

**UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME
DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY
ORGANIZATION PLAN FOR THE COMMITTEE
ON APPOINTMENTS AND THE COMMITTEE ON REAPPOINTMENT,
PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

I. PURPOSE AND MEMBERSHIP

The Committee on Appointments

1.1 The Committee on Appointments (CA) consists of all regular faculty, regardless of rank and regardless of the rank to which the candidate would be appointed. Regular faculty members include all TTT (tenured and tenured-track) faculty, as well as Other Regular Faculty (ORF), i.e. professors of the practice, teaching, and/or research.

1.2 Per the *Academic Articles* IV.1.b., non-regular faculty members, i.e. concurrent, visiting, adjunct, guest, affiliated, and retired, do not participate in the CA (nor in the CRPT).

1.3 The Department Chairperson chairs the CA and serves as a non-voting, ex-officio member.

1.4 The CA makes recommendations for appointments to the regular faculty as defined in the *Academic Articles* IV:5. Qualifications for appointment to the regular faculty are specified in the *Academic Articles* IV:3.

1.5 The procedure for appointments to the faculty as a University Named Chair are described in the *Academic Articles* IV:5:a.

The Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

1.6 The Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (CRPT) consists of all members of the tenured faculty of the Department who hold at least the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion, or in the case of reappointment of a tenure-track faculty member, who are at least at the rank of tenured associate professor. In addition, in the case of ORF candidates, the CRPT will include all ORF members who hold at least the rank to which the candidate seeks promotion, or who hold a rank higher than, or in the case of reappointments at the level of Professor, equal to that of the candidate seeking reappointment.

1.7 The Department Chairperson chairs the CRPT and serves as a non-voting, ex-officio member.

1.8 The CRPT makes recommendations for reappointment and promotion for all regular faculty and for tenure deliberations of TTT faculty.

Executive Committee

1.9 At the beginning of each academic year, the faculty of the Department will elect an Executive Committee (EC), consisting of five regular faculty members. All tenured faculty members and

ORF at the rank of associate or full are eligible for election to the EC.

1.10 The Chairperson will serve as an ex-officio member and chair of the committee.

1.11 In consideration of cases for reappointment, promotion, or tenure, EC members only participate in the consultations of the EC if they are eligible to participate in the CRPT deliberations of the same case. Thus, for example, associate tenured professors do not participate in EC discussions regarding promotion of a tenured candidate to full professor, nor do ORF members of the EC participate in EC discussions regarding TTT colleagues.

1.12 All regular faculty members are eligible to vote for the EC.

1.13 The EC assists and advises the Chairperson in her or his duties as the chair of the CA and CRPT, including, but not limited to, assistance with initiating a search, arranging interviews and on-campus visits, preparing reports for the CA, and in preparing files, identifying internal and external reviewers, and preparing reports for the CRPT.

1.14 The procedures for electing the EC, together with a more detailed account of its operations, are contained in sections III, IV, and V below.

II. CONFIDENTIALITY

2.1 All members of the CA, CRPT, and EC are obliged to respect the highly confidential nature of their proceedings, including deliberation, voting, recommendations, minutes and other documents. Committee documents are available to succeeding committees to the extent necessary for the appropriate conduct of their business.

2.2 For reappointment and promotion cases, the candidate's professional statement on their scholarship, teaching, and service and an updated *curriculum vitae* will be available to CRPT members electronically from Notre Dame's login-secured file server, and will be made available at the CRPT meeting. At the candidate's discretion, selected publications may be made available electronically behind a login as well. For faculty searches and CA deliberations, video recordings of interviews and job talks, similarly, will be distributed behind a Notre Dame login. All other documents pertaining to a search, or to the reappointment, promotion, or tenure process of a member of the faculty, will be available to the relevant committee in a printed copy only. In order to obtain access to these printed documents, a committee member will be required to sign a statement acknowledging that she or he has received the document, and agrees to respect its confidential nature. This statement must be signed each time the document is accessed.

III. VOTING AND ELECTION PROCEDURES

CA and CRPT Voting Procedures

3.1 Except where otherwise indicated, the deliberation and voting of the CA and CRPT will be governed by Roberts Rules of Order.

3.2 The Chairperson will preside at all sessions of the CA and CRPT, unless for serious reason she or he has to be absent; in that case, the Chairperson will appoint a member of the committee to serve as presider. The presider does not lose his or her right to vote, but is expected to maintain the neutrality proper to the chair of the meeting.

3.3 Each academic year the Chairperson will appoint two members of the regular tenured faculty to serve as Co-Secretaries for all CA and CRPT meetings for that year. At least one of these must hold the rank of full professor. The Co-Secretaries will be responsible for preparing the reports of the deliberations of the committees, in accordance with the procedures outlined below.

3.4 A quorum will consist of two-thirds of the membership of a given committee.

3.5 If for serious reason a committee member is not able to attend a meeting of the CA or the CRPT, she or he may communicate a vote on the question of appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure, to the Chairperson, or the Chairperson's proxy.

3.6 All votes will be taken by written ballot. These will be counted by the Executive Assistant to the Chairperson, or by another administrative staff member or colleague the Chairperson designates, and announced by the Chairperson to the committee. Per University regulations, for CRPT ballots faculty sign their ballot. Anonymity is preserved at the departmental level, but the signed ballots become part of the reappointment, tenure, or promotion file that is forwarded to the dean's office. Faculty do not sign their ballots for votes of the CA.

3.7 The Co-Secretaries will take minutes of all meetings of the CA and the CRPT, including a record of all votes taken. On this basis, they will prepare a report of the deliberations of the committee, including a summary of the different viewpoints expressed, the main lines of disagreement, and the final recommendation of the committee. The report will also include a record of the final vote. This document will be made available to the members of the committee within two working days after the meeting, and the committee members will then have three working days to review the document. Any proposed changes will be incorporated into the final report at the discretion of the two Co-Secretaries. The minutes will be available in hard copy only, and they will be kept for review, and then stored, in the Chairperson's office. Members of the committee who were not present at the meeting may review the minutes following the procedures outlined above, Section II, but may not suggest corrections.

EC Election Procedures

3.8 The election of new members to the EC shall be held by secret ballot at a department meeting in the beginning of the academic year. All regular faculty members of the Department are eligible to vote (see 1.1 and 1.2).

3.9 Members are to be elected one at a time on a series of single ballots, with the results of each ballot to be announced at the meeting. To be elected, a member must receive a majority of votes cast. The number of members to be elected annually is to be spaced over a three-year cycle so that two are elected each year over a two-year period, and one during the third year. Elected members shall serve on the EC for a period of three years, and may be reelected

for a second consecutive term. A faculty member who is elected to two consecutive terms is not eligible for reelection until three years have passed after the end of the second consecutive term.

3.10 Duly elected members who go on leave and do not wish to continue service during the period of their leave are to be replaced, for the period of their leave, by an eligible faculty member elected (at a special meeting, if necessary) by the process outlined above in 3.9.

3.11 A member eligible for election may request, on presenting compelling reasons to the Chairperson, not to stand for election.

3.12 Absentee ballots: Faculty members eligible to vote in an EC election who cannot attend the meeting because of leave, illness, or another substantial reason may write to the Chairperson with his or her choice or choices for each slot open. The absentee ballots will be counted according to the following example: If there are two slots open, the absentee faculty member would send in two names ranked in order of preference. The first name will be entered into the election for the first slot on each ballot until someone is elected. If the absentee's first choice was elected, his or her second choice will similarly be entered into the election for the second slot. If the absentee faculty member's first choice was not elected, this choice will continue to be entered into the election for the second slot, as above.

IV. APPOINTMENTS OF REGULAR FACULTY

Formal procedures for the appointment of regular faculty are found in the *Academic Articles* IV:5:a-g.

4.1 The formal procedure for appointments is in every case initiated by the Chairperson. At the end of the full formal process for a search and hire detailed below, the Chairperson submits a recommendation to the Dean, along with a written report approved by the CA that gives its deliberations and recommendation (*Academic Articles*, IV.5.a). The Dean submits these along with his or her own personal recommendation to the Provost, who submits all recommendations, along with his or her own, to the President, who makes (or declines to make) the appointment.

4.2 In appointments of TTT faculty that result from a search, the process typically begins during the spring prior to the year in which the search will be conducted. Proposals for searches are presented to the faculty at a meeting of the CA, scheduled in accordance with a deadline for receipt of departmental search proposals set each year by the Dean's Office. Proposals are presented to the CA by the area coordinators, after consultation with the faculties of their areas. Individual or groups of faculty members can also recommend searches across the needs of various areas or in other particular areas of needed departmental expertise. After the discussion of the CA of the relative merits of the proposals, the Chairperson makes a recommendation to the Dean, taking into account not only the result of the meeting of the CA, but further communications of faculty to the Chairperson, and advice from the EC.

4.3 If the Dean approves a search, the Chairperson composes a search advertisement, in consultation with the area coordinator of the principal area in which the search is taking place, and

with the advice of the EC. After approval by the Dean's Office, the search advertisement is posted and applications gathered. All faculty on the CA will have access to the application materials.

4.4 The Chairperson appoints a search committee, typically of five members, of which at least one will be a member of the EC, at least two will be from the principal area in which the search is being conducted, and at least one will be a member from another area. The Chairperson will constitute the committee taking into account the need for a membership that reflects the diversity of the Department and the specific needs of the search. In searches which fall in multiple areas, the Chairperson will constitute the committee to reflect the different areas involved, with the advice of the EC.

4.5 The search committee will review all applications and make a recommendation to the Chairperson for a first round of interviews, based on its own discussions and on feedback given it by other members of the CA. The Chairperson finalizes the list of interviews based on this recommendation, after consultation with the faculty of the principal area in which the search is conducted and with the advice of the EC. This list is sent to the Dean or the Dean's delegate for approval, and after receiving their approval, interviews are scheduled. Interviews may be conducted at a distance with video-conferencing technology.

4.6 The first round of interviews is conducted by the members of the search committee and the EC. The Chairperson will make every effort to ensure interviews are recorded and made available for other faculty to view. The Chairperson will organize and chair the interviews. Every effort will be made to schedule the meetings so that the greatest number of members of the EC and search committee can attend, seeking a balance between members of the principal area in which the search is being conducted and other members of the search committee and EC who can bring to the interview broader perspectives regarding the teaching and other needs of the department.

4.7 After all the first round interviews have been conducted, the members of the EC and the search committee will meet to discuss the interviews and advise the Chairperson on a list of finalists to invite to campus. The Chairperson is encouraged to consult with members of the principal area in which the search is being conducted to discuss the list. All CA members may submit their evaluation of the candidates based on their assessment of the taped interviews and other materials. The Chairperson is responsible for sending the list of finalists to the Dean or the Dean's delegate for approval.

4.8 The approved group of finalists will come to campus (typically, early in the Spring semester) for an interview of one to two days. Components of a campus visit include an interview with the Dean, or, at the Dean's discretion, the Dean's delegate; a formal job talk given to all faculty and students, which is recorded so that those who cannot attend can view it; an interview with the Chairperson; and an interview with the search committee and the EC.

4.9 At the conclusion of the process outlined above, the Chairperson convenes a meeting of the search committee and the EC. For each case, the search committee and the EC will select a secretary from among their members, who will record the sense of the discussion and formulate the Committee's counsel on the finalists for the position. This advisory report will be communicated to the full CA to assist in its discussion of a case.

4.10 Then the Chairperson convenes a meeting of the CA to discuss the candidates and vote on a recommendation. The search committee and EC advisory report is presented at the outset of the CA meeting, followed by plenary discussion. At the conclusion of this meeting, the CA recommends a ranked list of candidates to be offered appointment. First the CA recommends the top candidate by a simple majority vote. Then the CA considers from the remaining candidates a candidate to rank second, also by a simple majority vote. The minutes of this meeting are composed according to the procedures presented in 3.7 above.

4.11 The Chairperson writes her or his own recommendation. This recommendation, along with the recommendation of the CA, is forwarded to the Dean. From that point, further conversations about the appointment generally take place between the Dean and the Chairperson. As stated in the Academic Articles, the final decision on the appointment is made by the President.

4.12 Appointments of ORF that result from a search will generally follow the same procedure, although the precise nature of the campus visit may be modified in order to take into account the particular expertise being sought in the appointment. The Chairperson will make these modifications in conversation with the EC and relevant members of the ORF and TTT faculty for a given position.

4.13 Other types of appointment (such as spousal hires or joint hires by the Department and another Department or School) need not follow this procedure, but will always involve discussion by the Chairperson with the EC and consultation with faculty in the principal area in which the appointment would take place. In cases such as those where confidentiality or the need for immediate action make a meeting of the full CA impossible to complete in a timely manner, for example, the Chairperson will minimally consult with the EC and faculty in the principal area in which the appointment would take place. The Chairperson is responsible for constructing the process (or negotiating it on behalf of the Department) to accommodate these different levels of consultation and recommendation. When the Chairperson proceeds on a special case in this manner, he or she will inform the CA of the action taken and the procedures followed in a reasonable period of time.

V. REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE PROCEDURES

5.1 It is the Chairperson's responsibility to inform newly appointed members of the Department of procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure as soon as their appointments begin by supplying them with copies of this document. It is the Chairperson's further responsibility to evaluate all members of the Department annually, and to provide both an oral and written evaluation of untenured TTT members.

5.2 Untenured TTT members of the Department who are contractually required to be reviewed and assessed for reappointment in a given academic year, normally understood as third-year reappointment, present the Chairperson with a professional statement on their scholarship, teaching, and service and an updated *curriculum vitae* by August 15 of their second year (i.e. just before they begin their third year).

5.3 Untenured members of the Department who are contractually required to be reviewed and assessed for tenure in a given academic year present the Chairperson with a professional statement on their scholarship, teaching, and service and an updated *curriculum vitae* by May 15 in the spring semester of the previous academic year or the Monday after May 15 if it falls on a weekend. The candidate also needs to submit seven hard copies of all books, as well as an electronic copy of articles, book chapters, etc. by May 15 or the Monday after May 15 if it falls on a weekend so that the materials can be sent to reviewers. The candidate has the option (but is not required) to provide a list of up to three potential external evaluators of their research at this time. In consultation with the EC and select colleagues in the candidate's area of expertise, the Chairperson may, but is not obligated to, choose up to two of these to make up the six reviewers who will write a research assessment. A candidate may also provide names of two persons who are not to be asked to serve as referees. In such instances, the Chairperson does not use either of these two people as outside evaluators. See also 5.8 below.

5.4 Tenured members of the Department at the rank of associate professor who wish to be reviewed and assessed for promotion to the rank of full professor present the Chairperson with a letter stating their intention; a professional statement on their scholarship, teaching, and service; and an updated *curriculum vitae* by May 15 in the spring semester of the previous academic year or the Monday after May 15 if it falls on a weekend. The candidate also needs to submit seven hard copies of all books, as well as an electronic copy of articles, book chapters, etc. by May 15 or the Monday after May 15 if it falls on a weekend so that the materials can be sent to reviewers. The candidate has the option (but is not required) to provide a list of up to three potential external evaluators of their research at this time. In consultation with the EC and select colleagues in the candidate's area of expertise, the Chairperson may, but is not obligated to, choose up to two of these to make up the six reviewers who will write a research assessment. A candidate may also provide names of two persons who are not to be asked to serve as referees. In such instances, the Chairperson does not use either of these two people as outside evaluators.

5.5 It is the Chairperson's responsibility to explain the evaluation process to each candidate and, when appropriate, provide the candidate with feedback about the materials submitted by the candidate so that the candidate can improve them.

5.6 Requests for non-obligatory promotions, that is, early tenure cases and all promotions to the rank of professor, may be pre-screened by the Dean's Advisory Committee for Non-Obligatory Promotion Cases. It is the Chairperson's responsibility to inform members of the Department of pre-screening arrangements each year as they are received from the Office of the Dean. Members who choose to be pre-screened provide the Chairperson with a current *curriculum vitae* by January 15 or other date communicated by the Dean's Office. The recommendations of the Dean's Advisory Committee are non-binding. Whether a recommendation is positive or negative, a candidate for early tenure or for promotion to full professor has the right to receive, upon request, full consideration of his or her case starting with the Department and proceeding through to consideration by the university president (except as noted in 5.23 below). The candidate indicates their decision to seek promotion according to the procedures stated in 5.3 and 5.4 above.

5.7 Promotion and tenure cases which are not mandated, for example, early tenure or promotion to full professor cases, may be withdrawn at any point in the process, but only with the candidate's approval. Should a case be withdrawn after the solicitation of external letters and revisited the following year, the Chairperson must use exactly the same slate of reviewers as the previous year or must select an entirely different set of reviewers. The Chairperson may not pick and choose from the previous year's list.

5.8 In a promotion to tenure case that is contractually mandated, a candidate may request that her or his case be withdrawn before a final decision is reached and tender her or his resignation effective either at the end of the current year or the following year.

5.9 The Chairperson and the EC hold one or more meetings toward the end of the spring semester each year to discuss the candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure of which they are aware for the following year, in order to:

- a) discuss any special circumstances that must be addressed in upcoming candidate evaluations. These include identifying and accommodating the specific stipulations in the position description of an ORF colleague, contractual stipulations for the evaluation of a colleague who has a joint appointment with another academic unit (e.g. the Keough School of Global Affairs), requests for an evaluation letter from the director of a unit in which a faculty member has contractual obligations (e.g. the Center for Social Concerns), or the need to conduct peer teaching observations in advance if a colleague will be on sabbatical leave during the semester when their candidacy is being evaluated.
- b) advise the Chairperson on a list of referees' names for pending cases of review and assessment, including alternates. See 5.10 below.

5.10 External letters: A minimum of six external letters is required for all tenure and promotion to full professor cases; of these no more than two may be suggested by the candidate. Referees are normally expected to hold the rank of professor or an equivalent rank if from a non-North American institution. Referees hold the rank of associate professor only in exceptional and justified circumstances. Referees reflect the national and international character of the candidate's sub-discipline as appropriate. If two referees from the same institution are selected, reasons are provided in the Chairperson's evaluation of a case.

The Chairperson and EC make every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting referees. The dissertation adviser of a candidate for tenure does not serve as a referee. Scholars who have served on the candidate's dissertation committee, belong to the candidate's home Ph.D. Department, are former teachers, or are close research collaborators with the candidate should be avoided. Any compelling exception is discussed with, and approved by, the Dean and disclosed in the description of the reviewers.

After the final spring meeting of the EC, the Chairperson corresponds with referees, supplying the updated *curriculum vitae* of the candidate concerned in order

to indicate the material to be reviewed and assessed, and usually stipulating a date of September 1 as the deadline for receipt of letters of review and assessment. The Chairperson asks each referee specifically to describe any working relationship he or she has or has had with the candidate in order to avoid any potential conflicts of interest (see above). If such a potential conflict of interest 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 CRPT in its deliberations.

The instructions to the referees must be in writing. To ensure consistency in the letters sent to referees, a standard letter is used that is based on the standard letter presented annually by the Office of the Provost. Changes from the standard letter must be approved by the Dean. June 15 is the target date for securing the agreement of referees to write letters. This procedure does not preclude candidates from adding to their *curriculum vitae* after their initial submission of their research materials to the Chairperson.

5.11 In all cases of review and assessment a candidate is required to compose a professional statement that outlines the candidate's achievements in publication and research, teaching, and service. The statement is used for departmental review and is also included in the packet forwarded by the Chairperson to the Dean of the College. It should adhere to the guidelines presented in the university's annual Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guide, which currently states the statement is no longer than seven single-spaced pages.

5.12 In all cases of review and assessment a candidate is required to present an updated *curriculum vitae*, the contents of which are to follow the guidelines presented in the university's annual Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guide as well as the categories listed on Form P. It is the Chairperson's responsibility to advise a candidate on the format of the *curriculum vitae*. A candidate has the right to add information to the *curriculum vitae* at any stage of an evaluation process up to the second meeting of the Provost's Advisory Committee, which usually occurs in March.

5.13 Candidates for promotion to tenure and promotion to full professor in a given year present their research materials to the Chairperson by May 15 or the Monday after May 15 if it falls on a weekend, supplying six copies to be mailed to the external referees and one copy to be used for internal purposes. The Chairperson is responsible for the timely mailing of the materials to the external referees, and for bringing the internal copy to the attention of the EC and CRPT. In cases in which the expense of acquiring a sufficient number of books is excessive, the Chairperson will seek assistance for the candidate as needed in the form of additional funding for his or her R&PD account.

5.14 Candidates for review and assessment in a given year present their teaching materials to the Chairperson by September 1 (see Protocols for the Evaluation of Teaching below). The Chairperson is responsible for bringing the teaching materials to the attention of the EC and CRPT in a timely manner.

5.15 If a candidate for reappointment, promotion, or tenure has a substantial appointment in a center, institute, or program or has been expected to contribute to another unit of the University as part of her or his duties, the Chairperson will solicit from the director of that unit a letter explaining the faculty member's contributions. The letter will be weighed in the deliberations concerning service.

5.16 In the case of TTT faculty members, the recommendation of the CRPT is based on careful evaluation of the candidate's scholarship, as evidenced by publications and other relevant materials; of the candidate's teaching, as evidenced by Teacher-Course-Evaluation data (prior to 2008) and/or Course Instructor Feedback data (after 2008), peer evaluation and other instruments, including a teaching portfolio; and of a candidate's service to the Department, the University, and to the profession at large. See Section VI for Discipline-Specific Criteria for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure; protocols for the evaluation of teaching; and standards for the evaluation of service.

5.17 Over the course of the fall semester, the CRPT holds a sufficient number of meetings to deliberate on the cases at hand. In the case of TTT faculty members, it is normal procedure to produce three reports evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in the three areas of research, teaching, and service. It is the Chairperson's responsibility, in consultation with the EC, to assign the composition of such reports to individual faculty members, normally three, and to provide the CRPT with all materials relevant to a case and necessary for its deliberations. Each report is subject to a single-spaced six-page limit. The Chairperson does not write such reports.

5.18 In the case of ORF members, deliberations are based on the evaluation of the candidate's teaching, as evidenced by information such as CIFs, peer evaluation and other instruments; of the candidate's administrative leadership, as evidenced by information such as qualitative review of their contributions to the effectiveness of the Department; of the candidate's service to the Department, the College, the University, and the wider academy as evidenced by their *curriculum vitae* and service report; of the candidate's contribution to mission as evidenced by invited presentations, formation duties, publications, participation in national conversations or conferences in ecclesial or academic contexts. Each ORF will be evaluated in some or all of these categories according to the unique configuration of their specific duties as outlined in their job description. See Section VI for standards for reappointment and promotion as well as protocols specifically for the evaluation of ORF.

5.19 For the review of ORF members, in consultation with the EC, the faculty member up for review, and the faculty member's job description, the Chairperson discerns which of three reports – teaching/formation, administrative leadership, service/contribution to (ecclesial) mission – are necessary for a thorough review of the candidate. The Chairperson then commissions up to three reports, and a minimum of two, which evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate in the respective areas pertinent to their job description. It is the Chairperson's responsibility to assign the preparation and composition of such reports to individual faculty members and to provide all materials relevant to a case and necessary for its proper assessment. ORF faculty at or above the rank of the ORF member up for review are

eligible to serve as report writers for any of the possible three reports, especially the administrative leadership report. Evaluators must take care to adequately identify the diverse contexts in which ORF teach, administer, serve, and contribute to mission and tailor the evaluation processes accordingly, using the faculty member's job description (see also Section VI for protocols on the evaluation of ORF). Each report is subject to a single-spaced six-page limit. The Chairperson does not write such reports.

5.20 For each case considered, the EC shall select a secretary from among its members, who will record the sense of the key issues in the case and formulate the Committee's report and recommendations.. This advisory report will be communicated to the full CRPT at the outset of the CRPT meeting to assist in its discussion of a case. The CRPT discussion is followed by a vote of CRPT members, the results of which are forwarded to the dean with the candidate's packet. In recording the vote of the CRPT members, the secretary shall record only the vote, together with a summary of the Committee's deliberations that analyzes the strengths and weaknesses of the case, discusses the committee's conclusions, and provides a supporting rationale for the vote, including references to disciplinary standards. If a recommendation is not unanimous, the summary of the deliberations should accurately reflect all differing opinions. Further instructions on CRPT reporting procedures are outlined in 3.7 above.

5.21 The Chairperson is a non-voting member of the CRPT and writes a separate evaluation of the candidate. There is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the CRPT or between the CRPT and the Chairperson.

5.22 Packets to be forwarded by the Chairperson to the Dean of the College are completed according to the schedule of deadlines announced annually by the Office of the Provost.

5.23 As noted in the *Academic Articles* IV:5:a, if the recommendations of the Dean and either the CRPT and/or the Department Chairperson are negative, the Dean or, at the Dean's discretion, the Department Chairperson must meet with the candidate and deliver written notice to him or her that the decision concerning reappointment, promotion, or tenure is negative and that the candidacy is terminated. When a candidacy is terminated at this stage, the Dean also informs the Provost in writing of the termination but does not forward to the Provost any recommendations or the results of any meeting between the Dean, the CRPT, and the Department Chairperson.

5.24 When, having proceeded to consideration by the Provost Advisory Council, Provost, and President, a faculty member's request for reappointment, promotion, or tenure is denied, the Dean or, at his or her discretion, 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 standards of confidentiality stated in section II above.

VI. STANDARDS FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

6.1 Departmental requirements for faculty ranks are consistent with the general principles of attainment stated in the *Academic Articles* IV.3.a:

The Assistant Professor should have demonstrated promise as a teacher and as a scholar, interest in students, willingness to serve the academic unit, the University, and his or her discipline, and that genuine spirit of study necessary to keep courses current and to assure growth in knowledge and maturity.

The Associate Professor should have demonstrated excellence in teaching, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence on students, service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline, and standing among colleagues. Notable achievement in scholarship, as shown by significant publication or its equivalent or, where appropriate, by meaningful contributions to public service, is ordinarily required for this rank.

The Professor should possess the qualifications required for appointment as Associate Professor, should have maintained excellence in teaching; should have given significant service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline; and should have gained widespread recognition as a scholar.

6.2 The Department of Theology seeks to promote and tenure persons whose accomplishments and potentialities are judged to be of the highest order in research. The Department is considered to be one of the strongest of its kind in the world; therefore, superior scholarship that will sustain and ideally enhance the academic standing of the Department will be required for tenure and promotion.

6.3 The following paragraphs describe typical departmental expectations in the area of research and may be regarded as guidelines, though they do not substitute for faculty consultation with the Chairperson, one's area coordinator, or other mentors within the Department.

A candidate for third-year reappointment as an assistant (or pre-tenure associate) professor is normally expected to show evidence in research of: (a) publishing articles, essays, and chapters in appropriate high quality, peer-reviewed scholarly journals and collections; and (b) making progress with the composition of a first scholarly book or monograph, which may be, but is not restricted to, a substantially revised form of the Ph.D. dissertation, but could also include an unchanged version of the dissertation for inclusion in a prestigious series that stipulates that the dissertation appear essentially in the same state in which it was originally submitted. The definition of "book" and "monograph" varies from case to case according to sub-disciplinary conventions. Equivalent attainments are in all cases permissible. For example, one might argue that the translation of substantial text from an ancient source, annotated and with a lengthy critical introduction, or a critical edition of such a source, with similar annotation and introduction, could be regarded as the equivalent.

A candidate for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor is normally expected to show evidence in research of: (a) publication of articles, essays, and chapters in appropriate high-quality, peer-reviewed scholarly journals and

collections; (b) having published a well-placed first peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph; and (c) making substantial progress on a second major project evincing a research program that reflects current significance and the potential for future growth and fruitfulness.

A candidate for promotion to the rank of professor is normally expected to show evidence in research of (a) continuing to publish articles, essays, and chapters in appropriate high-quality, peer-reviewed scholarly journals and collections; (b) having published a second peer-reviewed scholarly book or monograph; and (c) having a significant and vital research agenda for the future.

6.4 Evidence in research is desirable in all cases, at an appropriate level, of other types of scholarly writings, such as edited or co-edited volumes, review articles, book reviews, and contributions to works of reference. In addition, one's visibility and impact in the profession should be evident by way of papers given in national and international venues, and also through activities such as editing a journal, editing a monograph series, serving on editorial boards, and other forms of professional academic engagement that indicate peer recognition of preeminence in the relevant field.

6.5 In no case does quantitative expectation in research take precedence over quality of attainment. The best journals and publishers for theological scholarship will normally vary over time and by sub-discipline; in assessing quality of placement, the Department will draw on the judgment of scholars from the appropriate sub-discipline within the Department as well as, in the case of promotion and tenure decisions, on the external referees. Publication in venues likely to influence the discipline as a whole is desirable. In assessing quality, the Department is seeking to reappoint, promote, and/or tenure persons whose work shows they are capable of scholarship at the most advanced level and of the highest quality. The Chairperson, the EC, the CRPT, and any other parties appropriately charged with contributing to assessment of a given case, will reflect not only on the candidate's capacity for development to eminence in his or her subject but also on the prospective vitality and continued significance of the candidate's main scholarly interest(s).

6.6 Given the significant diversity among ORF positions, Departmental requirements for faculty ranks are consistent with the general principles of attainment stated in the *Academic Articles* IV.3.c/d and rely upon close evaluation in consultation with each ORF's unique job description:

Teaching Faculty

The Assistant Teaching Professor should have demonstrated promise as a teacher, interest in students, willingness to serve the academic unit, the University, and his or her discipline, and that genuine spirit of study necessary to keep courses current and to assure growth in knowledge and effective pedagogy. Assistant Teaching Professors are evaluated on the unique distribution of responsibilities across categories of administrative leadership, service, contribution to mission, and formation enumerated in their specific job descriptions.

The Associate Teaching Professor should have demonstrated outstanding teaching

ability, growth in knowledge and effective pedagogy, salutary influence on colleagues and students, service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline, and standing among colleagues. Notable achievement in teaching, administrative leadership, meaningful public service, or contributions to (ecclesial) mission is ordinarily required for this rank. Achievements will be measured commensurate with distribution of duties as outlined in each ORF job descriptions.

The Teaching Professor should possess the qualifications required for appointment as Associate Teaching Professor, should have maintained excellence in teaching; should have given significant service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline. Innovation demonstrated through significant impact beyond the faculty member's own courses, substantial administrative leadership, curricular innovation, or widespread recognition for their contributions to the field is ordinarily required for this rank. Innovation will be measured commensurate with distribution of duties as outlined in each ORF job description.

6.7 Professors of the Practice

The Assistant Professor of the Practice should have demonstrated promise as a teacher and/or formator, interest in students, willingness to serve the academic unit, the University, and his or her discipline, and that genuine spirit of study necessary to assure growth in knowledge, skill, and effective fulfillment of their assigned duties. The Assistant Professor of the Practice is evaluated on the unique distribution of responsibilities across categories of administrative leadership, service, contribution to mission, and formation enumerated in their specific job description.

The Associate Professor of the Practice should have demonstrated outstanding teaching ability and/or formation prowess, growth in knowledge, skill, and effective fulfillment of their assigned duties, salutary influence on colleagues and students, service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline, and standing among colleagues. Notable achievement in teaching and/or formation, administrative leadership, meaningful service, or contributions to mission is ordinarily required for this rank. Achievements will be measured commensurate with distribution of duties as outlined in each ORF job description.

The Professor of the Practice should possess the qualifications required for appointment as Associate Professor of the Practice, should have maintained excellence in teaching and/or formation; should have given significant service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline. Innovation demonstrated through significant impact beyond the faculty member's own courses/program, substantial administrative leadership, curricular innovation, or widespread recognition for their contributions to the field is ordinarily required for this rank. Innovation will be measured commensurate with distribution of duties as outlined in each ORF job description.

Protocols for the Evaluation of Teaching

6.8 Candidates for reappointment, promotion, or tenure are invited to submit any materials

they consider relevant towards an evaluation of their teaching, collected in a teaching portfolio prepared for the review of the EC, the CRPT, and the Chairperson. All classes the candidate has taught can be represented in the portfolio. Materials may include syllabi, handouts, exams and other instruments of evaluation, evidence of innovative teaching techniques, evidence of student learning such as copies of student papers (with the names redacted) with the instructor's evaluative comments over the course of a semester, evidence of other major student accomplishments, etc. They may also include, at the candidate's discretion, comments submitted as a part of the CIF process. It is important to note that teaching includes not only classroom teaching but also advising, both formal (such as thesis director) and informal (e.g. advising students from class, advising student groups, facilitating service learning opportunities such as immersion experiences, etc.). The Chairperson should discuss the contents of the teaching portfolio with new faculty members. Alternatively, if the faculty member has chosen to have a faculty mentor, the faculty mentor can discuss this with him or her. While encouraged, because it gives a window into the faculty member's teaching that is alternative to that given in other evaluation sources such as CIFs, a teaching portfolio is not part of the mandatory materials that a faculty candidate must submit for evaluation, as listed on Form P.

6.9 Faculty members start their teaching portfolio from the time of their appointment to the University. Once one is in the habit of keeping such a portfolio, it can be updated each year relatively simply. The portfolio can be used to provide a fuller picture of the candidate's teaching than can be glimpsed from the CIFs alone, and therefore should be considered in the evaluation of a candidate's teaching for reappointment, promotion, or tenure deliberations for TTT faculty, for interim reviews of probationary TTT faculty, and for performance reviews of professional teaching and research faculty, where relevant. The teaching portfolio does not itself go forward for direct consideration by the Dean, the Provost Advisory Council, Provost, or President.

6.10 During a review for reappointment or promotion (ORF or TTT faculty) or tenure, all courses taught in the last three years will be considered eligible for review with the exception of the following: I-credit courses, readings and research courses, summer courses, or any course less than three credits taught in addition to the regular course load. Generally the assessment of syllabi and course materials will focus on three distinct courses, at least one of which should be a core curriculum required course and one a graduate course. If a faculty member does not teach at all levels, as is the case with some ORF, the choice of courses for assessment is adjusted accordingly. The following four elements will be addressed for each course evaluated:

COURSE DESIGN includes meaningful and clearly articulated learning goals, rigor of course, relevance to students' needs, and relationship to the program's curricular requirements.

IMPLEMENTATION includes creating a stimulating environment that is conducive to learning and effectively uses students' time, encouraging students to think analytically and creatively, and developing knowledge, skills, and habits of mind appropriate to the discipline.

EVALUATION OF STUDENT WORK includes setting high expectations for student performance, providing students with helpful feedback throughout the course, and applying appropriate standards for assessing student achievement of course learning goals.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS includes student feedback on quality of instruction and student satisfaction with their learning experience.

6.11 The candidate's professional statement should contain, among other things, a statement about the candidate's own goals and accomplishments in teaching (see 5.11).

6.12 For reappointment, promotion, or tenure cases, the Chairperson will solicit input from the faculty and the appropriate student population(s).

6.13 In all reappointment, promotion, or tenure cases, the Chairperson, in consultation with the EC, will designate a faculty member to write a report assessing the quality of the candidate's teaching. This report will be based on all materials presented by the candidate, on the relevant CIF data, and any conversations the assigned evaluator has with the candidate regarding teaching as part of the review process. It will also include the results of classroom visitations, as applicable. This report must be divided into five separate sections per the ACPET Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching and the Teaching Report Template (both available from the Chairperson), as follows:

- (a) overview of faculty member's teaching contributions;
- (b) comprehensive evaluation of representative courses;
- (c) student perceptions of teaching;
- (d) additional contributions to teaching and learning;
- (e) summary.

The written teaching report is part of the file for the department's deliberations and goes forward with the rest of the file.

6.14 Classroom visitations: Where possible, in cases of reappointment, promotion, or tenure, the faculty member designated to write the teaching report will visit each class the candidate is teaching during the fall semester of the review. (In rare cases if the candidate is on leave or is not teaching on campus, this will not be possible, though every effort should be made to anticipate such circumstance and visit the candidate's classes in the preceding semester). In doing a class observation, the evaluator should use the Department of Theology Class Observation Form (available from the Chairperson).

6.15 In addition to these classroom visitations at the time of reappointment, promotion, or tenure, in other years the EC, together with the Chairperson, will designate one of its own members or another member of the regular faculty in the Department to visit the classes of each tenure-track faculty member, when this is possible. For such class observations, the evaluator should use the Department of Theology Class Observation Form (available from the Chairperson). If the faculty member has chosen a teaching mentor, the teaching mentor

may, at the request of the faculty member, also attend the classes being visited. The EC member or designate will share his or her impressions with the faculty member and provide a brief written account of the visit and the conversation to the EC and the Chairperson. These written accounts will be kept on file and used during the time of reappointment, promotion, or tenure review. They can also be used as the EC and Chairperson discuss the progress of each probationary faculty member at the end of each academic year. Reviewers should keep in mind that the Department recognizes different teaching styles as legitimate (for example, lecture-based or discussion-based teaching styles).

6.16 These same procedures apply to ORF in any year in which they are undergoing a performance review for reappointment or promotion. Where applicable, teaching and/or formation work are evaluated together for reappointment and promotion cases of ORF. It is understood that each particular ORF job description outlines the proportion of teaching/formation appropriate to their position. The particular way an ORF member contributes to the teaching mission of the Department, while often including traditional classroom teaching, varies according to the position. It may include, for instance, field education and formation work (both in groups and in one-on-one meetings) in the MDiv program; advising, curriculum assessment work, or work in pedagogical training of doctoral students; and mentoring of doctoral or postdoctoral students. Particular care must be taken to adequately identify and assess teaching contexts beyond the traditional academic classroom in which departmental ORF serve (see 5.19). Department standards for reappointment and promotion of ORF are commensurate with, and elucidated in, the *Academic Articles* IV.3.b-g and IV.5.b-g.

6.17 Probationary faculty are encouraged to select a teaching mentor from any tenured member of the faculty or an ORF member who has been teaching for five years or more in the Department, and to discuss their teaching, including the results of classroom visitations or other evaluations, with their mentor.

6.18 In cases of reappointment, promotion, or tenure, all members of the EC and CRPT are expected to review all relevant materials, in order to be able to discuss the teaching report submitted by the designated member in an informed fashion, so that each faculty member can make their own properly informed judgment. The summary of the CRPT deliberations will provide an analysis of the discussion of teaching. The Chairperson's letter to the Dean will contain his or her own analysis of the teaching of the candidate, informed by all of the relevant materials and discussions mentioned above.

Protocols for the Evaluation of Service

6.19 The Chairperson in consultation with the EC appoints a faculty member to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of a candidate's service. The candidate's *curriculum vitae* should clearly indicate his or her service to the Department, the College, the University, and the wider academy. The written service report is part of the file for departmental deliberations and goes forward with the rest of the file. In all cases, faculty are concerned to evaluate not the number of assignments but the significance of the assignments and the quality of the candidate's contributions regarding each one.

Assistant Professors: Service for assistant professors is normally 10% of the total workload. A typical load for an assistant professor might be service on one or two departmental committees. Assistant professors do not normally participate in College or University committee work unless the individual has a particular interest in a specific committee and the nature of the work is not overly time-consuming. The service record should demonstrate that the candidate is able to contribute meaningfully to the community of learning and the discipline beyond teaching and research, and in ideal cases that the candidate has the potential for future leadership.

Associate Professors: Service for associate professors with tenure is normally 20% of the total workload; however, the percentage distribution is adjusted upward for individuals serving on several committees and/or as a program director such as the Director of Graduate Studies or the Director of the MTS program. Associate professors typically expand their service contributions by assuming significant departmental positions (for example, membership on the EC) and by extending their service contributions to the College and University. Associate professors may also begin to assume leadership roles in professional societies or on editorial boards.

Full Professors and Endowed Chairs: Service for professors and endowed chairs is normally 20% of the total workload; however, the percentage is adjusted upward for individuals serving in administrative positions, on several committees and/or as a program director. The percentage distribution equals that of tenured associate professors, but the quality of contributions from full professors is typically richer. Ideally, professors and endowed chairs provide leadership in roles such as program directors or Department Chairperson. They also remain active in less formal ways expected of senior leaders (for example, as mentors to junior faculty members) and as substantial contributors to the collegial atmosphere. Full professors and endowed chairs may expand their service to professional societies in the same way that they do to the Department, the College and the University.

Protocols for the Evaluation ORF

6.20 ORF fulfill a variety of roles that contribute in different ways and in different combinations to teaching excellence in the Department, to the administration of the Department's programs, and to service at the departmental, college and university level, as well as beyond the university. Protocols for evaluation of Teaching of ORF candidates for reappointment or promotion are commensurate with those outlined for TTT faculty in 6.8-6.18, with special attention to section 6.16.

6.21 Protocols for evaluation of Service and Contribution to Mission: In the case of ORF candidates for reappointment or promotion, service and contribution to mission are evaluated together. Similar to TTT faculty, service load for ORF should increase commensurate with their rank (see 6.19). Service may include, but is not limited to, departmental committee work, directorship of programs within the Department, contributions extending to the College and University, and leadership roles at regional or national levels in professional associations or societies. Contributions to mission may include presentations, trainings, workshops, formation

duties, publications, and participation in national conversations, work groups, or conferences especially in ecclesial contexts. These may be at the local, regional, national, or international level.

6.22 Protocols for evaluation of Administrative Leadership: ORF frequently fulfill administrative responsibilities essential to departmental function and educational effectiveness. Roles diverge significantly according to position. In the case of ORF candidates for reappointment or promotion, where appropriate (given the candidate's job description), administrative leadership should be evaluated in a separate report. ORF colleagues at or above the rank of the ORF candidate are eligible to write this report at the Chairperson's discretion, particularly those ORF whose administrative roles and experience will provide valuable expertise in constructing the report. Evaluation of administrative leadership could include, but is not limited to, attention to communication, collaboration, efficiency, effectiveness, timeliness and quality of work, regular evaluation of programs under ORF responsibility, anticipation of program needs and requisite planning to meet them. Successful execution of administrative responsibilities should be evaluated on the principles of consistency, completion, and quality, not reduced to a reflection on numbers and quantity.

6.23 In the areas of teaching/formation, service/contribution to mission, and administrative leadership, each particular ORF job description outlines the breadth and extent of their responsibilities. The Department Chairperson should update these job descriptions as needed, in consultation with the faculty member who currently holds the position. The pertinent position description will guide the process of defining and evaluating what configuration of these areas is appropriate for each ORF member. In sum, the weight given to teaching/formation, service/contribution to mission, and administrative leadership, as well as appropriate criteria for assessing how to evaluate them, shall be determined based on this position description and discussed by the Department's EC and CRPT at the time of reappointment or promotion.

VII. AMENDMENTS TO THE ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

7.1 Amendment to this Organization Plan may be proposed by the Chairperson or by a faculty petition signed by two-fifths of the faculty eligible to vote in an EC election.

7.2 Amendment of the organizational plan must be approved by a two-third majority vote of those regular faculty members attending any regularly scheduled department meeting, provided that written notice of the proposed amendment be given at least seven days in advance of the meeting. The terms of office of those then holding a position on the EC will not be affected by the amendment.

7.3 All amendments must be approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and by the Provost or the Provost's delegate.