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junior faculty. The CAP will advise the Chairperson in his or her preparation of annual reviews of junior faculty members. In cases involving third-year review and tenure decisions, the candidate and Chairperson will have a discussion about the candidate's research field prior to the review. If the candidate's research discipline is outside the area of expertise of the Chairperson and all members of the CAP, the Chairperson and candidate will also discuss which senior faculty members from within or outside the department would be best qualified to help evaluate the candidate's scholarship. When appropriate, after seeking the advice of the CAP and the Dean, the Chairperson will appoint a senior faculty member either from within the department or from another department in the University as a non-voting consultant to the CAP. The consultant will help write the research report on the candidate and will be one of its signatories.

B. Structure and Procedures: FPC

1. Composition: The committee that will evaluate and make recommendations concerning candidates for promotion to full professor will be composed of all full professors in the department in residence and, at the discretion of the committee, one or more professors from outside the department. The Department Chairperson serves as chair of the committee and participates in all committee deliberations, but does not vote with the FPC; the Department Chairperson provides an independent opinion in a letter addressed to the Dean. In instances in which the Chairperson of the department is an Associate Professor and his case is under review, the Chairperson will refrain from participating in the deliberations and decision of the FPC, and that committee will serve as the sole official voice of the department. It will elect a chair who will report its findings to the Dean. In cases in which there are fewer than three full professors in residence (the minimum number stipulated by university policy), the Dean appoints a full professor from an outside department in consultation with the Chairperson of the department. There should be at least three members on the committee, one of whom, when necessary, may be a professor from outside the department. If the candidate's research discipline is outside the area of expertise of all members of the full-professor committee, the Chairperson and candidate will also discuss which full professor(s) from outside the department would be best qualified to evaluate the candidate's scholarship. When appropriate, after seeking the advice of the full-professor committee and the Dean, the Chairperson will appoint a full professor from another department in the University as a non-voting consultant to the CAP. The consultant will help write the research report on the candidate and will be one of its signatories.

2. Responsibilities: The FPC is responsible for making departmental recommendations concerning candidates for promotion to professor. In cases of internal nomination for promotion to endowed chair, the responsibility for recommendation for promotion rests with the department’s Full Professor Committee.

II. Procedures for Renewal; Promotion and Tenure; Promotion to Professor; and Endowed Chair Appointments and Promotions

A. Renewal for a Second Three-Year Probationary Period
workload, with one member writing the research report, a second writing the teaching report, and a third the service report.

a. CAP will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s teaching that will include: i) a detailed narrative that analyzes the candidate’s official quantitative student course evaluation scores for all courses taught over the entire review period; ii) an in-depth evaluation of courses taught by the candidate (see Section IV below); and iii) an appraisal of additional contributions to teaching, including student mentoring, thesis direction, research advising, and inspiration of or assistance in noteworthy student achievements (e.g., publications, performances, exhibitions, and awards).

Teaching should be observed by the Chairperson and CAP members. When possible, they should observe tutorial and seminar teaching during the semester of review In cases where the faculty member will be on leave or have an unusual teaching schedule during the year of review, the Chairperson should instruct the CAP from the preceding year to contribute a teaching report for use as the next CAP sees fit.

CAP assesses teaching on the basis of the following information: 1) the faculty member’s statement of teaching philosophy in the personal statement; 2) CAP observations; 3) reports of course reviews conducted annually by senior faculty (See Section IV); 4) official student course evaluation quantitative data; 5) student course evaluation comments if submitted; 6) course syllabi if available; 7) Creative teaching innovations; any other materials submitted by the candidate that demonstrate teaching effectiveness; and 8) Student Advisory Committee comments. In addition to the narrative teaching report, the CAP will prepare an analysis of official quantitative student course evaluation data over the years leading to the review. Program expectations for teaching are described in III.B.1-2; see IV for in-depth course reviews.

b. Research is assessed through a review, conducted by the Chairperson and the CAP, of the faculty member’s scholarly materials.

c. Service is assessed through a review of information provided by faculty member and consideration of the faculty member’s contributions to the department, college, university, and profession.

6. In addition to the research, teaching, and service reports, the CAP will prepare a CAP Summary that analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the case, with each CAP member providing a statement of his or her view of the case along with a vote on recommendation. The Chairperson and all members of the CAP will indicate by their signatures that they approve the CAP Summary.

7. Qualifications for Renewal: The decision to renew a faculty member is based on the judgment that the faculty member is progressing towards tenure in a timely manner. In addition to beginning to meet the research standards described in Section III.A.2
3. Early Review

a. Any candidate for tenure may apply for early tenure – i.e., before the normal sixth year. If the individual chooses to apply for early tenure, he or she has the right to demand full consideration of his or her case starting with the department and proceeding through higher levels of the university even to the President. When the review is not contractually demanded and the candidate had requested the review the previous year, the department is not required to do a full review in the second year.

b. Candidates for early review can withdraw their case at any point in the process. An early withdrawal does not prejudice a contractually mandated review. In cases in which there is a tenure review in a following year, the CAP must contact all of the reviewers used in the first round or none of them.

4. The External Research Review. A minimum of six letters from external reviewers is required. The Chairperson invites the faculty member to submit a list of no more than three suggested reviewers outside the university with expertise in the faculty member’s area(s) of research; if the faculty member elects to submit such a list, it will be due by July 1. The CAP independently generates its own list of at least four external reviewers. The external reviewers are expected to be prominent members of the faculty member’s field, who are full professors at top universities and programs and are competent to judge the faculty member’s area of research. Deviations from this expectation must be justified. A candidate may exclude up to two persons as potential reviewers and the department is prohibited from using either of these persons as reviewers. The CAP will select no more than two external reviewers from the candidate’s list, but it is not required by University policy that any reviewers be selected from the candidate’s list. If those nominated by the candidate are not able to perform the review, the CAP must independently find additional reviewers and should not return to the candidate for additional names. The committee makes every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting referees. Reviewers who have served on the candidate's dissertation committee, who are from the candidate's home Ph.D. department, who are former teachers, or who are close research collaborators will be avoided. Any compelling exception should be discussed with and approved by the Dean and disclosed in the description of the outside reviewers. Between the final Spring meeting of the CAP and the end of July, the Chairperson will correspond with potential external reviewers, supplying the updated vita of the candidate to indicate the material to be reviewed and stipulating a date of November 1 as the deadline for receipt of outside evaluations. The Chairperson will specifically ask each referee to describe any working relationship she or he has had with the candidate to avoid potential conflicts of interest. If such a relationship becomes known after the solicitation of external letters, all letters are included in the packet, the conflict of interest is disclosed in the description of the reviewers, and additional external letters are sought so that six external evaluations from reviewers who have no perceived or potential conflict of interest are available to the CAP or FPC in their deliberations. Requests sent to reviewers should be in writing, consistent among themselves, and should be written according to the model letter provided by the Provost’s Office.
free not to undertake a full review in the following year if it judges that such a review is not warranted.

3. The Chairperson will require the candidate for promotion to professor to submit research materials by August 1 of the academic year when the candidate will be reviewed, and to submit teaching materials by September 15.

4. Candidates for Professor can withdraw their case at any point in the process. In cases in which there is a second review in a subsequent year, the Committee must contact all of the reviewers used in the first round or none of them.

5. The process is similar to that described for promotion to Associate Professor (see II.A.1-8 and II.B.1-7 above). Any tenured professor may nominate himself or herself for promotion to professor or may be nominated by a colleague (usually the Chairperson or another professor). The nomination goes to the Full Professors Committee, the composition and procedures of which are specified in I.B above.

6. When a faculty member's request for promotion to full professor is denied, the Chairperson delivers a letter to the candidate and advises that the Dean, upon request, will meet with the candidate to give as full a report as possible of the reasons for the denial without violating the rules of confidentiality.

D. Endowed Chair Appointments and Promotions:

1. As specified in the Academic Articles III.3.a [in revision pending trustee approval], "Holders of endowed chairs at the rank of full professor are normally expected to exhibit a level of distinction in research above that expected of full professors and excellence in teaching and service."

2. Candidates for endowed chair appointments can come either from outside the Program or by internal promotion of outstanding full professors within the Program. In either case, the candidate or candidates will eventually be reviewed by a committee (typically containing endowed chairs from the College) established by the Dean. If, after following the procedures outlined below, the Full Professor Committee is unable to endorse a single individual the nominations will go directly to the College Review Committee. In all cases, the Department Chairperson will send a letter on the candidate’s suitability to the Dean.

a. **External Candidates.** An external candidate for endowed chair can be nominated by any member of the department. Candidates from outside the Program must be reviewed by the CAP and the Chairperson and then subsequently by the department as a whole (as in any external appointment). The Chairperson and the CAP make the recommendation to hire. The recommendation to hire at the rank of endowed chair must be endorsed by the Full Professor Committee. An external candidate approved by the FPC will then be reviewed by the College Review Committee.

Sections 2-4 below articulate the expectations and research requirements for (2) renewal of appointment, (3) tenure and (4) promotion to Full Professor. In these Sections various kinds of publications are mentioned; thus it is useful at the beginning to elaborate the qualitative criteria that pertain to various kinds of publication at every stage of review. Letters (a)-(d) below pertain to "scholarly books," (f)-(g) to articles, and (h) to book reviews. Volumes of collected essays of which the candidate is the editor (e) are books, but in a secondary sense relative to scholarly books of which the candidate is the author.

Candidates for renewal, tenure and promotion to Full Professor should recognize that (except perhaps for certain kinds of instruments-of-research; see [d], below), generally speaking, electronic or on-line publication of books and articles as yet does not have the same credibility as traditional publication in print.

a. *Monographs.* Monographic studies are the most common form of book-publication among scholars in the humanities, and thus the criteria for evaluating them are generally known. In evaluating monographs, reviewers will consider the scope and difficulty of the research; the originality of the contribution to scholarship; the coherence and persuasiveness of the arguments(s); the evidence provided to support the argument(s) and the cogency of the interpretation of that evidence; the mastery of the scholarly literature pertinent to the subject (in various languages); the quality of the writing; the distinction of the press (in respect of the discipline or specialized field of research) at which the book is published.

b. *Scholarly Editions.* In evaluating scholarly editions of primary texts, reviewers will consider the need for, and importance of, an *Editio princeps* or new edition of the text (as argued, e.g., in the introduction); the scope of the historical textual evidence critically examined and analyzed; the cogency of the principles and method of edition established for the constitution of the text; overall, the justification of the text produced in the edition (typically presented in the introduction); the quality of the edited text; the comprehensiveness and clarity of the textual apparatus, the apparatus of sources, etc.; the comprehensiveness and clarity of the various indices; the distinction of the press and series (in respect of the discipline or specialized field of research) in which the volume is published.

c. *Translations.* In evaluating translations of literary, philosophical, scientific or scholarly works, reviewers will consider the significance of the work translated, as established, e.g., in a scholarly introduction; the accuracy of the translation; the literary quality and appropriateness of the translation in respect of the style, tone, etc. of the original; the originality of the contribution to scholarship (i.e., has the work been translated often or seldom or never before?); the scope and quality of the annotation to the translated text; the distinction of the press at which the translation is published.

d. *Reference Works and Instruments-of-Research.* This rubric covers various kinds of scholarly works, which usually are undertaken and executed by well-established
in an "all-inclusive" volume (e.g., global publications of conference-proceedings; note that some volumes of conference-proceedings are selective).

h. Book Reviews. Book reviews in well-established, highly-regarded scholarly journals will be evaluated according to the quality of the reasoning and evidence that supports and justifies the reviewer's evaluation and judgments of the book reviewed. Essay-length reviews can weigh the same (or nearly the same) as standard scholarly articles.

2. Renewal of Appointment.

The research of candidates for renewal (typically in the third year after original appointment) will be evaluated by members of the departmental Committee on Appointments and Promotion (CAP), assisted if necessary by an extra-departmental faculty-member from Notre Dame who is a recognized expert in the candidate's field of specialization. The candidate for renewal should have begun to establish a scholarly reputation in a particular field of specialization. The candidate should present a record of published or forthcoming essays in well-established, highly-regarded scholarly journals and/or in volumes of collected essays published by well-regarded academic presses. At this stage in a candidate's career, publication of articles in standard scholarly journals should be considered preferable to publication of articles in volumes of collected essays. The candidate also should have presented papers at scholarly conferences (in evaluating conference presentations, reviewers will consider the status of the organization sponsoring the conference or the reputation of annual conferences, the selectivity of the program, the list of other speakers, etc.). Moreover, through a combination of publications and manuscript materials the candidate should present strong evidence of significant progress towards the completion of a scholarly book in his or her field of specialization.

3. Associate Professor with Tenure.

The research of candidates for tenure will be evaluated by members of the departmental CAP, assisted if necessary by an extra-departmental faculty-member from Notre Dame who is recognized as an expert in the candidate's field, and by eminent scholars from other universities who are widely-recognized in the scholarly community as leading authorities in the candidate's field of specialization. The candidate for tenure should have achieved a recognized standing among scholars in his or her field of specialization, as evinced through a combination of publications and presentations at conferences, etc. Although the quality of research is more significant than sheer quantity, it is normally expected that a candidate for tenure will have published a scholarly book with a well-recognized scholarly press, or at least will have finished a book that has been accepted and is in-press (beyond an acceptance conditional on revisions yet to be made). Besides a scholarly book, the candidate should present a complement of articles published in well-established, highly-regarded scholarly journals and/or in volumes of collected essays that are published by well-recognized academic presses. At this stage in a candidate's career, it would be inadvisable for the candidate to have published articles exclusively or primarily in edited collections. In exceptional circumstances (or in the case of humanities
and the burden of proof will be on the candidate and the review Committee to make the case.

Further evidence of the candidate's distinguished scholarly reputation includes the following: serving as the editor of volumes of collected essays, reference works, etc. (serving as the editor of a well-established, highly-regarded scholarly journal is a separate kind of on-going scholarly productivity); invited lectures at other universities, plenary lectures and special addresses at major conferences; the organization of notable scholarly conferences; the holding of significant grants or fellowships that support one's research; appointments as a Visiting Professor or Senior Fellow at other universities; appointments to the editorial boards of scholarly journals and book-series; the holding of official positions or fellowship in scholarly societies and academies; awards and prizes for one's scholarly accomplishments, etc.

B. Teaching Standards in the Program of Liberal Studies

1. The Program has a long and demonstrated history of teaching excellence. Becoming an effective teacher in PLS takes time and collaboration. Faculty must master classical texts outside of their areas of expertise, integrate their courses with others in PLS, and become expert in leading class discussions. Reviews of teaching should be both evaluative and informative. See II.A.5.a regarding the comprehensive teaching evaluation for renewals and promotions and IV for in-depth course reviews.

2. For promotion to associate professor with tenure, the candidate should have demonstrated commitment to the Program’s distinctive curriculum and pedagogy and established a record of exemplary/effective teaching. For promotion to full professor or endowed professor, he or she should have maintained a record of excellent teaching.

C. Service Standards in the Program of Liberal Sections

1. Service expectations in the Program of Liberal Studies are in line with the College expectations as laid out in the Reference Guide for Arts and Letters Chairpersons and Faculty.

2. In the event that a faculty member being reviewed for promotion holds an appointment in an institute or center, the director will be asked to evaluate the candidate’s service to the institute or center.

3. Promotion Criteria

   a. Promotion to Associate Professor: Although service is a relatively modest requirement for the pre-tenure period, the candidate for Associate Professor with tenure should have demonstrated his or her commitment to the department and university through meaningful participation in committee
3. Review of Teaching Leading to Tenure Review:
   a. Each year following renewal until the semester of tenure review: Review of one course per year by a senior faculty member. By the year of tenure review, each distinct tutorial and at least two seminars should have been reviewed.
   b. Semester of tenure review: Review of all teaching by Chairperson and CAP.

4. Review of Associate Professor Teaching:
   a. Following promotion to associate professor with tenure and continuing until the semester of review for full professor—Review of one course every 2 years, alternating between seminars and tutorials, by a full professor.
   b. Semester of review for promotion to full professor: Review of teaching record by assigned members of the committee of full professors.

B. Elements of Course Review:
   1. COURSE DESIGN Are the goals of the course clearly articulated and in keeping with the Program of Liberal Studies’ curricular objectives. How well does this course integrate with other PLS courses? Is the course design sufficiently rigorous and relevant to students’ intellectual development?
   2. IMPLEMENTATION: Does the instructor establish an engaging environment? Are students being encouraged to think critically and to develop the knowledge and skills appropriate to the subject matter? How successfully does the instructor initiate meaningful discussion, include students in the discussion, and direct the flow of the discussion? How effectively does the instructor help students to improve their writing?
   3. EVALUATION: Does the instructor employ valid and reliable methods of assessing the learning goals of the course? Does the instructor set high expectations for student performance, provide helpful feedback throughout the course, and apply appropriate standards of evaluation? How effectively does the instructor conduct oral exams?
   4. STUDENT PERCEPTIONS: How do the students perceive the quality of instruction and the availability and helpfulness of the instructor?

C. The Process for Course Reviews
   1. Early in the semester in which a course will be reviewed, the faculty member conducting the review (reviewer) will meet with the instructor to discuss the objectives of the course and its structure (including selection of readings, course requirements, schedule, assignments, etc.).
   2. Typically, the reviewer will observe at least one class of the course; the instructor being reviewed may request a second observation.
VI. Amendment of the CAP Document

Proposals for Amendments to the CAP organizational plan must be submitted in writing to the Chairperson, who must distribute them in a timely fashion in advance of the faculty meeting in which they will be considered. Amendments may not affect the current membership or the terms of the current members on the CAP. Amendments must be approved by an absolute majority of voting members in the department.
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