Department of Communication—APT Guidebook, 2016-2017

Timeline	
April 15	Notification to Department Chair/APT Chair of intention to pursue promotion in the following academic year. (Note: notification is not required if review for promotion is mandatory.)
May 1	Submission to APT Chair of at least three names of external evaluators and, if necessary, a list of individuals who may not be expected to provide an objective review, with reasons. APT Committee meets to decide on external evaluators and assign a subcommittee to each case.
May 15	Submission to APT Chair of a signed/dated *CV*, signed/dated **personal statement**, and a complete collection of **all published research**. (Note: candidates may identify particular examples of research they wish to be highlighted for external reviewers.)
Late May-Early June	Review requests are sent to the external evaluators.
Late August-Early September	External evaluations are received. APT Committee prepares **summary statement** and **reputation of publication outlets** documents.
September 15	All elements of the dossier are due. **From the candidate**: teaching portfolio, mentorship/advising statement, *CV* addendum. **From APT**: summary statement, reputation of publication outlets, peer evaluations of teaching. **Candidate must present signed/dated candidate verification form**.
Early October	APT subcommittee prepares evaluative report; APT committee convenes decision meeting and votes on content of evaluative report/case.
Mid-October	The chair offers her/his judgment of the case; provides notification to candidate of both APT committee and chair's decision.
First Week in November	Dossiers due to ARHU.

Elements of the Dossier—Candidate

1. *Curriculum Vitae*—due May 15.

    The *CV* should follow the format as dictated by the Office of Faculty Affairs (see Appendix A—*CV* Template). It must be signed and dated by the candidate. Anything added to the *CV* following its May 15 submission is included on the *CV* addendum.

2. **Personal Statement**—due May 15.

    The personal statement is no more than **five pages in length** and presents the candidate's record directed toward non- specialists in the candidate's discipline (see Appendix B—sample personal statement).

3. **Teaching Portfolio**—due September 15.

    Teaching portfolios vary is composition and thoroughness; they usually include other documents that are stand-alone documents in the dossier (i.e., student evaluation data; peer evaluations, etc.). See http://tltc.umd.edu/portfolios for advice on teaching portfolio preparation.

    3a. *Teaching Statement*: This may be provided as a separate document in the dossier, or included as part of the teaching portfolio.

    3b. *Student Evaluation Data*: The dossier should not include "raw" student evaluation data. Instead, the candidate must provide a complete set of student teaching evaluation data using the template provided (https://www.faculty.umd.edu/policies/apt_forms.html). See Appendix C—student teaching evaluation template.

    3c. *Mentoring, Advising, & Research Supervision Statement*.

Elements of the Dossier—APT Committee

1. **Reputation of Publication Outlets**. See Appendix D; the candidate may provide information and relevant data for this document. Also, candidates should establish their Google Scholar profile; the APT Committee may use this data for both citation counts and h-index ratings.

2. **Summary Statement of Professional Achievements**. A purely factual rendering of the candidate's record; the candidate must sign as accepted the summary statement (or the candidate verification document) two weeks prior to the APT decision meeting; the candidate has the right to submit a rejoinder to the summary statement.

3. **Peer Evaluations of Teaching**.

Notes about Dossier Items:

1. The candidate sees and approves virtually all documents included in their dossier—the candidate verification document must be signed and dated at least two weeks prior to the APT decision meeting. See Appendix E—candidate verification document.

2. The entire APT process is confidential. The confidentiality of the process is especially important with reference to the external evaluators. Candidates should have no contact with external evaluators or potential external evaluators about the APT process.

3. Candidate notifications come from the chair and the dean at the first and second stages of the process; final notification comes from the president.

Appendix A: CV Template

<u>**Curriculum Vitae**</u>

Notarization. I have read the following and certify that this *curriculum vitae* is a current and accurate statement of my professional record.

Signature	Date

In general, do not list a work or activity more than once.

I.   **Personal Information**
I.A.   <u>UID, Last Name, First Name, Middle Name, Contact Information</u>
            Include mailing address, email, URL

I.B.   <u>Academic Appointments at UMD</u>
            Include specific dates

I.C.   <u>Administrative Appointments at UMD</u>
            Include specific dates

I.D.   <u>Other Employment</u>
            Include specific dates

I.E.   <u>Educational Background</u>
            Include dates, degrees, and institutions

I.F.   <u>Continuing Education</u>
            Include Sponsor/organization; title; location; date(s); type (forum, pre-conference, workshop, other)

I.G.   <u>Professional Certifications, Licenses, and Memberships</u>

II.   **Research, Scholarly, Creative and/or Professional Activities**
II.A.   <u>Books *(Include full citation information and ISBN)*</u>
II.A.1.   Books Authored *(specify original or revised edition)*
II.A.2.   Books Edited
II.A.3.   Books Translated *(as translator)*
II.A.4.   Major Reference Works
II.A.5.   Exhibition Catalogs
II.A.6.   Other

<u>II.B.</u>   <u>Chapters</u>
II.B.1.   Books
II.B.2.   Collections
II.B.3.   Encyclopedia
II.B.4.   Series
II.B.5.   Research Paper
II.B.6.   Other

II.H.2.	Datasets
II.H.3.	Constructed Projects
II.H.4.	Demonstrations
II.H.5.	Inventions
II.H.6.	Original Plans and Designs
II.H.7.	Photography
II.H.8.	Software and Applications
II.H.9.	Websites
II.H.10.	Exhibitions and Installations
II.H.11.	Curatorial Practice
II.H.12.	Performance or Interpretation – Performing Arts
II.H.13.	Direction – Performing Arts
II.H.14.	Production – Performing Arts
II.H.15.	Costume, Stage, Multimedia, and Theatrical Design
II.H.16.	Artistic and Graphic Design
II.H.17.	Dramaturgy
II.H.18.	Artwork
II.H.19.	Choreography
II.H.20.	Playwriting, Screenwriting, and Musical Composition
II.H.21.	Works of Creative Writing
II.H.22.	Performance or Interpretation – Film, Video, and Multimedia
II.H.23.	Direction – Film, Video, and Multimedia
II.H.24.	Production – Film, Video, and Multimedia
II.H.25.	Citations and Reviews
II.H.26.	Other

II.I.   Significant Works in Public Media
          Specify the following: Title, Publication/Media Name, Contributors, Types (print, online, broadcast, video, documentary)

II.I.1.	Explanatory, Investigative, or Long-Form Journalism
II.I.2.	Other Significant Journalism
II.I.3.	Commentary / Analysis
II.I.4.	Interactive Online Database
II.I.5.	Radio Series
II.I.6.	TV / Radio Broadcast
II.I.7.	Ongoing Articles / Columns in Newspapers
II.I.8.	Ongoing Articles / Columns in Magazines
II.I.9.	Ongoing Articles / Columns in Newsletters
II.I.10.	Other

II.J.   Sponsored Research and Programs – Administered by the Office of Research Administration (ORA)
          List source, title, amount awarded, time period and role (i.e., principal investigator or co-investigator) in reverse chronological order or its inverse. If there are co-investigators, please list them.

II.J.1.	Grants
II.J.2.	Contracts
II.J.3.	Other

II.K.   Gifts, and Funded Research not administered by ORA

II.K.1.	Gifts *(solicited and in-kind funds)*
II.K.2.	Community Capacity Building *(assistance provided resulting in awards)*
II.K.3.	Volunteer Contributions
II.K.4.	Other

II.L.	Centers for Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
II.L.1.	Centers Established
II.L.2.	Centers Directed
II.L.3.	Symposia Organized *(though center)*
II.L.4.	Other

II.M.	Patents
II.M.1.	Device
II.M.2.	Other

II.N.	Entrepreneurial, Technology Transfer, and Public Engagement Activities

II.O.	Other Research / Scholarship / Creative Activities

II.P.	Research Fellowships, Prizes and Awards

III.	**Teaching, Extension, Mentoring, and Advising**
III.A.	Courses Taught
	Include courses taught in the last five years. Indicate approximate enrollments and any unusual formats.
III.B.	Teaching Innovations
III.B.1.	Major Programs Established
III.B.2.	Education Abroad Established
III.B.3.	Textbooks
III.B.4.	Software, Applications, Online Education, etc.
III.B.5.	Instructional Workshops and Seminars Established
III.B.6.	Course or Curriculum Development
III.B.7.	Teaching Modules
III.B.8.	Other

III.C.	Advising: Research or Clinical
	This refers to students whose projects the faculty has supervised as adviser, committee chair, or committee member (indicate role). The name of student, academic year(s) involved, and the name of institution if other than UMD should be indicated, as well as placement of the student(s), if the project is completed. List completed work first.
III.C.1.	Undergraduate
III.C.2.	Master's
III.C.3.	Doctoral
III.C.4.	Post-doctoral
III.C.5.	Other Directed Research *(e.g. K-12 Interactions)*

III.D.	Mentorship
III.D.1.	Junior Faculty
III.D.2.	Other

Research, Teaching, & Service

Damien Pfister
Department of Communication, University of Maryland

Research

My scholarship theorizes *networked rhetorics*, *visual culture*, and *public argument and deliberation* in the context of digital media technologies. As my work engages these different domains of rhetorical theory and practice, I strive to answer a series of questions: How do new media technologies like social software change rhetorical practice? How do nascent genres of communication, like blogging or memes, provide opportunities for citizens to influence public argument? How does "digitality" expand the communicative repertoire of citizens through visual means of persuasion? How do these new modes of communication play out in the networked public sphere, where citizens interact to constitute democratic public life? What will be the cultural impact of social software merging with ubiquitous computing technology?

These guiding research questions have led me to theorize how digital media technologies re-arrange traditional modes of human communication and deliberation. My research is featured at prestigious university presses, in leading journals, and in highly selective special issues of journals and edited books. In the process of developing my research agenda, I have collaborated with graduate students to socialize them into the research process and I have taken on editorial leadership roles.

Although these three subfields are intimately entangled in my work, I will highlight them separately.

Networked Rhetorics

My most significant scholarly achievement is the November 2014 publication of my book, *Networked Media, Networked Rhetorics: Attention and Deliberation in the Early Blogosphere*, in the Rhetoric and Democratic Deliberation series by The Pennsylvania State University Press. This is one of the most highly regarded book series in the transdisciplinary field of rhetorical studies. Based on my dissertation, but substantially revised and with new material comprising over half the book, *Networked Media, Networked Rhetorics* examines key episodes in the early blogosphere to theorize how new, digitally networked intermediaries influence public deliberation. A short passage from the first chapter succinctly articulates the thesis of the book:

> Rhetoric is a *technê*, a productive craft or art; it is also dynamic, changing with technological innovation and cultural needs. A new communication technology necessarily changes the nature of the *technê*, as entrepreneurial rhetoricians leverage the novel expressive possibilities afforded by a new medium of communication. Similarly, rhetoric's scope and function fluctuate with changing cultural conditions. In some cultures, it is conceived as primarily pertaining to producing oral and civic discourse; in others, it is considered a metahermeneutic for all symbol use. As rhetorical practices change, they create new communication problematics that, in turn, require a recasting of

old rhetorical theories and the generation of new rhetorical theories capable of explaining rhetoric's revisioned scope and function. With digital media technology, citizens are layering new genres of communication, like blogs and mash-ups, on top of more recognizable forms. These changing conditions of mediation merit the development of a 'new rhetoric' capable of guiding public advocacy and deliberation in contemporary times. *Networked media* spur *networked rhetorics* (p. 9).

I theorize networked rhetorics through three case studies of blogging episodes that shaped public deliberation. First, I spotlight bloggers' investigative and interpretive work in the wake of Trent Lott's quasi-segregationist toast to Strom Thurmond in December 2002. Second, I focus on Salam Pax, a pseudonymous Iraqi who blogged in English during the prelude to the 2003 Iraq War. This case explores how the *affective* registers of blogging sharply contrast with the purported emotional neutrality of the institutional press. Finally, I consider the rhetorical interventions of climate science bloggers at *RealClimate,* a science blog started in 2004 that provides rapid response to climate science stories in the traditional press. The book concludes by identifying six areas for future research in networked rhetorics: (1) theorizing the attention challenges that accompany information abundance, (2) documenting the range of rhetorical performances afforded by networked media, (3) accounting for the contexts of many-to-many communication, (4) refiguring the rhetorical canon to respond to digital technologies, (5) developing a more robust conception of cosmopolitan citizenship, and (6) focusing on rhetorics of control societies.

Since *Networked Media, Networked Rhetorics* focuses on the link between rhetorical action and public deliberation, I believe it will find a multidisciplinary audience beyond rhetorical studies as a rejoinder to the dominant Habermasian theory of the public sphere. Much scholarship on public deliberation (across Communication, English, Political Science, Sociology, Media Studies, and Journalism/Mass Communication) stems from Jürgen Habermas' work on the bourgeois public sphere. His justly celebrated work explores how 15th and 16th century bourgeois culture harnessed the then-new technology of print to produce novel modes of democratic engagement. Habermas has thus far declined to theorize an analogous role for internetworked media to play in contemporary democratic public cultures. In fact, in recent work, he specifically negates the democratic potential of the internet by arguing that internetworked communication simply creates information overload and political fragmentation. The three case studies in *Networked Media, Networked Rhetorics* respond in different ways to Habermas' pessimistic assessment of networked communication by identifying when citizens affected civic life through interaction in what scholars are beginning to call the "networked public sphere."

The utility of "networked rhetorics" as a conceptual rubric is demonstrated in three additional journal articles and one essay in the selected works of the Alta Argumentation Conference. A 2011 essay, featured as the lead article, in *Argumentation and Advocacy* is an abbreviated version of the Trent Lott case study in my book. Another 2011 essay, also featured as the lead article, in the international science and technology studies journal *Social Epistemology* examines how *Wikipedia* represents a model of expertise reliant on iterations of public argument rather than credentials. Although Twitter is often devalued as brief, meaningless communication, I theorize in a 2015 essay for *Environmental Communication* how Twitter's brevity can be appreciated by taking the avian metaphor embedded in the social networking site seriously. Finally, my 2015 contribution to the selected works of the Alta Argumentation Conference looks

at how the brevity of Twitter produces fodder for sentiment analysis that challenges the rational-critical basis of public deliberation. Given the positive response my work has received in peer-reviewed journals, invited special issues, and selected works, I am optimistic that the frame of "networked rhetorics" will instigate future scholarship at the intersection of rhetorical studies and digital media studies.

This optimism is founded in part by a project inspired by *Networked Media, Networked Rhetorics* that further probes the intersection of ancient rhetorical theory and digital communication networks. *Ancient Rhetorics + Digital Networks* is a co-edited volume, with Michele Kennerly (Communication Arts & Sciences, Pennsylvania State University), that asks scholars to consider how ancient rhetorics can help us understand communication in the context of digital media. This volume, with contributions from established interdisciplinary scholars, has received an advance contract with the University of Alabama Press in the Rhetoric, Culture, and Social Critique series. We delivered the manuscript for peer review in October 2015.

Visual Culture

Networked Media, Networked Rhetorics is primarily a study of "textual" rhetorics. In the decade since the genesis of the blogosphere, internetworked media became more image-centered. Since networked rhetorics are increasingly *visual* rhetorics, my scholarly agenda has evolved to weave in consideration of how digitality changes visual culture.

An innovative two-part essay in *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies* on the Occupy movement, co-authored with two graduate students, marks my primary contribution to the study of visual culture under the conditions of digital mediation. The first part of the essay reconstructs "rhetorical scenes" based on our fieldwork and participant observation of Occupy Lincoln in the Fall of 2011. The second part of the essay is a more traditional interpretive essay theorizing the import of what we call "networked public screens" in the context of Occupy. Blending work on the "networked public sphere" with scholarship on the "public screen," we argue that the ability of Occupiers to circulate their own images on a small scale through social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter helped draw attention to a panoply of issues like inequality and political representation.

Several other projects also participate in broader conversations about digitality and visuality. Most prominent among these is a co-authored article (with Carly S. Woods), "The Unnaturalistic Enthymeme: Figuration, Interpretation, and Critique after Photographic Naturalism," forthcoming in a special issue of *Argumentation and Advocacy* on "Twenty Years of Visual Argument." In this essay, we engage with Cara Finnegan's well-known work on the "naturalistic enthymeme," which theorizes how audiences of film photography in the early 20th century assumed that the images they were seeing were real and not manipulated in any way by the photographer. We argue that this way of seeing photographs as natural representations of reality has faded with the rise of digital photography. Ongoing projects on internet memes and Google Glass promise to make additional contributions to the theorization of visual culture and digital media.

Public Argument and Deliberation

I am committed to bringing conversations about technology into studies of public argument and deliberation, and have been invited to serve in an editorial capacity for two different projects that meet this goal. First, I was the guest editor for a special issue of *Argumentation and Advocacy* on "Public Argument/Digital Media." This special issue featured an introductory essay and four strong contributions on a range of topics from the 9/11 Memorial, the use of YouTube in Presidential elections, argumentation on discussion boards, and the use of blogs in state-level politics. Second, I edited a Symposium on "Deliberation Technology" for *The Journal of Public Deliberation* that took up the question of how digital technologies could be used to sustain informal and formal networks of deliberation. In the wake of the Arab Spring, this Symposium on Deliberation Technology brought together scholars from the United States, Spain, Palestine, and Australia to consider the prospects for technology and deliberation in a transnational context.

Because the internet is a global medium, much of my work has and will continue to have a transnational dimension. A lead forum essay co-authored with intergroup scholar Jordan Soliz in the *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* on intercultural communication in a globally networked society evidences this commitment. The editor of the forum called this essay a "conceptual portal" to the new and growing subfield of intercultural new media studies.

An interdisciplinary research project on televised Presidential campaign advertisements also contributes to scholarship on public deliberation. Television advertisements historically have an outsized influence on setting the agenda for public conversation; yet, few studies endeavor to analyze long-term trends in this kind of public discourse. I formed a research team with political scientist Dana Griffin and two graduate students to conduct a longitudinal study of national televised Presidential campaign advertisements. The University of Nebraska Campaign Ads Project (UNeCAP) produced a public dataset for campaign advertisements, published one essay, and has others in-progress.

Digital Projects

In addition to traditional scholarship published in journals and university presses, I am actively engaged in digital humanities projects that leverage new modes of publication. The most significant of these is the Association for the Rhetoric of Science and Technology's (ARST) Oral History Project (OHP). I organized, conducted, edited, and published oral history interviews with 14 of the major figures in the rhetoric of science and technology, with a commitment to high production values. Publicly available through YouTube, these interviews, spanning almost 9 hours, document both the organizational and intellectual histories of a vibrant subfield of Communication research. I co-authored a formal write up of the major findings from these oral history interviews for *Rhetoric Review*, with two graduate students from other universities who assisted me during the interviews.

Future Research

I am extending these established lines of inquiry into the next phase of my research program, which examines the rhetorical and cultural implications of wearable computing. Over the next several years, I intend to critically investigate wearable technologies, especially as they intersect

with social software. I already have one essay on mobile phones (what I call the "original" wearable) accepted for publication at *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* and another essay on Google Glass that will be submitted to the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* when the new editor begins accepted manuscripts in 2016. These two projects will funnel into a new book project, tentatively titled *Always On: Fashioning Ethos after Wearable Computing*. As material and digital environments become further enmeshed, this book project is poised to take on some of the most interesting and important technological phenomena of the next decade.

Teaching

My pedagogy is deeply rooted in the rhetorical tradition. Traditionally, teachers of rhetoric help students use the available tools of persuasion—the voice or the page, the radio or the screen—to effectuate change in the attitudes, values, and policies of local, regional, and global cultures. A rhetorical pedagogy appropriate to our own intensively networked times must be supple enough to account for the profound differences in communication that digital mediation affords. Thus, I aim to acquaint students with historical knowledge that contextualizes these recent developments in media technology, the theoretical and critical sensibilities to make sense of discrete rhetorical performances, and the practical ability to intervene as citizens in ongoing controversies. To encourage a recalibration of rhetorical studies to encompass the digital, I have developed five undergraduate and five graduate courses during my time at Nebraska. My pedagogical efforts have been recognized with strong course evaluations from undergraduate and graduate students and, in 2011, I won the Bruce Kendall Award for Outstanding Teaching by the Department of Communication Studies at Nebraska.

Teaching Methods and Effectiveness

My teaching experience ranges across a number of contexts. I have taught introductory and upper-level courses, face-to-face and online, honors seminars and non-honors courses, large lecture classes and standard enrollment classes. I vary my teaching methods in order to reach the diverse learning styles present in our students. I strive for "interactive lectures" that strategically integrate open-ended questions drawing on prior course concepts and more focused questions that move the lectures along and keep students engaged. One undergraduate detected the pedagogical value of this approach by noting how "[s]tudents played an important role in developing argument and class discussion, making the lectures more memorable." Many of the courses I teach lend themselves to the use of dynamic media examples, so I often draw on images, videos, and audio to demonstrate a point—thus breaking up lectures or initiating small group discussion.

In order to familiarize students with new tools for communication, I integrate blogging and video production into many of my classes. In my Visual Communication class, for example, I publish a blog post each week that contains a reading guide with questions (to prepare students for quizzes), "points of entry" (interesting links that are related to that week's course content), and a "blog prompt," a question that students can respond to when authoring their own posts.

I have consistently received excellent quantitative and qualitative teaching evaluations from students. Students evaluations, averaged over several courses at Nebraska, regularly rated my

teaching as exemplary and far above average. This quantitative assessment of my teaching is confirmed by the qualitative comments I receive. Undergraduate students note that my courses are "[d]ifficult, but very good!" They comment that "[a]lthough my grade won't reflect it, I sure learned a lot and became a COMM major" and that "[c]ourse materials, lectures, and reading were among the best I've had." One graduate student observed that "[Damien] really explains concepts thoroughly. He really CARES about his students and advancing their individual programs of study. Promoted the sharing of diverse perspectives." Another noted "[t]his class increased my knowledge and appreciation for rhetoric. To be honest, almost every class I learned more and left with new questions I had yet to consider."

My undergraduate teaching primarily focuses on COMM 215, Visual Communication; COMM 189H, a first-year Honors seminar; and courses related to digital media, including a new foundational course for the Communication Studies major, COMM 250, Rhetoric, Media, and Civic Life. At the graduate level, my teaching focuses on rhetorical theory and media studies. In courses like Contemporary Rhetorical Theory, or in seminars focusing on the rhetorical theories of Kenneth Burke, I acquaint students with 20th century rhetorical theory. In courses like Public Argument & Deliberation or Media & Culture, I focus on how mediation shapes communication and culture more generally. In courses like Networked Rhetorical Theory, I aim to give graduate students the context necessary to intervene in unfolding conversations about the need to re-theorize rhetoric for digitally networked times.

Graduate Advising

I have been active in advising graduate students, serving as the primary advisor to eight Ph.D. students (five completed), co-advising another Ph.D. student, and advising two Master's students (one of whom wrote a thesis). I have served as a committee member on thirteen other Ph.D. committees (nine completed) and one Master's thesis committee. My graduate students are working in novel, important areas of the discipline like remix studies, the digitization of warfare, transnational organizing, and municipal deliberation. I am active in mentoring my own advisees and other graduate students, in the department and across the discipline, regarding research and teaching. I have collaborated with graduate students on published research projects, as noted on my *CV*, and provided extended feedback on research design and manuscripts authored by graduate students.

Summary

Undergraduate and graduate teaching is a continuing—and rewarding—challenge. I offered a range of undergraduate and graduate courses at Nebraska in my time there, and look forward to continuing to push myself pedagogically in order to engage students in a rigorous program of study. I constantly seek to improve the courses that I teach, as I continue to refine the sequencing of course material, assignment details, and lectures. Each semester, I examine course evaluations and recalibrate the course in order to respond to student feedback. I intend on pursuing professional development opportunities in the coming years.

Service

I strive to be a good citizen in the Department, College, University, and the Communication discipline, recognizing that service is a crucial, if at times underappreciated, element of the academic enterprise. Much of my service intersects with my research and teaching strengths in rhetoric, digital technology, and deliberation. I consistently volunteer for service opportunities that improve the reputation of the Department and the University, exceeding what is usually expected of junior faculty. As I look to the future, I expect to take advantage of more opportunities to serve the University community, the discipline of Communication, and the wider community.

Departmental and University Service

In my department at Nebraska, I have endeavored to be of service in a number of different ways. I have served on both the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees, chaired the Departmental Web Committee, and co-chaired the Media Committee. Moreover, I assist with a range of civic engagement activities on campus in line with my scholarly expertise. For example, I was the seminar leader for the Civic Communication module that constitutes part of the co-curricular core of Nebraska's Civic Engagement Certificate program. I also co-sponsored "The Voice: Communicating for Social Change," a 2013 Learning Community that gathered civically-oriented undergraduate students together in a curricular and co-curricular program around communication and community engagement.

I also help to enrich the intellectual life of the college and university by coordinating and giving public lectures. I am a co-organizer of Nebraska's "Humanities on the Edge" series that brings to campus prominent speakers for public lectures at the Sheldon Art Museum. Speakers in the past several years include such luminaries as Ernesto Laclau, Michael Hardt, Jodi Dean, E. Patrick Johnson, and Deirdre McCloskey. In addition, I am co-sponsoring Nebraska's student chapter of the Rhetoric Society of America. I delivered a talk on Google Glass and democratic culture to this chapter of RSA in the Fall of 2014.

I am also a co-PI, with Associate to the Vice Chancellor Linda Major and Associate Professor of Political Science Patrice McMahon, on a U.S. Department of State Bureau of Educational and Cultural Activities grant called the "Study of the United States Institute." This grant, totaling $675,000 over three years (2014-16), annually brings 20 students from Angola, Botswana, Mozambique, South Africa, and Zimbabwe to Nebraska for a six-week study experience. The formal curriculum includes learning about U.S. history and political culture, the role of civil rights in democratic governance, and media and civic activism. Students meet with community leaders, experience life in the dorms and in the Lincoln, Nebraska, and associate with "Peer Mentors" from UNL. I have been responsible for collaboratively conceiving and writing the grant, organizing one week of the curriculum, managing the Peer Mentors' involvement, and assisting in the day-to-day operations of the program.

Disciplinary Service

I fulfill several different service roles in the Communication discipline. I am an active member of the National Communication Association (NCA), where I review conference papers and proposals for the Rhetorical and Communication Theory and the Association for the Rhetoric of

Science and Technology divisions. I regularly organize traditional conference panels at NCA. In addition, for four years, I was a member of the NCA-Forum Advisory Board, a group that sponsored convention programming aimed at fostering deliberation within NCA.

My editorial service also contributes to the goals of the discipline. In 2010, I guest edited a special issue of *Argumentation and Advocacy* called "Public Argument/Digital Media," featuring four peer reviewed articles and my introduction. I have also edited or co-edited two forums, featuring shorter contributions by a diverse group of scholars. One co-edited forum was an extension of an NCA-Forum program on the documentary *The Garden*. The forum, published in *Environmental Communication*, gathered five prominent scholars to reflect on the critical and cultural politics of this documentary about urban gardening in Los Angeles. I also edited a Symposium for *The Journal of Public Deliberation* on "Deliberation Technology." In the wake of the Arab Spring of 2011, numerous commentators speculated about the role of technology in stimulating and sustaining the widespread protest movements. The Symposium collects four essays, from national and international scholars, on the potential of "deliberation technology" to sustain the democratic potential of these movements.

In addition to editing research publications, I serve on the editorial board of the journal *Argumentation and Advocacy* and have been an *ad hoc* reviewer for four other journals. I have recently been invited to join the editorial board for one of Communication's flagship journal, *The Quarterly Journal of Speech.* In the wake of the publication of my book, I have been asked to review book manuscripts for several presses, including the University of South Carolina Press, Lexington Books, and Bloomsbury. I also served on the Editorial Board of the Alta Argumentation Conference, a biennial conference with a long history of excellence. As a member of the Editorial Board for the 2013 conference, I reviewed submissions, served on the top student paper selection committee, chaired panels, winnowed submissions down for the selected works volume, and provided detailed edits for 15 essays. This experience opened up a similar opportunity, as I was asked to serve in a similar role for the inaugural European Conference on Argumentation in Lisbon, Portugal. This opportunity to serve the discipline at the international level is an exciting one that should provide even more opportunities to strengthen the community of scholars invested in argumentation.

Student Evaluation Ratings

Course: UNIV100	N	Mean F07	Course Level Mean*	N	Mean S08	Course Level Mean*	N	Mean F08	Course Level Mean*
The course was intellectually challenging.	19	3.05	3.26	39	3.08	3.29	27	3.05	3.26
I learned a lot from this course.	19	3.05	3.27	39	3.09	3.47	27	3.09	3.47
The instructor treated students with respect.	19	3.00	3.00	39	3.00	3.00	27	3.00	3.00
The instructor was well-prepared for class.	19	3.21	2.88	39	3.27	2.78	27	3.27	2.78
Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.	19	3.26	2.82	39	3.29	2.82	27	3.26	2.82
Average		3.11	3.05		3.15	3.07		3.13	3.07

* Average rating for all similarly leveled course sections (e.g., all 100-level courses sections)
in that college in that semester.
Scaled 0-4: Strongly Disagree=0; Strongly Agree=4. N/A is not in the average.

The standards the instructor set for students were…			
	F07	S08	F08
Too Low	0%	5%	10%
Appropriate	89%	85%	80%
Too High	11%	10%	10%

How does this course fit into your academic plan or course of study?			
	F07	S08	F08
CORE Requirement	32%	29%	10%
Program Requirement	58%	61%	80%
Elective	11%	10%	10%

Reputation of Publication Outlets—Guidelines and Suggestions

The evaluation of publication outlets for their quality is both a subjective process and a data collection effort. Factors to be considered in the assessment of publication quality may include:

- Anonymous, peer review
- A broadly representative, highly regarded editorial board
- Publication history and efficiency
- Coverage in major abstracting and indexing services
- Citation analyses, impact factors, and download statistics
- Acceptance/rejection rates

Sources of Information about Publication Outlets:

1. **Ulrichs Global Serials Directory** (available at UM Libraries). This database provides current and fundamental information about over 900,000 serial publications.

2. **Individual publication websites**. Provides information about the journal's history, current editorial board, and where the journal is abstracted and indexed. May also provide acceptance/rejection rate information.

3. **Journal Citation Reports** (ISI-Thomson/Reuters; available at UM Libraries). Offers impact factors ("the average number of times articles from the journal published in the past two years have been cited in the JCR year"), Eigenfactor analysis ("based on the number of times articles from the journal published in the past five years have been cited in the JCR year, but it also considers which journals have contributed these citations so that highly cited journals will influence the network more than lesser cited journals"), 5-year impact factors ("the average number of times articles from the journal published in the past five years have been cited in the JCR year"), and cited half-life ("the median age of articles cited by the journal in the JCR year. For example, in JCR 2003, the journal *Food Biotechnology* has a citing half-life of 9.0. That means that 50% of all articles cited by articles in *Food Biotechnology* in 2003 were published between 1995 and 2003") information for 77 journals in Communication.

4. **SCImago Journal & Country Rank** (http://www.scimagojr.com/index.php). Offers a ranking/listing of 200+ journals in the Communication category. Provides both an SJR rating (defined as "a measure of a journal's impact, influence or prestige. It expresses the average number of weighted citations received in the selected year by the documents published in the journal in the three previous years") and an H Index (defined as "Journal's number of articles (h) that have received at least h citations over the whole period"). Using the SJR measure, the database derives quartile rankings for journals in a given category.

5. **Scopus CiteScore** (https://journalmetrics.scopus.com/). Offers citation metrics and rankings for 242 journals in Communication.

6.   **Harzing's Journal Quality List** (http://www.harzing.com/jql.htm). Offers a digest of ratings for a range of journals, including 20 Communication journals.

7.   **Microsoft Academic Search** (http://academic.research.microsoft.com/). Along with other information, Microsoft Academic Search provides two rankings of 103 Communication journals, by "Field Rating" and by "Citations."

Citation Analyses:

1.   UM guidelines now ask candidates to provide citation counts of their research.

2.   Sources for citation counts:

       Google Scholar (http://scholar.google.com/); Google Search engine (http://www.google.com).

       Microsoft Academic (http://academic.research.microsoft.com/)

       Publisher Website—Taylor & Francis, Wiley-Blackwell, Sage, and other publishers will include information about citation patterns for specific articles. They may also include "download" statistics for individual essays.

Other considerations:

1.   Accurate depiction of an essay/journal: Simply because an essay appears in a peer reviewed journal does not necessarily mean that the essay itself was peer reviewed. Essays may be invited, may appear in special issues that are not peer reviewed, or may be review or commentary essays.

2.   Statistics or other information used to assess and support the reputation of publication outlets should be completely cited and referenced.

3.   Individual entries for specific publication outlets should be clear and brief.

4.   All publication outlets must be assessed and justified for their reputations, including non-journal outlets. Many of the metrics for assessing the reputation of journals (impact factors; citation factors, etc.) may not be available for other publication outlets (i.e., book publishers, etc.).

Sample entry:

Human Communication Research (four articles)

Human Communication Research is published by Wiley and is an official publication of the International Communication Association. The journal seeks to advance understanding of human symbolic processes with a strong emphasis on theory-driven research, the development of new theoretical models in

communication, and the development of innovative methods for observing and measuring communication behavior. Currently edited by John Courtright of the University of Delaware, the journal is in its 42nd year of publication. *Human Communication Research* follows a policy of double-blind peer review, maintains an international editorial board, and publishes four issues each year.

Journal Citation Reports Impact Factor: 2.400 (#5/79 journals in Communication); Five-Year Impact Factor, 3.713
SCImago Journal Ranking: 2.199; H-Index: 61; Q1 in Anthropology (#4/289 journals in Anthropology); Q1 in Communication (#6/277 journals in Communication); Q1 in Developmental and Educational Psychology (#23/283 journals in Developmental and Educational Psychology); Q1 in Linguistics and Language (#14/659 journals in Linguistics and Language)
Acceptance Rate: 11%

Candidate Verification

Name: _____ Dept: _____

I have seen the following components of my dossier:

	Initials	Date
Summary Statement of Professional Achievements		
Reputation of Outlets of Publication		
Student Evaluation Scores		
Peer Review(s) of Teaching		
Record of Mentoring / Advising / Research Supervision		
Department Promotion Criteria		
Agreement of Modified Criteria (if applicable)		
Sample Letter Requesting Evaluation		

_____

Signature

*Please note that the CV and personal statement must be signed **on those documents**.*
*Signing this page **does not** replace those two signatures.*