

**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**

**Organizational Plan**

COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

FULL PROFESSOR COMMITTEE

**Table of Contents**

Purpose and Membership .....	2
Election Procedures .....	2
Procedures and Guidelines .....	3
Disciplinary Standards .....	5
Research .....	5
Teaching .....	7
Service .....	8
Provisions for Kroc Institute Faculty .....	9
Confidentiality .....	9
Amendments to the Organizational Plan .....	9

# **DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY**

## **Organizational Plan**

### **COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS**

#### **FULL PROFESSOR COMMITTEE**

#### **PURPOSE AND MEMBERSHIP**

1. The Committee on Appointments and Promotions will consist of six members. The chairperson of the committee will be the Chairperson of the Department of Sociology serving as a non-voting member. The remaining five members will be full or associate tenured members of the department. Two and three members will be elected in alternate years for a two year term. An alternate will also be elected to fill vacancies that may occur between the yearly elections of the CAP.
2. Full Professor Committee: Promotion to full professor will be considered by a committee of all eligible full professors. The Chairperson of the department will serve as a non-voting member and chair the committee. If the committee is considering the Chairperson for promotion, the committee will elect a member of the committee to chair the deliberations. When deliberations concerning the Chairperson's case have been concluded, the Chairperson will resume the role of committee chair.

#### **ELECTION PROCEDURES**

3. All members of the department who have been on the regular faculty (tenured, tenure-track, or special professional) for at least two semesters prior to the election are entitled to vote. Adjunct and visiting faculty cannot vote. Faculty having a joint appointment (but not a courtesy or concurrent appointment) can vote and hold office. The election will be held at the end of each spring semester by a secret ballot.
4. Under the amended procedures adopted at the September 5, 2003 faculty meeting, the method of election will be the following: from a list of all eligible and willing department faculty, the top six receiving votes on the first ballot will be placed on a run-off ballot. On the second ballot, the number of positions to be filled, minus one, will be elected. On the third ballot, the last winner will be elected. On the fourth ballot, the alternate will be elected. On each ballot, the chair will not vote, unless there is a tie. The chair need not and should not announce when such a tie-breaking vote has been necessary. On the first ballot, the number of names for whom an eligible faculty member may vote should equal the total number of positions to be filled. On the second ballot, the number of names for whom an eligible faculty member may vote should equal the total number of positions minus one. Eligible faculty may vote for only one name on the third ballot and one name on the final

ballot. For example, in a year in which two seats are open, on the first ballot, eligible faculty will vote for up to two people. The top six vote getters will then proceed to the second round. In the second round, eligible faculty vote for one person. The top vote getter will be elected to a two-year term. In the third round, eligible faculty vote for one person. The top vote getter will serve a two-year term. In the fourth round, eligible faculty vote for one person. The top vote getter will be the alternate for a one-year term.

5. If, for any reason, a member of the committee cannot serve during his or her elected term, the alternate will take his or her place until the next election of the CAP. If the original term has not expired at the time of that CAP election and the original faculty member can return to the CAP, he or she will resume the position until the end of the original term. If he or she cannot continue or does not wish to continue, another faculty member will be elected to fill the remainder of the term.

## PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

6. Assessment and determination of future faculty needs will involve the total departmental faculty, although specific recommendations for a particular candidate for hiring will come from the CAP.
7. Candidates undergoing evaluation for reappointment, tenure, or promotion will have their required supporting materials reviewed by the CAP (or Committee of Full Professors, when appropriate). These materials include an updated CV, a five-page personal statement that addresses the candidate's research, teaching, and service, and materials that can be used to evaluate teaching. These must be submitted by August 15. The candidate should consult with the Department Chair to discuss the preparation of these materials prior to this deadline, preferably in the spring semester before she or he is to be evaluated. Certain members of the CAP (or Committee of Full Professors) will be assigned to evaluate specific areas of the candidate's performance (i.e., research, teaching, service) and to report their evaluations to the committee. However, all members of the committee will be expected to be familiar with materials collected in the evaluation process.
  - (a) For cases involving promotion or tenure, evaluations of a candidate's research must be obtained from at least six external reviewers. A candidate may submit a list of up to three potential external reviewers, from which no more than two may actually be selected. The candidate may also submit a list of no more than 2 potential external reviewers to whom the candidate objects. The department is prohibited from using either of those persons as external reviewers. The expectation is that all reviewers will be full professors; if an associate professor is used, there must be an explanation of the need for that specific reviewer.

The Committee will make every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting external reviewers. Reviewers who have served on the candidate's dissertation committee or who are close research collaborators will be avoided. Any exceptions will be discussed with and approved by the Dean. The

Chairperson will correspond with potential reviewers, supplying them with the updated curriculum vitae of the candidate to indicate the material to be reviewed and stipulating a date of November 1 as the deadline for receipt of letters of review and assessment. At this point in time, the chairperson will specifically ask each reviewer to describe any working relationship she or he has or has had with the candidate in order to avoid any potential conflict of interest. If such a relationship becomes known following the solicitation of external letters, these letters will be included in the packet, the conflict of interest will be disclosed in the description of the reviewers, and additional external letters will be sought so that six external evaluations from reviewers who have no perceived or potential conflict of interest are available to the Committee in its deliberations.

- (b) All instructions sent to external reviewers, and all evaluations of candidates, must be in writing. To ensure consistency in the requests sent to reviewers, the letter to external evaluators 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. An appropriate honorarium will be offered to outside referees.
- (c) The department Chairperson should 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.
- (d) The CAP (or Committee of Full Professors) has an obligation to ensure that it has all relevant information from a candidate to optimize the chance for a fair review. When the committee identifies the need for specific information, the Chairperson should request that the candidate supply the information.
- (e) At the conclusion of all reviews for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the CAP (or Committee of Full Professors) must produce a report of their deliberations that contains sufficient information to explain why committee members voted as they did. The Committee summary will analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the case, discuss the Committee's conclusions, and provide supporting rationale for the vote, including references to disciplinary standards. If a recommendation is not unanimous, the summary will accurately reflect all differing opinions. The summary must report the Committee's vote and it must be signed by all members of the Committee.
- (f) If the department Chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the CAP's (or the Committee of Full Professors's) recommendation, the Chairperson should meet with the CAP (or Committee of Full Professors) to discuss the disagreement. If there may be disagreement, communication and trust are likely to be improved by open discussion of the opposing viewpoints.

- (g) A candidate for early tenure or promotion to full professor has the right to receive, upon request, a full review of his or her case, starting with the department CAP (or Committee of Full Professors) and proceeding through to review by the President. When the review is not contractually mandated and the candidate has requested a review the preceding year, the department CAP (or Committee of Full Professors) can decide not to conduct a full review the second year if the committee determines that the candidate has not presented sufficient reasons to justify his or her request.
8. If a faculty member's request for reappointment, tenure, or promotion is denied, the Chairperson will deliver the letter and advise the candidate that, upon request, the Dean will meet with the faculty member to give as full a report as possible of the reasons for the negative decision, without violating confidentiality.

## DISCIPLINARY STANDARDS

### 9. Standards for Tenure and Promotion

The Academic Articles of the University state that tenured associate professors should have "demonstrated outstanding teaching ability, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence on students, and standing among colleagues" (III.3.a). In addition, "Notable achievement in scholarship, as shown by significant publication or its equivalent or, where appropriate, by meaningful contributions to public service, will ordinarily be required..." Full professors should "possess the qualifications required for appointment as associate professor, should have maintained excellence in teaching, and should have gained widespread recognition as a scholar" (III.3.a). To produce sufficient clarity and provide guidance both to candidates and to those involved in making tenure and promotion decisions, the University's broad guidelines require interpretation by departments using their own disciplinary standards.

RESEARCH: As a discipline, sociology recognizes and encourages a variety of research styles and forms of scholarly expression. Indeed, this intellectual diversity is one of its great strengths. As a result, successful tenure and promotion cases vary substantially according to the demands and norms present in sub-disciplinary specialty areas.

Despite the diversity of approaches in sociology, there is a common orientation guiding tenure and promotion in the Department of Sociology at Notre Dame. When evaluating the research record of a tenure candidate, the most important criterion is that the candidate has developed at least one strong, coherent research program in which she or he has developed and become associated with an important theoretical idea or substantial empirical contribution. It is not enough to have simply amassed a long list of publications with solid placements. Rather, the department aims to confer tenure on a candidate who has demonstrated an influential, high quality contribution to the field of sociology and who is pursuing a line or lines of thinking that will result in a substantial advance in sociological scholarship and theory.

Achievement of this goal can be demonstrated by a number of means, but most typically is accomplished by publishing scholarly articles, books, or a combination of the two, all of which are viewed as equally valid and valuable by the broader field. Choices made about publishing through books versus articles should be made after careful consideration of the norms in the individual's sub-disciplinary areas, the style of research work and writing, how to influence the appropriate audience, and mentoring advice from senior scholars.

Although there is no hard and fast quantitative criteria for the volume of output, a typical article record at tenure time usually contains approximately 10-12 articles (equivalent to about 2 per year during the probationary period), and 2-4 of these in the top general journals in the field or the top specialty journals in the candidate's primary area of research. The number of research articles published can vary fairly widely depending on the placement of the articles, the pattern of co-authoring, and the quality and originality of each piece. While collaborative research is valued by the department and is the norm in many sub-fields, solo-authored and lead-authored pieces are generally better evidence of a junior faculty member's contribution to, and potential influence on, the field. Edited books may be important contributions to the field. However, when editing a book, a candidate should demonstrate his or her own intellectual contribution to it by publishing a substantial chapter or chapters within it. Publishing chapters in other scholars' edited books may be important, but should not constitute the bulk of the research record. The published articles combined should evidence a sustained and growing engagement with at least one particular intellectual issue and show progress in the treatment of the problem from article to article.

A typical book record would usually, but not universally, consist of a book (possibly derived from the dissertation) published with a strong university press and 3-5 articles or chapters that may or may not be related to the book project. Although different in style of presentation of the core ideas, the book should evidence the same kind of sustained engagement with an intellectual problem as the series of articles.

Whether taking the book route or article route, the tenurable candidate also will have demonstrated the ability to establish an independent research program by developing work (through, for example, new articles or credible steps toward a second book project) that extends beyond the dissertation.

The department may also expect to see some attempts to procure external funding or fellowship support (more or less depending on the kind of research the candidate produces) but would not necessarily expect successful grant-getting at this point.

It is important to emphasize that meeting the numerical thresholds in the examples above will not, by itself, be sufficient to achieve tenure. In the end it is the quality, visibility, and potential impact of the body of scholarly work that is critical.

When evaluating the research record of a candidate for full professor, it is most important that the candidate has developed a post-tenure research record that has made a progressive and influential contribution to knowledge and theoretical development in the field of sociology, be that through deepening an existing line, expanding to new intellectual terrain, or synthesizing and generalizing past work. Just as when candidates are considered for tenure, a long list of publications is inadequate, in-and-of itself. Rather, the body of scholarship must have had a recognizable impact on the primary sociological sub-fields in which the candidate works. In terms of research volume, the post-tenure expectations approximate or perhaps slightly exceed those expected prior to tenure. Procurement of some form of external funding is typically expected, unless the core work of the candidate does not call for such support.

TEACHING: Notre Dame's Academic Articles (III.3a) state that a candidate for associate professor should, among other things, "have demonstrated outstanding teaching ability," and that a candidate for full professor "should have maintained excellence in teaching."

In general, candidates for renewal, tenure and/or promotion should provide evidence to CAP that they are challenging students and that they are helping students to develop skills that are appropriate to the courses that they teach. These may include skills related to research methods, statistical analysis, critical thinking, ability to apply important concepts, development of evidence for claims, writing skills, and oral expression.

CAP will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of teaching whenever a faculty member is being considered for renewal or for tenure and/or promotion. The comprehensive evaluation includes an analysis of TCE scores, additional contributions to teaching, and also an in-depth evaluation of at least three representative courses taught during the last three years. These courses will be selected by the Department Chair in consultation with the faculty member who is being evaluated. As part of these in-depth course evaluations, faculty members must submit a syllabus and copies of teaching materials such as exams, assignments, and descriptions of in-class exercises and activities.

The in-depth evaluation of teaching will fully address the following:

- (a) Course Design: Are the learning goals for the course meaningful and clearly articulated? Is the course design rigorous and, where appropriate, consonant with the program's curricular requirements?
- (b) Implementation: Does the faculty member create a stimulating environment that is conducive to learning? Are students inspired and encouraged to think analytically and creatively, and to develop knowledge, skills, and habits of mind appropriate to the discipline?

- (c) Evaluation of Student Work: Does the faculty member employ reliable balanced approaches for assessing a student's achievement of the course learning goals? Does the faculty member set high expectations for student performance, provide students with helpful feedback throughout the course, and apply appropriate standards when evaluating student work?
- (d) Student Perceptions: Do the students perceive themselves to be well taught by the faculty member? Are the students satisfied with their learning experience in the course?

Peer visitations are an important part of the evaluative process. Direct observation of teaching can reveal teaching strengths and weaknesses and provide opportunities for conversations about teaching that will help the evaluator to better understand the instructor's approach to teaching. These conversations can also be used to provide feedback to instructors that can be used to improve teaching effectiveness.

Prior to a renewal decision, each candidate will be visited at least once by the Department Chair and at least twice by a member of CAP. The process is repeated when a candidate is going up for promotion to associate professor with tenure, and when going up for promotion to full professor. In the latter case, however, a member of the Full Professors Committee (FPC), rather than a member of CAP, would participate in the peer visitation process.

In addition to materials requested as part of an in-depth evaluation of specific courses, faculty members may voluntarily submit a teaching portfolio or any other evidence of teaching effectiveness. For example, they may submit copies of students' written work, with names redacted, to show how students have responded to particular assignments or to demonstrate how students have benefited from the faculty member's mentoring. They may also provide evidence pertaining to effective mentoring of graduate students, promotion of undergraduate research efforts, special educational initiatives and innovations, advising workloads, and other activity related to teaching excellence so that this important work can be taken into consideration in the evaluation process.

**SERVICE:** Although service is a relatively modest requirement for the pre-tenure period, assistant professors should demonstrate commitment to the department and university through meaningful participation in committee work. Typically, an untenured assistant professor would devote no more than 10% of her or his time to service with the other 90% being divided between research and teaching. More service is expected of those who wish to be promoted to full professor; the College standard for tenured faculty is 20%. As faculty members continue to achieve greater standing in the academy, there should also be a commensurate increase in his or her contributions to professional services roles, which can be useful indicators of visibility in the discipline and beyond.

Although faculty candidates for promotion may find these guidelines helpful, they should be careful to avoid interpreting them without consulting with senior colleagues. The intent of including them in the CAP document is to encourage discussion among the faculty so that the standards and developing records of faculty are clearly understood and fairly judged.

#### PROVISIONS FOR KROC INSTITUTE FACULTY

10. The membership of CAP or the FPC will be expanded when faculty members with special appointments in the Joan B. Kroc Institute are being considered for renewal, tenure, or promotion. These special appointments are defined as faculty members who were recruited and hired by the Kroc Institute, who are not sociologists by training, and whose salaries are paid in full by the Kroc Institute. In such cases, where the Department of Sociology has agreed to serve as the faculty member's tenure home, the Department will expand the membership of CAP or the FPC to include as voting members: the Regan Director of the Kroc Institute; two tenured Kroc faculty members chosen by the Regan Director; and a tenured faculty member from the University at large, chosen by the Provost. The department Chairperson will not vote, but will serve as chair of the expanded Committee. The expanded Committee will follow the review procedures outlined in the Department of Sociology's CAP document, except that the candidate's teaching and scholarship will be evaluated against the discipline-specific standards for peace studies that have been approved by a majority of faculty in the Kroc Institute and by both the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Provost. The Regan Director will appoint report writers for research, teaching, and service. These reports will be included in documentation that the department forwards to the Dean and Provost in the advancement process.

#### CONFIDENTIALITY

11. All business conducted by CAP or a Full Professor Committee (FPC) relating to appointments, renewals, or promotions is strictly confidential.

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN

12. Provisions for amendment:
  - (a) Any amendment to this organization plan may be adopted by a majority vote of all department regular faculty (as defined in point 2).
  - (b) Upon written petition by at least one-third of the members of the department regular faculty (as defined in point 2), the Chairperson will call a meeting for the purpose of considering and voting on proposed amendments.
  - (c) The proposed amendment or amendments are submitted to the Chairperson in writing so that they can be included on the agenda in the announcement of the meeting. This provision applies to a regular department meeting of the faculty as well as to one called by petition.

