

Doctoral Dossier HANDBOOK
Instructional Systems Technology
Indiana University
June 2023

The dossier

The doctoral program in Instructional Systems Technology is intended to provide you with the skills and experiences necessary to be successful in a research role in our field (whether that role takes place in an academic, corporate, school, government or other setting). Within this PhD program you will assemble a dossier, an organized collection of documents, in order to organize and present indicators of competencies you have attained along the way to candidacy. Those competencies will fall into three categories: research, teaching and service.

Your dossier will be evaluated at three checkpoints. The second and third checkpoints serve as your qualifying exam. If you are intending to obtain an academic position in the future, the dossier will also serve as the start of your scholarly dossier to be used later in promotion and tenure processes.

The dossier should include, at minimum:

- a) Candidate's statement and statements prefacing the research, teaching and service sections of the dossier
- b) A literature review, separate from any of those incorporated into studies you have carried out (the literature review required in R711 can serve this purpose)
- c) a first-authored research study ready to submit to a national or international peer-reviewed journal
- d) evidence of conference presentation as lead presenter
- b) evidence of basic knowledge in IST
- c) competencies in teaching and service relevant to your main research interest

With the exception of the first-authored study, evidence may be presented of work completed up to five years prior to entering the program providing that it meets the standards of quality applied to all dossiers. You should meet with your advisor in advance of the second dossier review to ensure that all the evidence you submit is of high quality; this does not ensure on its own that you will pass the review, but it will prevent any unfounded assumptions.

Your dossier must represent more than routine competence, even if that competence is accompanied by conscientious effort and enthusiasm. Similarly, it must reveal more than sheer quantity of effort. The dossier should stand as an indicator of quality scholarship, teaching and service on the part of the doctoral student it represents. This quality is assessed in relation to the point in the program where the dossier assessment is made. The key question asked by the faculty is, "Is this student adequately prepared to conduct independent research at the dissertation level."

Dossier reviews

There are three key evaluation checkpoints (or dossier reviews) in which you will

participate before you are nominated to candidacy. They are:

Review	When ...	How ...	Significance
1	semester of your 2 nd R695 seminar ----- this should occur mid-semester; it is the students' responsibility to initiate scheduling this meeting	closed meeting with your IST advisory committee members	this is a developmental review; your committee gives you feedback on the direction, amount and quality of your work
2	semester of your 4 th R695 seminar ----- the dossier is due approximately the first week of the semester (specific due date will be announced by the department); the department schedules oral presentations during approximately the third week of the semester; questions from external readers (members of faculty not on your advisory committee) are forwarded to you and your advisory committee chair 48 hours prior to the review	open meeting with oral presentation to the faculty as a whole; 15 minutes presentation + 20 minutes Q&A primarily from the external readers closed deliberations of the entire faculty will be held following the presentations and candidates notified of results approximately the following week Possible results include: 1. full pass; proceed directly to R795 and third review 2. conditional pass; conditions will be set by the full faculty and reviewed by your advisory committee – conditions must be judged satisfactory for a pass 3. fail	this is considered by the Graduate School to be your “written qualifying exam” -- if you do not pass this review you may move to the Ed.S. program (if you have sufficient credits) or discontinue studies doctoral students are entitled to undergo this review one additional time in the event of failure; the faculty may set the timeline and conditions for this re-take
3	within one semester after you take R795 Dissertation Proposal Preparation	closed meeting with the members of your IST advisory committee	this is considered by the Graduate School to be the equivalent of your “oral exam;” following this review you can be nominated to candidacy – your seven year

			dissertation clock begins from the date of this review
--	--	--	--

The dossier is cumulative; you will add to it between each review and not remove anything from it, although you may revise your candidate's statement and statements about research, teaching and service. After the first and second reviews you will write a précis of the feedback given to you about your progress so far, especially about what you need to do for the next review. This will be included in the dossier for the next review.

For details on the difference between an advisory committee and a research committee, coursework and candidacy, requirements for written and oral quals, time limits for coursework and dissertation, and other Graduate School policies that apply to your degree program, review the Graduate Bulletins of the School of Education and the University Graduate School. The School of Education graduate Portal website includes a checklist of doctoral process and milestones. It is important that doctoral students download and check this list frequently during the program.

Review of the doctoral dossier

The faculty will use the following guidelines in reviewing the dossier, applying their experience and professional judgment.

Quality of the overall work

- Work has clearly presented new challenges and learning opportunities to this student
- Work shows evidence of competence and insight on the part of the student

Progress in focus and integration

- Goals statements demonstrate an emerging, viable and realistic research focus well connected to a theoretical base of knowledge
- Evidence shows strategic rather than haphazard progress; changes of direction are explained convincingly and with insight
- Proposed future activities align with stated goals
- Activities that no longer contribute effectively to the scholarly agenda have been phased out over time

Awareness of connections to theory and prior work

- Student's work consistently demonstrates a grasp of the major ideas and theories within the declared focus area
- Student draws in relevant knowledge from areas outside the primary focus when appropriate
- Student's use of knowledge from multiple areas displays understanding of the theories, their relationship to the student's work, and their applicability to the student's work

Oral presentation (for 2nd review)

- Presentation is succinct, well organized, understandable
- Student displays full grasp of the topics for which dossier evidence has been presented
- Student can discuss the future direction of their work
- Student can describe the relationship of their work to knowledge in the field in terms congruent with the general understanding of professionals in the field

General organization and presentation

- Dossier follows the required organization outline
- Materials are complete and in good condition
- First-authored study is clearly indicated
- Updates are clearly marked

Organization of the dossier

The doctoral dossier should be assembled in the order shown here. At early reviews, some of the sections of the dossier will not be filled, but links for those sections should appear nevertheless. All items from each review should remain in the dossier for subsequent reviews (unless they are clearly revised versions of papers, for example), although they may not be reviewed again if they were considered final in a previous review.

- I. Candidate's statement (updated for each review)
- II. Précis of feedback from previous reviews verified by committee (reviews 2 and 3)
- III. Progress in academic program
 1. Plan of Studies (draft form at first review; approved form thereafter)
 2. Current transcripts from IU (from OneStart showing grades, current GPA and highlighted to show residency requirement met)
- IV. Evidence of research competencies
- V. Evidence of teaching competencies
- VI. Evidence of service competencies
- VII. Draft of dissertation prospectus (review 3)
- VIII. List of dissertation committee members (review 3)
- IX. Curriculum vita (dated)

Candidate's Statement

The candidate's statement should be included and updated/revised at each review. It is expected to evolve from one review to the next. The statement should be approximately 3-5 pages long at the first review and no longer than 6-7 pages by the final review. The statement should be an essay rather than simply bulleted items or a listing of the work included in the dossier. It should address:

Goals

State your professional goals and demonstrate that your teaching, research and service work is becoming more integrated and focused over time spent in the program. Describe how your work fits into the field and then how your own scholarly efforts fit into your evolving, individual research agenda.

Description of your primary focus area in research

The focus area statement focuses specifically on the research group(s) and activities you have participated in leading up to each review. This statement should be coordinated with your personal goals statement so that it is clear how your selection of research group(s) and participation in group activities is supporting your goals.

Plan for developing your focus area and professional activity competencies

Identify:

- the competencies you have acquired and their contribution to your goals within your area of focus
- what competencies remain to be acquired or improved and what you plan to do to acquire and document each
- when you expect to have acquired and documented each

Integration of your anticipated or identified minor area

Evidence of professional competency in research

You must meet and are expected to exceed baseline indicators for competency in research. The baseline indicators are:

- two literature reviews (one from R711 – may be re-written – and one from independent research work)
- 1st author research manuscript submitted to a peer reviewed journal, together with reviewer feedback
- research presentation at a conference for which you are lead presenter

Evidence of professional competency in teaching

You must meet and are expected to exceed baseline indicators for competency in teaching. The baseline indicators are:

- materials resulting from independent preparation of a sustained learning experience (team teaching or volunteer teaching that encompasses a significant portion of a course)
- evaluations and/or peer observations and/or supervisor endorsements accompanied, where possible, by student work samples

Evidence of professional competency in service

You must meet and are expected to exceed baseline indicators for competency in service. Dossiers submitted without evidence of service to the department by the time of second review cannot be awarded a full pass. The baseline indicator is:

- project documentation and/or letter describing and acknowledging

significant service in a venue related to scholarship such as a school or university level committee, community educational organization, or local, state or national professional organization

Exceeding minimum evidence of competency

Research

- independent research project report(s)
- client-based research project report(s)
- pilot study report(s)
- grant proposal(s), submitted and either accepted or rejected, togetherwith reviews from funding agency
- first, single or co-authored publications
- refereed and non-refereed journal articles
- book chapters
- white papers
- funded project reports
- annotated scholarly bibliographies
- significant & relevant web publications
- other creative work relevant to focus area

Teaching

- course materials
- curriculum materials
- syllabi, materials, evaluations or observations and, where possible,sample student work from:
- workshops
- tutorials
- classroom activities
- co-instructor's description and evaluation of your role for team or co-teaching in P16 – graduate courses, online, F2F or blended
- description and supervisor's assessment of sustained teaching in aninformal learning environment
- report(s) of evaluation of teaching/learning materials
- first, single or co-authored publications related to teaching
- conference presentations related to teaching

Service

- reviews you have conducted for relevant conferences and publications
- description and acknowledgment of contributions to department, school, university or community initiatives and citizenship activities inthe field

- service-related presentations and publications
- documentation of sustained mentoring activities
- description and acknowledgment of your application of academic skills to pro bono efforts

Oral defense of the dossier

Once each fall and spring term the department qualifying exam committee organizes the Dossier II event which all doctoral level students and all faculty are expected to attend. The department assigns two faculty readers for each dossier. These readers are members of the faculty not serving on the advisory committee for that student. The readers review that student's dossier, prepare questions for the student, provide those questions about 24 hours in advance of the event to the student and chair of the advisory committee, and lead the questioning for that student during the Dossier II event.

Students scheduled for the Dossier II review complete these steps:

- Update the dossier and make it available to the qualifying exam committee by the announced deadline
- Prepare a presentation no longer than 15 minutes and including the minimum information outlined below
- Ideally, practice the presentation with the primary research group and use feedback to refine the presentation
- Review questions from the external readers and prepare for them, preferably in consultation with the chair of the advisory committee

During the Dossier II event, each student presenting has 15 minutes to cover the required information. The external readers and, time permitting, other faculty and students, may then ask questions for a period of 20 minutes. The faculty retire for an additional 25 minutes following each presentation and come to a decision regarding the assessment of PASS, FAIL, or PASS with conditions for that student. The entire faculty votes on this decision. Decisions are relayed to each student, together with integrated feedback from the external readers and the faculty discussion, within approximately a week of the Dossier II event.

Deadlines for the conditions in the case of PASS with conditions will be included in this feedback where appropriate. Deliverables for conditions are turned in to the student's advisory committee and evaluated by that committee. The committee then reports passed or failed conditions to the qualifying exams committee. Failed conditions count as a failed Dossier II review.

Students who fail Dossier II are entitled to attempt one additional time to pass the review. There is generally a time limit on when the second attempt must be made, often the following term.

Required content for the Dossier II Presentation

Any unobtrusive and professional template from PowerPoint or other presentation software is allowed for the Dossier II presentation. The presentation must contain a minimum of the following content:

My Scholarship

- Describe your intellectual development in the primary area of your scholarly interest
 - Areas in which you aspire to become learned
 - Major activities you have undertaken to study in this area
 - The big ideas in this area and their philosophical and theoretical/empirical underpinnings
 - Gaps in your own present knowledge
 - Concise description of your first-authored study
- Describe your research agenda as you envision it at this point

Integration

- Explain how your research, teaching and service fit together
 - If you have taken some time to find your area of focus, discuss how you see these efforts coming together as you move forward in your program
 - Think about what each of these areas of effort adds to the others; they do not all have to be identical or explicitly connected
 - Your service activities in the program, outside the program and in community or national venues as applicable
- This is an important part of your presentation – help the faculty panel understand how your professional identity is emerging or consolidating across all your scholarly work

Professional and Academic Goals

- Summarize your goals
 - Professional goals include your plans for the sector in which you want to work and the role you hope to assume (tenure track faculty in a research one institution, or corporate research specialist, or professional development consultant in business, and so on)
 - Academic goals include the coursework you have left to finish, major academic projects you want to complete, and your timeline for beginning, finishing and defending your dissertation work