College of Arts and Sciences Reappointment Dossier Guidelines for Probationary Faculty and Continuing Lecturers

Tenure-Track, Probationary Faculty

Untenured faculty are reappointed annually for the seven years of their probationary period. The tenure case will typically be submitted during the sixth year, roughly six months after the last reappointment has been finalized. The appointment for the first year is made at the time of the initial hire into the tenure-track appointment. The timetable for reappointments for the subsequent six years (the second through the seventh probationary years) is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year at IPFW</th>
<th>Reappointment for</th>
<th>Chair receives request</th>
<th>Faculty officially notified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2(^{nd}) year</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3(^{rd}) year</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4(^{th}) year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>5(^{th}) year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6(^{th}) year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7(^{th}) year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Third year review is part of the reappointment process for tenure-track faculty*

The purpose of this college-wide format for reappointment materials is to establish a continuing record of the untenured faculty member’s accomplishments in a clear and unambiguous manner, consistent with the format that will ultimately be needed for the promotion case, although more briefly. It will permit the Chair and the Dean, and the department committee (when one is part of the process) to clearly examine the untenured faculty member’s progression toward tenure and promotion with each successive reappointment.

For each reappointment, the information submitted should build on that submitted for the previous years. Thus, at the second reappointment, the information should include that submitted for the previous reappointment, plus new accomplishments in all three areas of endeavor. At the third reappointment, the information should include that submitted for the previous two reappointments, plus new accomplishments, and so on for each new reappointment. Therefore, it is important that probationary faculty members save the previous reappointment dossier to use as a basis to add the new information for each reappointment.

The general format used will be that of OAA-99-1, the Promotion and Tenure Dossier Format Guidelines (you can find it at: [http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/2016-faculty-support-resources/faculty/pandtandreappointment/promotion-tenure-reappointment.html](http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/2016-faculty-support-resources/faculty/pandtandreappointment/promotion-tenure-reappointment.html)). Should the Office of Academic Affairs modify or replace OAA 99-1, the new format should be used at the time it comes into effect.
On Page 3 of OAA 99-1 the following sections of a promotion and tenure dossier are outlined:

SECTION IV: The Promotion and/or Tenure Dossier. The promotion and/or tenure dossier presents the primary quantitative and qualitative documentation supporting the candidacy. The dossier contains five major parts:

A. General Information  
B. Teaching  
C. Research and Creative Endeavor  
D. Service  
E. Curriculum vitae

To provide information in support of reappointment, use the guidelines and sections for the Teaching (B), Research or Creative Endeavor (C), and Service (D) sections. You should also include an updated CV (E). For reappointment purposes, you can ignore section A.

The information provided in support of reappointment, although using this format, is expected to be brief, not more than two to three pages per year. In a P&T case, there is often detailed commentary and extensive documentation provided in some subsections. That is not expected for reappointment. Each section in OAA 99-1 has a final subsection for peer commentary. At tenure time, that will consist of comments from internal and external reviews. Again, that is not expected for reappointment (an internal teaching reviewer’s comments may be included with reappointment materials if desired, but it is not necessary). At a minimum, the reappointment information should include a list of courses taught and a summary table of quantitative student evaluations (with norms, if available), a brief narrative reflection about teaching, information about some other measures of teaching effectiveness (see the list in OAA 99-1), publications and presentations completed during the probationary period, information about ongoing research and work under review, grants submitted and received, and some information about university, community, and professional service. In all cases (teaching, research, and service), for the purpose of providing information to support reappointment, only use the categories in OAA 99-1 that are relevant to you.

You should build on this document with each successive reappointment, such that it becomes cumulative over time. Therefore, it would be a reasonable expectation that information provided for the first reappointment would be the briefest, with each year’s document becoming a bit longer. On the other hand, it is also important that it be very clear to the chair and dean, and members of any relevant department committee, what is new since the last reappointment (e.g., new courses, new publications, new service). You should highlight the new information in some way (e.g., boldface).

By the time of the third year review (reappointment number 4), perhaps before, in your reappointment dossier, you should indicate whether you are planning to submit a tenure case based on excellence in teaching or research. In general, the tradition in the College of Arts and Sciences has been for most cases to be based on excellence in research or scholarship, but there have been some very solid and well regarded teaching excellence cases, and this option is fully recognized by the college and the university as one appropriate route to tenure and promotion.
By the time of the third year review, faculty planning to pursue either option should have been establishing a record of significant accomplishments to support their choice. Stating that one has been considering a teaching or research excellence case at the fourth reappointment does not necessarily commit one to this avenue at promotion and tenure time. However, one should understand that as one progresses, it is likely to become increasingly difficult to establish excellence along the alternate route.

On the Office of Academic Affairs website (http://www.ipfw.edu/offices/oaa/2016-faculty-support-resources/faculty/pandtandreappointment/promotion-tenure-reappointment.html) there are three memoranda (one on teaching, one on research, and one on service) provided to assist faculty with documenting different categories of supporting materials for teaching, research, and service. You may find them helpful as you prepare the reappointment documents, and eventually, when you prepare your promotion and tenure case.

Finally, if your department requires more detailed information, say in a third year review, the more detailed information may also be provided to the college office in support of that year’s reappointment.
Continuing Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year at IPFW</th>
<th>Reappointment for</th>
<th>Chair receives request</th>
<th>Faculty officially notified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd years</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6th year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7th year</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing lecturers are reappointed annually. The first reappointment is for the second and third years of the position as a continuing lecturer; subsequent reappointments are for a year at a time. These reappointments are initiated in the departments in February and apply to the academic year that begins approximately 18 months later. The first five reappointments are outlined above; subsequent reappointments follow the same timetable.

The college has established a practice of reappointing continuing lecturers using the college reappointment dossier for the first five years of their service as continuing lecturers. Continuing lecturers should only use the categories in OAA 99-1 that are relevant to them. For these early reappointments, the college expects a detailed reappointment dossier, with a cumulative record of teaching, research, and service for their time in the position. Both the chair and the dean will provide a detailed review for these reappointments. Once the continuing lecturer has been reappointed five times, at the sixth reappointment and beyond COAS continuing lecturers will switch to a brief reappointment process, unless the department chair or the dean requests a detailed reappointment. For the brief process, the continuing lecturer will submit a CV to accompany the reappointment, and the chair and dean will write a brief reappointment recommendation indicating that performance continues to be satisfactory. If the chair or dean believes that a more extensive process is necessary for a particular continuing lecturer, they may implement it.
College of Arts and Sciences  
Reappointment Dossier – Tenure-Track Faculty

Name: ___________________________________________ Date: __________________

Department: ______________________________________________________________

Date of initial hire in tenure-track position: ________________________________

Tenure decision date (Spring of the penultimate year; see the reappointment form provided to your chair): ____________________

Reappointment Number (see table above): ________________________________

Area of Excellence: [ ] Research; [ ] Teaching (check one at 4th and subsequent reappointments)

By reappointment Number 4, at the third-year review, you should indicate whether you are planning to submit a case for promotion based on excellence in research or teaching. This does not necessarily commit you to this choice at tenure time, but faculty should be seriously considering one direction or the other by the third-year review, and should be building a record of support for a case in that area.

Using the categories in OAA 99-1, provide information about teaching, including a table of student evaluations and norms (if available), research or creative endeavor, and service. A sample set of materials for the third reappointment (the Spring semester of the second year) follows.

Note also that your department chair should provide the previous reappointment form with all sections completed (the chair’s, dean’s, VCAA’s, and chancellor’s) to accompany the current year’s materials (e.g., at the third reappointment, the completed second reappointment form should be attached).
College of Arts and Sciences
Reappointment Dossier – Continuing Lecturers

Name: ______________________________________ Date: _______________________

Department: ___________________________________________________

Date of initial hire as a continuing lecturer: _______________________

For the first five years in the position the process below should be followed, providing a cumulative record for the first five years. Using the categories in OAA 99-1 that are relevant to you, provide information about teaching, including a table of student evaluations and norms (if available), service, and if applicable, pedagogical or other scholarship. If continuing lecturers are undergoing the brief review process used by the college for long-time continuing lecturers as recommended by their chair, they need only submit a cv to accompany the reappointment recommendation. Continuing lecturers are reappointed based on their teaching and service records, although some are engaged in scholarship.

A sample set of materials for the third reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member follows, which can be modified for the continuing lecturer.

Note also that your department chair should provide the previous reappointment form with all sections completed (the chair’s, dean’s, VCAA’s, and chancellor’s) to accompany the current year’s materials. This applies to brief as well as detailed reappointments.
Name: Terry Smith-Jones Date: February, 2014

Department: Media Studies

Date of initial hire in tenure-track position: August, 2012

Tenure decision date (Spring of last probationary year; see the reappointment form provided to your chair): Spring, 2018

Reappointment Number (see table above): 3

Area of Excellence: ☐ Research; ☐ Teaching (check one at 4th and subsequent reappointments)

B. TEACHING (new material for this reappointment is in bold type).

1. Credit Courses Taught

   Guidance: List all credit courses taught at IPFW, starting with the most recent academic session. Include any special sections such as Honors or independent research credits, even if they do not count towards your teaching load. List those courses taught since the last submission of this dossier in bold. Indicate whether enrollment figures represent the initial enrollment in the course or the end-of-semester enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Session</th>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Contact Hours</th>
<th>Enrollment*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>MDST 101</td>
<td>Intro to Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 (online)</td>
<td>MDST 101</td>
<td>Intro to Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td>MDST 250</td>
<td>Intermediate Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>MDST 101</td>
<td>Intro to Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>MDST 101</td>
<td>Intro to Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>MDST 250</td>
<td>Intermediate Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>MDST 101</td>
<td>Intro to Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>MDST 101</td>
<td>Intro to Media Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Other Courses Taught
Guidance: Many individuals will have nothing in this section, but consider if there are courses you teach where credit hours are not assigned, such as continuing education. List courses starting with the most recent academic session. List those courses taught since the last submission of this dossier in bold. Indicate whether enrollment figures represent the initial enrollment in the course or the end-of-semester enrollment. Courses appear in a table, as in IV.B.1.

3. Student Evaluations of Credit Courses
The standard evaluation form used by the Media Studies Department asks students to rate the instructor and the course on fifteen items on a 5-point scale (5 = excellent, 4 = above average, 3 = average, 2 = below average, 1= poor). I have selected five of the items to include here. The department means for each item across all courses and all instructors since Fall 2005 are also presented.

Q1 The instructor’s knowledge of the subject matter
Q2 The instructor’s ability to present the material in an organized fashion
Q3 The instructor’s clarity
Q4 The instructor overall
Q5 The course overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Media Studies (MDST 101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 (48/55)*</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 (21/25; online)</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013 (55/60)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013 (58/63)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 (52/60)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 (59/63)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Media Studies (MDST 250)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2013 (35/40)</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013 (33/37)</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Media Studies (MDST 400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012 (15/18)</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*number completing forms/number enrolled)

3.b. OAA 99-1 notes that it is helpful to readers if the candidate includes some information about how he or she responded to student feedback and comments to modify and improve his or her teaching; this kind of analysis is encouraged in this section of the dossier.
The course I have taught most frequently is MDST 101. In the first semester I was here, students’ comments indicated that they found some of my presentations lacking in clarity and organization, and my student evaluations for those items were somewhat lower than department means. I took extra efforts to develop PowerPoint slides to enhance my organization of the material, and decided to make regular checks with the students as to whether they understood the points I was making in lecture. In my second semester, I asked one of my class visitors, Professor Monroe, to give me some advice about increasing clarity of presentations, and I attended one workshop and one consultation with CELT in order to improve these skills. My student comments and evaluations have demonstrated improvement.

In my upper division class, MDST 400, students are responsible for leading and participating in regular class discussion. I am currently undertaking a study of ways to improve student preparation for these discussions, and their ability to take part in discussing readings meaningfully, so that ultimately these class experiences enhance student learning for everyone. I examined some pedagogical research in order to determine how to design discussions to increase and improve the quality of participation. For example, in the August 2008 issue of the Teaching Professor, to which my department subscribes and keeps in the department, there is an example of using prepared essays both before and after the discussion, and “traffic light signals” by which each student signals his or her willingness to participate, but through which they also earn points. I have implemented this procedure this semester, and will measure its effectiveness in two ways: (1) indirectly, through student feedback on open-ended comments at the end of the semester, and (2) directly, by comparing the scores on essay exam questions on the midterm and the final which reflect students’ knowledge of the material in the readings that are discussed in class with scores from previous semesters.

4. Peer Comments on Credit and Noncredit Teaching

The following faculty members have visited my classes:

Ellen Davis, Department Chair, Media Studies, MDST 100, Fall 2012 and Fall 2013 (observed the online section); MDST 400, Spring 2013.

George Nesbitt, Professor, Media Studies, member of mentoring committee: MDST 100, Fall 2012 and Spring 2013; MDST 250, Fall 2013.

Alice Munroe, Associate Professor, Media Studies, member of mentoring committee: MDST 100, Spring 2013 and Fall 2013; MDST 250, Fall 2012.

Harvey Cox, Professor, Department of Medieval Studies, teaching mentor: MDST 100, Fall 2012 and Fall 2013; MDST 400, Spring 2013.

Reports from Professors Nesbitt and Cox were attached in previous reappointments (numbers 1 and 2, respectively). A report from Professor Munroe is attached to the current reappointment materials.
5. Contributions to Course and Curriculum Development

In Fall, 2013, I taught Introduction to Media Studies (MDST 101) online; this was the first time this course was taught online.

In Spring 2013, I developed and taught Advanced Media Studies (MDST 400) which is a new course for the department, and a needed addition to the curriculum for our majors.

6. Publications and Productions Related to Teaching


8. Student Research Direction

I supervised an honors thesis for senior major, Amanda Kendall. She presented her work at the Spring 2013 IPFW Undergraduate Research symposium and was awarded second prize by the IPFW Chapter of Sigma Xi. Amanda will also present her work at the upcoming meeting of the Midwestern Association for Media Studies in May, 2014.

9. Grants for Teaching Improvement

DECCO grant ($4250) to develop Introduction to Media Studies (MDST 101) as an online course, funded Spring, 2013. Course taught online in Fall 2013.

11. Institutes, Workshops, Conferences, Expositions, and Other Programs Attended

Regional Association for Media Studies Pedagogy, January 15-17, 2014
CELT, 11/15/2013 Tips for Making Lectures More Active
CELT, 8/21/2013: Fall Teaching Conference
CELT, 3/21/10: Using PowerPoint effectively
CELT, 2/15/10: individual consultation on increasing clarity in classroom presentations
CELT, 1/30/10: Working with Digital Images for the Classroom and the Web
CELT, 8/20/2012: Fall Teaching Conference

C. RESEARCH

1. Publications (publications prior to my appointment at IPFW are listed on my cv.)

b. Book Chapters

c. Articles


2. Unpublished Work Related to Research and Creative Endeavor

a. Lecture or Paper Presented at a Professional Meeting


Kendall, A. N., & Smith Jones, T. G. (2014, upcoming). *Clothing and behavior of women musicians and singers in music videos: A content analysis*. Paper to be presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Society for Media Studies, Detroit, March. (This is Amanda Kendall’s honors thesis referred to in B. 8., above.)


3. Research and Creative Endeavor in Progress

Smith-Jones, T. G. (under editorial review). A review of depictions of prosocial behavior in television programs for children across the world: Where do you find more and why? Under review at *Children’s Media: An International Journal*. This is the second review of this paper after an invitation to revise and resubmit by the journal’s editors.

Carlton, O. T, Halverson, C. N., & Smith-Jones, T. G. (manuscript in preparation). Methods of studying the impact of media exposure in childhood: Strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations. (This work is in collaboration with my doctoral advisor, Orrin Carlton, and one of his current doctoral students, Carrie Halverson. It is a major review of research methods used to study childhood media exposure, and will be submitted to the major journal in our field which publishes methodological reviews, *The Bulletin of Media Studies Methods*).

Smith-Jones, T. G. (work in progress). I am currently engaged in three active studies, all part of my program of research on the impact of the media on children, with a special focus on the impact of media depictions of prosocial behavior:

a. A study of historical changes in depictions of prosocial behavior in children’s
cartoons from the 1980s to the present. **Data collection for this project is complete. I recently had a paper accepted for upcoming presentation on this project, and I expect to submit a manuscript to a refereed journal late this summer or early next fall.**

b. An examination of the ways in which children are impacted by depictions of prosocial behavior in programming for adults versus in programming for children. Data collection is ongoing for this project, for which I received an IPFW Summer Grant in summer 2013. I anticipate that data collection will be complete at the end of Spring, 2014, and I will submit the work to a conference and a refereed journal after that time.

c. In collaboration with my senior departmental colleague, Dr. Munroe, who is interested in violence in the media, I am planning to examine the differences between depictions of violence and prosocial behavior in the media both across time, and internationally. We hope also to examine television versus video games. This project is in very early stages, although we just completed a review chapter for a book edited by Dr. Munroe.

4. Grant Acquisition and Current Grant Proposals

   **Smith-Jones, T. G. The impact of prosocial behavior in children’s video games: An intervention study. Purdue Research Foundation Summer Grant, to be funded, summer 2014.**

   **Smith-Jones, T. G. Depictions of prosocial behavior in television programming aimed at children versus that aimed at adult viewers. Similarities and differences. IPFW Summer Grant, funded summer 2013.**

D. SERVICE

1. University Service

   b. College of Arts and Sciences
      Student Affairs Committee, 2013 – 2012

   c. Department of Media Studies
      Graduate Admissions Committee, 2013-2014
      Curriculum Committee, 2012-2013

2. Professional Service

   Ad hoc reviewer for the following journals:
   *The Bulletin of Media Studies Methods (January, 2014)*
   *Significant Media Studies Journal* (July, 2013)
4. Community Service


Interviewed for article on how families use the media, *Greater Fort Wayne Family Magazine*, May, 2013.