatic of the conventional notion that good research is deemed credible *only* when the faculty writes and publishes the research findings and conclusions in a particular manner. The narrowness of this demand negates the unique and specific attributes of work in film and digital media.

Many grant proposals are hefty examples of intellectual rigor and action that is done thorough both a traditional and creative approach to action research, covering a range of relevant perspectives including program content, business and legal aspects, production management plans, and more. The grant proposal for a film project is similar in scope to a full business plan for any private enterprise, with an orientation toward creative expression and the sound management of funds. Further, a film or digital media work that is produced for the specific benefit of a commercial or non-commercial client---for example, a social development agency, a public charity, an association with any specialized purpose, or other institution with a specific in-house need or interest for the production of media programming that benefits the public outreach efforts of the organization---would have no value in the context of faculty performance evaluation for research, for no other reason than this kind of activity is not considered to be scholarly according to the traditional and conventional template for faculty work. An erroneous comparison might be made in any area such as Sociology, Ethnic Studies or Cultural History---for example, a faculty in one of those disciplines or fields might write a cookbook, perhaps a cookbook about a particular culinary culture—and perhaps this cookbook is commercially published and the professor makes a profit from the project. The common reality is that the cookbook would not be considered to be equivalent as a form of scholarship, instead, it would be considered a commercial project with no academic or research relevance. However, what happens if the historian who writes the cookbook is interested in the sociology of culinary culture (for example, Yemeni culinary culture), writes a cookbook about traditional Yemeni cuisine, produces a film about Yemeni culinary culture that is based upon his research? At this time, in my observation, the professor would receive no value for any of the above actions, unless there was a scholarly paper that is published in a peer-reviewed journal for professionals

in the field. The inconsistency, discrepancy and vagueness of the response in academe to the question what is good research is sorely apparent and blatantly unfair.

Part 2/Theory 3: Considering the faculty member's welfare *before and after* the evaluation

As described in Chapter 4, there are several important considerations that must not be neglected before and after the evaluation, particularly when criteria are irrelevant or lacking, or in the case of an unsuccessful outcome for the faculty from the evaluation process.

The post evaluation experience for faculty, particularly in the case of an unsuccessful performance evaluation, is a serious matter. The following recommendations are offered as ways to promote good will and alleviate a cascade of problems and pressures for faculty that are faced with a negative outcome in a performance evaluation.

The most important considerations were described by Franke (2001) and supported by other data collected in this inquiry, including:

- Deliver the bad news with compassion, always considering the golden rule---“how would you feel if you received this letter” (Franke, 2001, 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, the institution that has denied tenure to a candidate should help the individual move on with his or her career (Franke, 2001).

The importance of these ethical considerations should never be minimized or overlooked.

Part 3: Recommendations from theory and outcomes

The issue is not whether we should change, but whether any particular change proposed will make an improvement. The literature is replete with calls to move from frameworks to blueprints at every level. There are assumptions about what is happening and comparisons being drawn, but I am compelled to confront the notion promoted by avid proponents of the conventional system---that the unique and specific nature of work in film and digital media unique situations is not a form of scholarship and therefore recognition and rewards are limited, or not possible.

The heart of this doctoral dissertation is its theoretical conclusions and recommendations that have emerged from research data. The outcome of three theories were described in the previous section, derived from careful study of data---the literature, from surveying and interviewing of participants in this research, and personal reflection in the form of auto/ethnographic writing. Recommendations herein state who needs to pay attention to the research outcomes, with each recommendation relating back to the research problem and providing at least partial response to the research question. Ideally, it is anticipated that some or all of the recommendations will generate a new round of questions and topics for future study.

Part 3 consists of thirty-four recommendations (#1-34) that emerge in response to the research problem, research question and the need for change. The recommendations herein are intended for faculty members, for academic leaders in the field of film and digital media, and administrative policy makers in institutions of higher learning. The following section moves from general recommendations to increasingly specific recommendations for consideration by all concerned parties in a performance evaluation in the field of film and digital media, at departmental, college, and university levels.

General recommendations

Recommendation #1: The entire process of performance evaluation for the purpose of promotion of rank should be dumped. Advancement of faculty rank should be based on time served within the college or university, not on abstracted notions of scholarship and merit. By instituting this change (advancement on the basis of years of service), an illusion of meritocracy (and institutional stability) can be preserved, but its emphasis is shifted away from the impossibility of objectively measuring the merit, worth or value of faculty work in any particular field, and prioritizes the practical role that a faculty member serves at their place of employment as a teacher, researcher and provider of service. As Participant #4 wrote:

Our university does not grant tenure; instead, contracts have to be renewed at intervals between 2-8 years, depending upon education level and how many previous contracts one has completed (Respondent #1).

Advancement in higher education has been demonstrated to be *passive* because there is no substantive change in the job being performed by a faculty member who has been promoted or tenured, although there is a convoluted expectation that advancement is *active* (Pergement and Veum, 1995). To reconcile this discrepancy, this recommendation links a promotion of rank to the retention process. This recommendation remains consistent with Boyer (1990), that all domains and aspects of faculty work should be recognized (see recommendation #3). If a faculty member has been successfully evaluated for employment retention year after year then that same faculty member should be entitled to be promoted. A faculty member's promotion or tenure could still offer a raise in pay and other active benefits, but the process of achieving advancement and reward would be linked to time served and upon criteria that are relevant to the job being performed. The idea of a meritocracy in the evaluation of research and other

performance by faculty academia is delusional, at least when it comes to the appraisal of works of art such as that which emerges in the field of film and digital media, so the pretense of objectivity should be abandoned and replaced by a more neutral and fair solution.

Recommendation #2: Consider the advantages of a non-meritocratic institutional structure that has sustained discrepancies, inequalities, and inadequacies in the process of performance evaluation. Discard the myth of meritocracy by re-defining and expanding the notion of scholarship in higher education as inclusive of alternative approaches, methods and outcomes. While the desirability of meritocracy is arguable from negative and positive perspectives, perpetuation of the myth of meritocracy as superior and objective is overtly harmful because it discounts the most important causes of inequality that persist in the process of performance evaluation. It leads to unwarranted prominence of those already in the inner circles of power, while also sustaining the unwarranted marginalization of those who are not.

Recommendation #3: A new model for re-defining scholarship activity should rely upon Boyer (1990):

- The scholarship of discovery---original research that includes work that is creative in nature and purpose;
- The scholarship of integration---the synthesis of knowledge, skills and approaches;
- The scholarship of application---collaborative scholarly activities with others; collaborative sharing of professional and disciplinary expertise in diverse social, commercial, governmental, industrial and other developmental settings, within and beyond the institutional setting of higher education;

- The scholarship of teaching---the sharing and transformation of knowledge for the benefit of learners in any context (Diamond, 2002).

It is also recommended that the definition of scholarly activity be expanded to include:

- Conventional *and* alternative forms research activity that lead to the production of intellectual, artistic, and creative works (output) in all of the arts, including the field of film and digital media;
- Recognition of forms of writing for publication, presentation, performance, educational purposes, creative expression and other purposes, including auto/ethnographic and other forms of personalized writings;
- Work and activities by faculty that communicate across disciplines, between programs and departments, among institutions, and within the community.

Diamond (2002) wrote: “While the documentation of research and publication has become fairly standardized since the 1980s, demonstration of quality work in other domains is just beginning to receive attention” (p. 18). Many alternatives to the traditional and conventional three-part model of teaching, research and service have been identified and described in this dissertation (Boyer, 1990; Rice, 1991; Gray, Adam, Froh and Yonai, 1994; Hutchings and Schulman, 1999).

Recommendation #4: The recognition and evaluation of faculty work should be de-centralized and brought under local review and authority. Individual academic units should be given the responsibility of determining if a specific activity, work and approach are within the work of the discipline and the priorities of the institution, school, college, department and profession.

Central administrators or central committees should have no authority to make determinations about the recognition and evaluation of unique and specific attributes of faculty work. Each

department within each institution should decide by design or default the extent to which it will pursue *quality* in terms of (a) external perceptions and/or (b) fulfillment of internal purposes and agendas associated with field and disciplinary advancement, and with fostering individual achievement. It is recommended that we eschew aspirations for standardization, both institutional and national, and seek a more modest objective: to develop and provide a resource for applications that focus upon local expertise and local concerns.

Recommendation #5: An institution's published, formal documents should articulate the unique and specific attributes for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media. Formal documents or statements can include:

- Institutional mission and vision statement
- Departmental mission and vision statement
- Faculty handbook that is consistent with university bylaws

Recommendation #6: The process of performance evaluation should be cost effective and time-efficient. Faculty submitting a dossier for review should clearly and easily know what is the extent of effort and products that are expected of them, and what documentation is required, and what is the schedule of deliverables and decision making that pertains to the performance evaluation processes.

Recommendation #7: If the meritocratic process of performance evaluation is sustained, then committee members (in tandem with administrative authority) should assist faculty by providing proven examples or models that guide faculty through the entire process---from the outset of

employment, through the years of employment leading up to the application for performance evaluation, and throughout the entire process until completion (also see recommendations #31-33). This recommendation is particularly important if the activity is one that falls outside of the traditional areas of research and publication, such as work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

Recommendation #8: Because so much of the source of quality in artistic, scholarly and professional work in film and digital media is individual, it is extremely problematic to assume that what works in one case will work automatically in another. In pedagogical approaches, there are no universal certainties. Therefore, if the meritocratic process of performance evaluation is sustained, then a new model for recognizing and evaluating faculty work in any discipline, including the field of film and digital media, should honor the approach and artifacts of work, rather than the conventional notion of artifacts *over* approach (Diamond, 2002). Borrowing from the theoretical models provided by Diamond and Adam (1993) and Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997), the criteria for recognizing approach and artifacts in faculty work in the field of film and digital media should focus on the following:

- The approach and activity require a high level of discipline-related expertise
- The approach and activity break new ground or is innovative
- The completed work has significance or impact
- The completed work can be peer reviewed by experienced and knowledgeable colleagues
- The approach and completed work demonstrate clear goals
- The completed work was adequately prepared
- The approach and completed work demonstrate appropriate methods

- The completed work demonstrates significant results in its completed form
- The completed work was effectively presented
- The approach and completed work are supported by reflective critique, both by the faculty who made the work and audience members

If the meritocratic process of performance evaluation is to be sustained at a particular institution, then a complex mathematical model should be used to judge the performance of faculty members. The model used to judge Olympic gymnasts is an example of what can be used. In the Olympics, gymnasts are no longer judged according to the perfect 10 as the ultimate goal. Now, gymnastic competitors get two scores---one each from two different panels of judges. There is an A score with its own judges, and a B score with its own judges. The A judges allocate a score that measures the difficulty of a move. The way to maximize one's A score is to "cram the toughest possible moves into your routine and pack them as tightly together as you can manage" (Ellenberg, 2008, p. 2). The A score starts at zero points and is incrementally increased, step-by-step, according to the difficulty of the moves and the routine. Each move has a known and highly precise point value and it is the job of the judge to notice and additively attach value to each move. The B score starts at the top of the scale rather than at the bottom, and counts every mistake by deducting points for each miscue (Ellenberg, 2008). Each mistake or miscue has a specific value, and these amounts are subtracted from a total of 10. The final tally is the sum of the A score and the B score.

The downside of this approach is a plethora of problems, and these problems outweigh any advantage that this approach might suggest. It is difficult to imagine an artist being motivated to make creative decisions about the writing, shooting or editing of a film on the basis

of accruing points---gee, this shot, this transition or this effect will be worth a bundle of points! But, if the meritocratic process of performance evaluation must be perpetuated at an institution, then a point-based measuring tool is probably a fair and objective solution.

Recommendations specific to the field of film and digital media

In the specific context of recognizing and evaluating the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media, Tomasulo (2008) and Bukalski (2010) have provided the most guidance. The following is a composite group of recommendations that have emerged from data.

Recommendation #9: Artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and video can be disseminated and evaluated in similar ways as some forms of conventional scholarship, although an understanding of this work is less well-developed and less well-understood by some within the academic community. The process of recognition and evaluation should emphasize the specific and unique aspects of work. Each type of work and each individual work exhibit specific intent, content, methodology, and product. Individual or group decisions during performance evaluation about these four elements should be based upon the ways that creativity, inquiry, and investigation were used to produce work in various artistic, scholarly, pedagogical, or other specializations within the field of film and digital media.

Recommendation #10: Completed creative work by faculty in film and video consists of products of research whose forms have a greater variety in length than is found in printed

materials. The length of a finished work is significant but not indicative of the effort required to complete it.

Recommendation #11: It should be recognized and appreciated that in performance evaluation it is extremely important to know what role a faculty member played on a particular production. In many cases, the faculty member had total responsibility for the production. In other cases, his/her role might have been that of writer, editor, cinematographer, art director, sound designer, 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.

Recommendation #12: All artists, scholars and designers in the field of film and digital media know that mere technical fluency is not sufficient for true quality. However, it is recommended that the performance evaluation include the formation of a list of characteristics that define individual achievement and general notions of technical quality associated with high-level individual work in the artistic domain---prioritizing and allowing for the recognition of fundamental knowledge and skills, and conceptual frameworks associated with disciplines and specializations relating to the field of film and digital media. A list forms the partial basis for describing attributes, capabilities, capacities, and the nature of work that are present when knowledge and skills are being applied in an advanced and sophisticated way, such as the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media. The specifics associated with each characteristic vary among disciplines and specializations within the field. The 22-point list of production criteria by Tomasulo (2009) and the series of policy

statements by NASAD (undated) could be a starting point for determining an overview of the steps of work in the process of producing work in film and digital media.

Borrowing from portions of Tomasulo's (2008) 22-point list of measurable (quantifiable) outcomes for recognizing and evaluating the technical and creative aspects of student work in film and digital media, and using the four aspects/four phases model set forth in Chapter 4, the following criteria can be recommended (depending on the job performed by the faculty member on a particular project) in the following categories for performance evaluation:

Screenwriting

- Originality of premise
- Clarity of narrative
- Character development
- Dialogue
- Storytelling technique
- Shot design
- Acting performances

Production

- Cinematography
 - Shot composition
 - Lighting
 - Focus
 - Camera movement and support
- Production design
 - Wardrobe, hair and makeup
 - Set design

Audio

- Dialogue recording
- Production recording

Post Production

- Editing
 - Pacing
 - Editing for geography and space
 - Conveying information
- Special effects
- Sound design
 - Music
 - Sound mix (dialogue, music, sound effects)

A point-allocation scheme could be developed for adding and deducting points based on the

breadth and specificity of what is evidenced in the faculty's work. Score A could be an additive list that measures the difficulty, from relatively easy to astonishing---giving point value to a particular shot, its set decoration, the lighting of a scene or the compositing of a sequence; while score B could be a tally of mistakes or other problems---such as a focus problem, shaky camera, boom microphone in the shot, etc. What if the faculty member whose work is being evaluated has done several jobs on a particular project---directing, writing, producing, cinematography, editing, audio recording, etc.?---then a separate sheet for each job title should be done by each judge. The subjectivity that emerges when we try to develop an objective model or implement meritocracy in performance evaluation is obvious, and not highly recommended. An alternative approach would be to emulate the model used for a beauty pageant, but I believe that this option has been fully discounted in Chapter 4. The questions that have challenged and shown the conceptual weaknesses behind large-scale assessment systems should not be overlooked or easily dismissed. Systems that would replace substance with a false kind of objective, numeric evaluation are not a viable solution in the context of work in film and digital media because they would replace doing with counting.

As artists and designers in the field of film and digital media grow in sophistication, technique becomes more complex. Methods of intellectual pursuit, including analysis and interpretation are combined with the various techniques, artistic mediums, and methods of production, blended with them, integrated and synthesized at ever increasing levels of sophistication. Methods and techniques combine and integrate to become units, patterns, and entireties so that one acquires the ability easily to combine techniques, concepts, and process in a virtually infinite number of variations of art and design work. Often, those techniques become building blocks of still larger patterns, so that an artistic structure and an aesthetic architecture

emerge. Physical and intellectual skills gradually work in larger and larger conceptual and creative units. This reflects the same set of principles surrounding parts and wholes (Wait, M. and Hope, S., 2009).

Recommendation #13: 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.

Recommendations pertaining to scriptwriting in the field of film and digital media

Recommendation #14: 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.

Recommendation #15: 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.

Recommendation #16: The timeline of a commercial production is seldom aligned with the schedule expectations of faculty work in the academic world. Sometimes scripts are 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.

Recommendation #17: Far more important than the *number* of scripts written by a faculty member, emphasis for recognition should be placed upon the challenges of the project as posed by its writer, 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.

Recommendations for recognizing and evaluating the dissemination of work

Recommendation #18: Public showings of a film or video work to informed audiences should be considered dissemination of the work, equivalent to that of scholarly publication.

Recommendation #19: 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. 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.

Recommendation #20: Selection for screening by an academic associations based on a preconvention evaluation can be considered an indicator of quality, provided the current reputation and procedures of the association are known.

Recommendation #21: It should be recognized that museums, media arts centers, film festivals, association conference and universities schedule public presentations. The prestige of such invitational showings varies, of course, depending upon the importance of the institution and the rigor of the selection process. 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.

Recommendation #22: When a faculty member's creative work is presented in a public venue or other venue or event, it is usual for the faculty member to orally (perhaps also in writing) introduce the work and to respond to any subsequent questions, comments, and criticisms. As highly educated and experienced professionals in the field, faculty members in film and digital media know how to make effective oral presentations that contextualize evaluations and assessments, and are aware of the things that they know and do. The recommendation is to learn effective ways to articulate and present this knowledge in convincing ways for those who don't know what we know and can't do what we do.

Improvement is always possible, but the fact that improvement is possible does not mean that we do not know what we are doing. All art and design professionals work their whole lives to improve their powers of self-assessment. In fact, if expert judgment were still trusted in our society and among policy-makers associated with higher education, there would be no need for

this paper. The problem is well-stated by Wait, M. and Hope, S., (2009):

It is not that we do not know how to describe our work, or how to make assessments and evaluations, but rather that we are probably 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. Our purpose is to help us all think more deeply about communication, with the goal of maintaining assessment on terms useful and productive for the art and design profession. This is becoming increasingly problematic in these difficult times for all of American higher education. Therefore, maintaining assessment on our terms requires an increased focus and effort by all those with an interest in the future of our profession (p. 2)

Recommendation #23: The merit of a film or video work may be indicated by its broadcast on television. 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.

Recommendation #24: It should be understood that multiple showings/screenings of the same film are not the equivalent of reprints of a scholarly work. 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. Recognition should be given to work that is shown in multiple locations, consider the reputation of the multiple venue(s) in which the work is being screened.

Recommendation #25: 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.

Recommendation #26: The evaluation process should recognize all meaningful reviews of faculty creative work that appear in scholarly and professional publications, library media publications, and even, in some cases, newspapers. These constitute an important and serious form of peer review that should be recognized. 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.

Recommendation #27: It should be acknowledged and appreciated the possibility that appropriate means of dissemination and evaluation have not yet been devised for certain types of creative or artistic works. Multi-image pieces and some types of experimental work in film and digital media fall into this category. In such cases, it is necessary to rely on professional peer evaluations to establish the value and importance of faculty creative work.

Recommendation #28: Disseminated scripts must be 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 can include any of 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.
- 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.

Recommendations for peer review

Recommendation #29: Faculty serving on review committees should focus on the quality of the product(s), and not whether or not the activity should be considered as scholarly. Committees should not be considering a need to categorize faculty activities. The system and criteria for performance evaluation at the departmental, college and university levels should be fair, clearly articulated, written, easy to understand, consistent (yet unique and specific) across the disciplines, openly available for review by all concerned parties, and recognizing of *difference*;

and no one particular field, discipline or group of disciplines, or particular group of faculty members or administrators, should determine or dictate what scholarship should be for another disciplinary field or group.

Recommendation #30: Peer evaluation of film or video work should be focused upon determining the probable difficulty of a faculty member's particular project that is under review.

Recommendation #31: 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.

Recommendations for the post evaluation period

Recommendation #32: Bad news from an unsuccessful performance evaluation should be delivered with compassion, honesty, and always considering the feelings of the message's recipient.

Recommendation #33: Colleagues should be encouraged to interact professionally with the unsuccessful candidate after the denial of tenure, to preclude the possibility that a faculty member would be socially isolated with a sense of failure in a time of need.

Recommendation #34: The institution that has denied a candidate's tenure or a promotion should openly encourage and provide constructive, productive, and available mechanisms that directly and significantly help the individual to move on with his or her career.

Part 4: Concluding Thoughts

In closing, I do not believe that there is a single formula, approach, package, or template that will satisfy the need for fairly and fully recognizing and evaluating faculty work in the field of film and digital media in every instance. All the data show clearly why a total reliance on quantifiable data, sometimes mischaracterized as assessment, is not consistent with the nature of evaluation in the arts, including work in the field of film and digital media. I cannot suggest just one way of doing a performance evaluation process that is better than all the other ways. A “best practice” should cover the range of recommendations presented herein, rather than focusing on a specific formula or approach.

There are conventional, highly developed evaluation systems in academic settings which function at all sorts of levels. These have intended to be consistent with the nature and expectations of faculty work and its many specializations. The proponents of conventional practice may not reflect an understanding of what is done in the field of film and digital media, or see validity in it because it is not consistent with science, social science, or humanities based views of how knowledge and skills are organized and taught, or how they are evaluated. But no one can say that those of us at the borders, we in the field of film and digital media, working within the general domain of art and design, do not have systems and approaches that work in terms of defining who we are as professionals, the broadness of scope in what we do, and the aesthetic/creative, technical, business, and legal nature of our field. Our unique and specific process of work and the nature of outcomes from our work prove the validity of our approach, and this combined whole should be the basis of an evaluation.

In performance evaluation of all faculty work, not limited to work in the field of film and digital media, it is necessary to consider complete wholes that may contain many parts or

elements. These parts may be evaluated separately, but the most critical thing is how the parts work together to produce a composite result. While it is important to have fully functioning parts, this does not mean that functioning parts will automatically create a functioning whole, much less an outstanding result. The composite result should be judged in terms of its unique and specific characteristics, and not overlook the importance of the work's intent. Intent is to be determined and articulated by the faculty member who developed and produced the work. Intent can be expressed in specific terms, and the approach of a particular work can be done in any one of many successful ways. The artistic aspects of work in film and digital media have an infinite number of possibilities, and the faculty artist makes particular choices among them. The nature of successful evaluation in artistic matters depends on understanding the relationships between the goals, conceptualizations, processes, and products of the creator in great depth, and then being able to evaluate the creator's success at developing connections between the goal, processes, and eventual product. Since there is an infinite number of goals, many of which may evolve as one creates, and since decisions about them are made by individuals, an effective performance evaluation requires deep knowledge and sophistication. It is for all these reasons that the artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media rely primarily on individual evaluation rather than standardized assessment.

If the two polar extremes of the continuum proposed by Braxton, Luckey and Helland (2007) were to be broadened to allow the inclusion of alternative forms of artistic, scholarly and professional work, an increasingly vast landscape would open in the middle of the continuum, enabling a synthesis of approaches, a meeting of the traditional/conventional with the creative/alternative/innovative to occur. Artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media can be located in the middle of the continuum, rather than

being placed on the extreme polar opposite from conventional research output---although until now such work is not recognized on its merits and its faculty practitioners are marginalized in conventional workplaces. A question for further study would be to demonstrate how the breadth and variety of art works and performances, including musical compositions, creative writings, paintings and others works of art can also be located firmly on the continuum.

Each institution, meaning its administrators and its faculty, are tasked to collectively answer for themselves the three following questions in the context of performance evaluation:

- Which characteristics or attributes will be evaluated?
- How will data be collected during evaluation?
- Who will do the evaluation?

If these questions are answered with clarity and honesty; considering *difference* among the disciplines, the *unique and specific attributes* of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, and is respectful and honest towards all concerned parties and interests, then the research problem and research question raised herein have been resolved.

Borrowing from an indigenous perspective it is clear that an important, fundamental and underlying notion that guides my inquiry and advocacy about change in the ways of recognizing and evaluating faculty work is the need for *respect*---a growing need for respect of the *self*---in the context of the individual person, in the context of community, and in the context of community as a plural entity of individuals. We need a growing and improved level of respect that honors excellence that is achieved in diverse ways, reaching beyond conventional notions of research and the limits of the status quo. In this light, common notions of hierarchical advancement and promotion, linear progress, the quest for more money and other value systems in our modern culture are only superficial indicators of group membership and group respect, a

means of rewarding competence, and acknowledgement that otherness is accepted by the insider group (Janis, 1982). Once the unmet need for a useful model emerges, underpinned by the value of true respect, including respectful acknowledgement of otherness, the research problem, the research question and its ramifications will disappear into history.

The notion of change and the patterns of resistance to change continue to affect the problem situation and are never far away from the research problem itself. The historical norm in organizations and institutions of higher learning is to prioritize equilibrium, yet this norm is also perceived to be constantly under threat by forces seeking to unbalance or disrupt the desired state of equilibrium. Despite the perception that equilibrium equates with stasis, the true nature of equilibrium is itself forever changing and is at odds with systemic nature of change (Buckley, 1968). Prioritizing the a state of equilibrium and stasis as necessary and ideal explicitly disallows change, and thus explains why institutions find it difficult to change.

Boyer (1990) and subsequent scholarly works have challenged faculty and administrators on a personal, professional and institutional level to rethink their scholarly identities and aspirations. A more broadly framed concept of research, where new forms of communication, creative expression and outreach are integrated and valued, must be implemented, specifically in the context of faculty promotion of rank, tenure review and in applications for faculty rewards at institutions of higher learning. Broadly-based and more coherent, relevant and pertinent consideration and evaluation of creative work and scholarly teaching by faculty in film and digital media fosters greater collaboration between faculty and administration, and more meaningful engagement of faculty with students and the community. Further, a new paradigm for consideration and evaluation of creative work will facilitate greater intrinsic motivation for creative work in the future in the context of teaching, leading to more possibilities for

interdisciplinary collaboration. Transparent and relevant criteria for evaluating and rewarding of creative work by faculty in film and digital media, and all other areas of fine arts, would encourage faculty to know that the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching in filmmaking and media production practice, including scholarly teaching, can be considered as a complex and interrelated activity with value. A more integrative and holistic approach by faculty will result in the production of more creative resources for students and the public, in the forms of publication, broadcast, other public exhibition or performance, intra-organizational communication, or other conventional and non-conventional forms of scholarly outreach.

Institutions worldwide, with some notable exceptions, are applying outdated and relatively irrelevant criterion, thwarting most possibilities for fair and proper consideration or successful advancement of faculty who are engaged in creative work output as a necessary and logical form of expression. Irrelevant criterion that relate to work(s) in film, digital media and other forms of Fine Arts practice have led administrators to unrealistic expectations and an underestimation of faculty's creative work, a lose-lose situation for all concerned parties. There is confusion on all sides, resulting in creative faculty being hamstrung by an inconsistent application of rights and standing in the university and college setting, and a perceived disparity of opportunity amongst peers. Such disparity exacerbates the possible perception of non-advancement in career growth and provokes greater de-motivation toward research by highly motivated faculty members that would otherwise aspire to and qualify for promotion under more reasonable circumstances. Change is necessary at this time.