

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

**Organization Plan for
the Committee on Appointments and the Committee on Reappointment,
Promotion, and Tenure**

I. Committees

1. The Committee on Appointments (CA) consists of the department chairperson, who is the ex officio chairperson of the Committee, and all members of the regular faculty of the department as defined in the *Academic Articles* IV, 1. The purpose of the CA is to implement the procedures for appointment set forth in the *Academic Articles* V, 5.
2. The Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (CRPT) consists of the department chairperson, who is the ex officio chairperson of the Committee, and all 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 tenured at the rank of associate professor. The purpose of the CRPT is to implement the procedures for reappointment, promotion, and tenure set forth in the *Academic Articles* V, 5.
3. In cases where the chairperson is an associate professor, and his or her case is under review, the chairperson will not participate in the committee deliberations; in this instance, the full professors will designate one of themselves to serve as chairperson of the CRPT.
4. In cases of reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the chair will propose a slate of five members of the appropriate Committee as report writers; the slate will be confirmed by vote of the CRPT. Two faculty members will produce the research report, two will produce the teaching report, and one will produce the service report. These report writers will not constitute a voting body nor will they report their findings as a bloc. The candidate will have the opportunity for a confidential, non-binding consultation with the chair concerning the chair's proposed slate prior to the CRPT vote. The chair will appoint at least one research report author who is in or near the field of the candidate or in a position to know the methods and norms of that field. Appointments will be sensitive to the needs of the candidate and to the equal distribution of work within the department (including the possibility that some writers may be serving as writers for another case). For tenure cases, the chair will consider rank in selecting report writers and will appoint at least three at the rank of full professor. Reports must conform to the length constraints designated by the PAC.
(<https://provost.nd.edu/administrative-resources/guidelines/>)

5. A quorum of any meeting of these Committees consists of the department chairperson and two-thirds of the Committee members (eligible faculty who are on leave may participate but are not counted for the purpose of constituting a quorum).

II. General Procedures: Review, Reappointment, and Promotion of Regular Faculty

The recommendations of the CRPT concerning reappointments and promotions of tenured and tenure-track (hereinafter “TTT”) faculty are based on as careful and objective an evaluation as possible of: (a) the candidate’s teaching, (b) not merely the amount but the quality of the candidate’s publication as evidence of a growing intellectual maturity and mastery of his or her field, and (c) the candidate’s services to the Department, the College, the University, and the profession.

1. **Confidentiality.** The members of the Committee are bound to keep everything that is said and done, as well as the contents of reports, during the meetings of the Committee in confidence. Furthermore, in any context outside that of the Committee discussions, Committee members are bound to maintain strict neutrality about Committee decisions. Even if a Committee member has not participated in a discussion or decision, that member is bound to silence and neutrality about the decision.
2. Each year before deliberations begin, the Committee will discuss criteria for review, renewal, and promotions to each rank, as delineated in the *Academic Articles* and this document. In all cases below, if a deadline falls on a weekend or holiday, the deadline shall instead be the first business day following.
3. All members of the Committee participate in the discussions and voting which concern appointment, renewal, tenure, or promotion. Members should prepare for these discussions by becoming very familiar with the candidate’s record. In cases of renewal, tenure, or promotion, Committee members should, at a minimum, read the candidate’s c.v., personal statement, the teaching, service, and research reports, external letters, and a selection from the candidate’s research file.
4. In early February, the department chairperson, in writing, invites the faculty of the department to recommend promotions for themselves or their colleagues. These nominations must be submitted to the department chairperson in writing no later than two weeks from the date of the memo. The Committee reviews every nomination submitted. However, if the candidate has requested and received a review the previous year, the Committee may decline to conduct a review unless the candidate presents reasons to justify his or her request, or if a review is contractually mandated. If the nominee’s contractual situation mandates it, the Committee makes an evaluation, with a recommendation to the Dean. If the nominee’s contractual situation does not mandate it, the Committee determines whether the grounds exist for such an evaluation. Should the Committee so decide, the nominee is notified and an evaluation is carried out; any positive recommendation is forwarded to the Dean, but a negative recommendation is forwarded only if the nominee requests it. When such decisions are not made necessary by the contracts and years in service, faculty may decline to be

considered for promotion. In such cases, the original recommendation will be withdrawn from consideration by the Committee.

Materials for promotions of non-TTT regular faculty are assembled in the spring for review by the CRPT in the fall. See II.19 below for a discussion of promotion procedures for non-TTT regular faculty.

In accord with II.8, TTT candidates for promotion may by 1 April provide a list of reviewers to contact or not to contact. Materials for tenure or promotion (c.v., professional statement, research materials) are due in the chairperson's office on 1 June preceding review in the fall. Supporting teaching materials for the case are due to the chairperson by 1 September.

The department chairperson should explain the evaluation process to each candidate, and, when appropriate, provide the candidate with feedback about the materials submitted so that the candidate can improve them. The chairperson is responsible for gathering the materials necessary for Committee deliberations and for distributing them at the beginning and collecting them at the end of each meeting. The Committee must ensure that it has all relevant information from the candidate to optimize the opportunity for a fair review, and it may request that the chairperson obtain additional information from the candidate. These materials may include previous Committee recommendations which are germane to the case at hand. The department chairperson is further responsible for assigning members particular tasks of evaluation (e.g., evaluations of a candidate's publications, teaching, or service) as indicated in I.4 above.

5. Evaluation of Teaching

In accordance with the University's guidelines for evaluating a TTT faculty member's teaching, the English Department's report on the candidate's teaching will be written by the two members of the appropriate Committee designated by the chair (per I.4). Reports will be formatted in accordance with PAC guidelines. Both report writers will make classroom visits, use the department's classroom observation template, share with each other their observations, and consult with each other in writing their reports so as to coordinate between the evaluation of CIFs and the teaching record. The report will evaluate the candidate's complete teaching record, which will include the following components:

- A. An in-depth review of three courses taught by the candidate *before* the semester of the review (when possible these should comprise one graduate course, one English major course, and one undergraduate service course).

After consulting with the candidate, the teaching report writers will determine which courses will be reviewed. The candidate will supply relevant course materials (syllabi, exams, assignments, etc.), a description of learning goals and methods for each course, and a sampling of graded student work for each course. The evaluators will take into account all materials created for each course (syllabus, exams, assignments, handouts, etc.). The candidate should be prepared to supply graded papers (illustrating a range of

grades) with names redacted. The candidate is responsible for archiving graded work from the three years preceding the review.

The report writers will employ the following criteria as specified by the Advisory Committee to the Provost on the Evaluation of Teaching (https://provost.nd.edu/assets/286163/acpet_guidelines_2_18_07_revised_8_7_17.pdf):

- i. Course design: Are the learning goals for the course meaningful and clearly articulated? Is the course design rigorous, current, relevant to students' needs, and, where appropriate, consonant with the program's curricular requirements?
 - ii. Implementation: Does the faculty member create a stimulating environment that is conducive to learning and effective in the use of students' time? Are students being inspired and encouraged to think analytically and creatively, and to develop knowledge, skills, and habits of mind appropriate to the discipline?
 - iii. 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?
 - iv. Student perceptions: Do the students perceive themselves to be well taught by the faculty member? Are the students more than satisfied with their learning experience in the course?
- B. If the candidate is teaching during the semester of the review: an evaluation of the course(s) taught during the semester of the review, based on classroom visits and an evaluation of the materials that the candidate has developed for those courses.

After consulting with the candidate to find a mutually convenient date for a classroom visit, evaluators will assess:

- The organization and type of the class. Do students understand how the day's lesson fits into the overall schedule or objectives?
- Classroom communication. Relevant questions might include: Are lectures clear? Does the teacher move class discussions through a logical arc? Does he or she give appropriate responses to student questions? How well are difficult questions / situations handled? What is the quality of class discussion as measured by numbers of students involved and the kinds of contributions they make? Does the candidate challenge students to learn? To think in new ways? Do student contributions move the discussion in a fruitful manner?

- The skills being taught. What is being taught? Is it appropriate for the course and level of the students? Are there a variety of appropriate teaching methods employed (e.g., A/V, small group discussion, etc.)?
 - Integration of research with teaching.
- C. An evaluation of the candidate's record of additional contributions to student learning in the form of independent studies, thesis and dissertation direction, student mentoring, supervision of research, the introduction of innovations within the curriculum, etc. Contributions that have led to noteworthy student achievements (e. g., publications, performances, placements, awards) should be highlighted.
- The department chairperson will be responsible for encouraging faculty to save course materials to be considered for review.
- D. An evaluation of the candidate's CIF scores.

6. Evaluation of Research

The two faculty members selected to write the research report (see I.4) will collaborate on an evaluation of the candidate's research. Reports will be formatted in accordance with PAC guidelines. Standards for evaluation of literary scholarship and creative writing differ, and therefore the discussion of standards is divided into separate sections.

Evaluation of Literary Scholarship

Renewal. The candidate should have begun to establish a scholarly reputation in a particular field of specialization. Normally, such a record will entail published or forthcoming essays in well-recognized, peer-reviewed academic journals and/or edited collections of essays published by well-established academic presses. Assessment of the quality of journals and presses, including digital publications, will be determined according to the standards of the candidate's field of specialization. At this stage in a candidate's career, article publication in academic journals should be considered preferable. The candidate should also have presented several scholarly papers at academic conferences, preferably in the candidate's field of specialization. There should also be strong evidence, through some combination of publications and/or manuscript material, of significant progress towards a scholarly book, similarly within the candidate's field of specialization.

Tenure. The department seeks to tenure and promote persons whose accomplishments and potentialities are judged to be of the very highest order in research and creative work. The candidate should have achieved a recognized standing in his or her field of specialization through a combination of publications and presentations of scholarly papers which represents a coherent body of work. The quality and coherence of this work, along with the quality of publication and conference venues, will take priority over matters of quantity. The quality of research activities is assessed by the CRPT in consultation with external reports provided by

leading scholars in the candidate's field of specialization. Normally, external reports should be provided by distinguished full professors at leading academic institutions. In rare cases, and with the Dean's approval, distinguished scholars at institutions not considered in the top tier who are recognized as outstanding authorities in the candidate's area of specialization may serve as external reviewers. Although quality of research figures more significantly than sheer quantity, general expectations for research productivity include a scholarly book (ideally in print) with a well-recognized academic press and a cluster of essays in peer-reviewed academic journals and/or edited collections of essays published by well-established academic presses. In exceptional cases, a substantial and coherently integrated body of scholarly articles, or a major critical edition of a primary work, may be considered as equivalent in research achievement to the publication of a scholarly book. At this stage in a candidate's career, it would be inadvisable to publish essays exclusively in edited collections. Assessment of the quality of journals and presses, including digital publications, will be determined according to the standards of the candidate's field of specialization. These publications should be complemented by scholarly presentations at venues whose quality will also be determined according to the standards of the candidate's field of specialization. The publication of an edited primary work and/or an edited collection of scholarly essays will be considered as significant, though not essential, complements to these scholarly activities. The candidate should also provide evidence (which could include publications, manuscript materials and/or conference papers) of a new research trajectory that extends beyond work already completed.

Full Professor. The candidate is expected to have established a prominent national and international reputation for distinguished scholarship and leadership in his or her field of specialization. Such an achievement is determined by a variety of factors, which may differ according to the candidate's field of specialization. Quality of research is valued above quantity, but candidates will normally be expected to have published two scholarly books and a significant number of scholarly articles, whose overall coherence of focus establishes the candidate as a leading authority in the relevant field of specialization. Editions of primary material and editions of collections of scholarly essays may contribute substantially to this standing. Exceptions to these approximate publication norms should also be recognized. In rare cases, a coherently integrated body of a substantial number of scholarly articles since tenure may be considered equivalent to a second scholarly book in terms of establishing the candidate's prominent academic stature. Candidates at this career stage will often publish scholarly articles in edited collections of essays, and invitations to publish in such venues will be regarded as a mark of the candidate's prominent reputation. Assessment of the quality of publication venues will be conducted according to the standards of the candidate's field of specialization. Further evidence of the candidate's distinguished reputation may include the following: significant presentations of scholarly conference papers, invited addresses, and plenary lectures; the organization of notable scholarly conferences; prominent positions on editorial boards of academic journals and presses; leading positions in scholarly associations; the holding of substantial external grants and fellowships; direction of doctoral dissertations; broad citation of the candidate's published work by other scholars. Supporting external reports on the candidate's scholarly reputation should come from distinguished figures at prominent academic institutions who hold the rank of full professor. Normally, external reports should be provided by distinguished full professors at leading academic institutions.

In rare cases, and with the Dean's approval, distinguished scholars at institutions not considered in the top tier who are recognized as outstanding authorities in the candidate's area of specialization may serve as external reviewers.

Evaluation of Creative Writing

Renewal. Normally, the standard for renewal is similar to that of candidates in scholarly fields of specialization. The candidate should have begun to establish a reputation in a particular area of creative writing. According to the norms of hiring practices in creative writing, the candidate will have begun the tenure track process with one book publication. Since being hired, the candidate is expected to have several works accepted (i.e., either published or forthcoming) in well-recognized literary journals, magazines, or electronic or emerging media. Evidence of a second book project (in published or manuscript form) is expected. The candidate should have also presented several readings at well-regarded literary and/or academic venues.

Tenure. An ideal tenure case in Creative Writing will demonstrate that the candidate has published a substantial body of work in highly regarded presses and journals, developed a coherent body of work that follows a clear trajectory, and established an artistic conversation with other writers of his or her generation about the nature of contemporary creative writing. This conversation may find voice in the candidate's writing itself, in editing the work of other writers, in translation, and in criticism. Supporting external reports on the candidate's reputation as a writer should come from distinguished figures at prominent academic institutions who hold the rank of full professor. In certain cases, and with the Dean's approval, distinguished figures at institutions not considered in the top tier who are recognized as outstanding authorities in the candidate's area of specialization may serve as external reviewers; some appropriate external reviewers may not be linked to an academic institution.

The expectation is that the writer should have published two books with presses that are considered prominent in the candidate's field(s) of specialization. Poets are also expected to have published a range of short works on a regular basis in highly respected literary journals, magazines, or electronic or emerging media. Prose writers may complement their book publications with a group of prose pieces in literary journals, magazines, or electronic or emerging media, but it is understood that novelists will not always publish short fiction and that the standard of two books in itself meets tenure expectations for novelists. Assessment of the quality of presses, journals, and electronic and emerging media will be made according to the standards of the candidate's areas of specialization. It is also expected that the candidate will have given a significant number of readings at well-regarded venues, which could include both academic institutions and non-academic settings associated with important literary activity.

Full Professor. The candidate is expected to have established a prominent national and international reputation for distinguished publication and leadership in his or her area of specialization. Such an achievement is determined by a variety of factors, which may differ

according to the candidate's specialization. Quality of research is valued above quantity, but candidates will normally be expected to have published several books and a significant number of publications in literary journals, magazines, or electronic or emerging media whose overall coherence of focus establishes the candidate as a leading figure in the relevant field of specialization. Editions of primary material and editions of collections of scholarly essays may contribute substantially to this standing. In some cases, substantial numbers of edited works and scholarly articles, in addition to creative work, may be considered equivalent to book publication in terms of establishing the candidate's prominent stature. Assessment of the quality of journals and presses, including digital publications, will be determined according to the standards of the candidate's field of specialization. Further evidence of the candidate's distinguished reputation may include the following: a notable record of readings at important literary and/or academic venues; invited addresses and plenary lectures; the organization of notable conferences; prominent positions on editorial boards of journals and presses; leading positions in literary associations; the holding of substantial external grants and fellowships; mentoring of MFA students; broad citation of the candidate's published work by other writers and/or critics. Supporting external reports on the candidate's reputation as a writer should come from distinguished figures at prominent academic institutions who hold the rank of full professor. In certain cases, and with the Dean's approval, distinguished figures at institutions not considered in the top tier who are recognized as outstanding authorities in the candidate's area of specialization may serve as external reviewers; some appropriate external reviewers may not be linked to an academic institution.

7. Evaluation of Service

The faculty member selected to write the service report (see I.4) will evaluate the candidate's service contributions to the department, university, and the profession within the following guidelines: Assistant professors should typically devote no more than 10% of their time to service, while associate professors with tenure and full professors should generally devote 20% of their time to service. All faculty members are expected to demonstrate that they are committed to contributing meaningfully to the community of learning and the broader discipline beyond teaching and research. Service in the department includes academic advising and active contributions to one's field, such as attending meetings, program activities, and other events.

Renewal and Tenure. It is the policy of the department to shield non-tenured faculty from an amount of service that would distract them from research and teaching. This generally includes appointment as chairs of department committees, a large number of obligations to units outside the department, and appointment to university committees (unless the individual has a particular interest in the specific committee and the nature of the work would not be overly time-consuming). Assistant professors shall be exempt from academic advising and committee work in their first year of service. During their second term assistant professors are expected to take on a greater role in departmental culture and to demonstrate the potential for future leadership. It is customary for assistant professors at this stage to serve on one or two departmental committees.

Promotion to Full Professor and Endowed Chair. More service is expected of those who wish to be promoted to full professor. Associate professors typically expand their service contributions by assuming significant departmental positions and by extending their service

to the college and university. Associate professors may also begin to assume leadership roles in professional societies or on editorial boards. The difference between the service workload of associate professors and full professors is not so much in quantity as in the level of responsibilities within each assignment. The quality of contributions is typically richer. Ideally, full professors and endowed chairs provide leadership as departmental chairpersons and 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.

8. External Evaluations

Deliberations concerning tenure, promotion to associate professor, or promotion to full professor require a minimum of six additional evaluations from scholars outside the University. The candidate may submit to the chairperson by 1 April a list of up to three potential evaluators. In seeking the six external evaluations, the Committee may choose no more than two (2) external evaluators suggested by the candidate, but is not obligated to choose any. The candidate may provide a list of up to two persons to whom (s)he objects as outside reviewers; the department will not contact these two people.

The committee makes every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting reviewers. The dissertation adviser of a candidate for tenure and promotion does not serve as a reviewer, not even as an extra reviewer. Scholars who have served on the candidate's dissertation committee, belong to the candidate's home Ph.D. department, or are close research collaborators with the candidate do not normally serve as reviewers. Any compelling exception is discussed with, and approved by, the Dean and disclosed in the description of the 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. (See II.6 above.) The choice of the outside reviewers will be determined by a discussion and vote within the Committee.

Between the meeting in which the Committee determines the list of outside reviewers and the middle of June, the chairperson corresponds with the reviewers, supplying the updated curriculum vitae of the candidate to indicate the amount of material to be reviewed and stipulating a date of 1 October as the deadline for receipt of letters of review and assessment. The chairperson will specifically ask each reviewer to describe any working relationship she or he has or has had with the candidate to avoid any potential conflicts of interest (see above). If such a relationship becomes known after 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 their deliberations. 15 June is the target date for securing the agreement of the referees to write letters. This procedure does not preclude the candidate from adding to the c.v. before presenting his or her research materials to the Committee.

The instructions to the reviewers and the evaluations of the candidate must be in writing. To

ensure consistency in the requests sent to all 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. The department chairperson will serve as the contact in seeking the outside evaluations. All of the evaluators shall be given the same instructions, and these instructions shall be made in writing.

9. All members of the Committee will prepare for discussion and voting as indicated in II.3. Members of the Committee may offer suggestions for revisions of reports during the discussion of a candidate's case.
10. In every case, deliberations must include casting a preliminary written ballot and a subsequent discussion. After the preliminary ballots are counted and the results announced, each Committee member must vocally identify his or her vote as Approve, Disapprove, or Abstain, and must state the reasons for the preliminary decision. Subsequent debate will focus upon the specific considerations involved in the individual decisions.
11. After each case has been deliberated and preliminary written ballots have been cast and discussed by the Committee, the department chairperson's preliminary decision, including his or her reasons, is to be reported and discussed in the presence of the Committee.
12. Each member of the Committee indicates verbally his or her final vote in one of the following manners: Approve or Disapprove. The department chairperson, who does not vote, counts the votes and announces to the Committee the results of each vote. In the event of a tie vote, the department chairperson calls for further discussion and another vote.
13. A sustained tie vote, or the sustained failure to arrive at a majority of positive votes, is interpreted as a negative decision.
14. The minutes of the Committee's deliberations regarding recommendation for reappointment, promotion, or tenure shall discuss all areas of review, provide a rationale for the committee vote, and be signed by all members of the Committee.
15. If the department chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the Committee's recommendation, the chairperson should meet with the Committee to discuss the disagreement prior to forwarding his or her letter to the Dean. If disagreement occurs, communication and trust are likely to be improved by discussion and debate of the opposing viewpoints. However, there is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the Committee or between the Committee and the chairperson.
16. Faculty members for whom recommendations regarding promotion, tenure, or reappointment have been submitted to the Dean will not be informed of the decision on their case until the date stipulated by the *Academic Articles* and the Office of the Provost.
17. When a faculty member's promotion, tenure, or reappointment has been denied, the department 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 a negative decision without violating rules of confidentiality.

18. Review Policy for Untenured Faculty

Each year the department chair will appoint two to three faculty members to review untenured faculty. This committee will assess each untenured faculty member's progress towards renewal and tenure annually, according to the following schedule: the first review will take place in the spring of the first year of the faculty member's appointment; the faculty member will be reviewed each subsequent spring except for the spring just prior to the autumn in which the faculty member is to be considered for renewal or tenure. At the first review, the committee will review the faculty member's teaching, research, and service up to the time of the review. In subsequent reviews, the committee will review the faculty member's teaching, research, and service for the previous year in relation to the report produced the preceding spring. Upon completion of each review, the committee will produce a written report and a copy of the report will be given to the faculty member. The chairperson will meet with the faculty member to discuss the report and its recommendations.

19. Teaching Faculty

The CRPT will conduct an internal review of Teaching Faculty for renewal and promotion when nominated, as indicated in I.4 above. The CRPT will evaluate the faculty member according to his or her contractual obligations for teaching, administration, and service. In accordance with *Academic Articles* IV, 3, (c), to be promoted to the rank of Associate Teaching Professor a faculty member should ordinarily have demonstrated outstanding teaching ability, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence on colleagues and students as evidenced by curricular innovation, participation in disciplinary conversations about pedagogy, or increased responsibility for academic programs. To be promoted to Teaching Professor a faculty member must further distinguish herself or himself in the areas specified above. Evidence of such distinction may include, but is not limited to, exceptional student advising, creative and effective course design, or mentoring of colleagues. The faculty member should also have given significant service to the department, the University, and/or the discipline; and should ordinarily have made significant academic contributions beyond his or her own courses (more generally within the department, the University, or through national organizations).

20. Promotion to Chaired Professor

Promotion to Chaired Professor shall be conducted in accordance with *Academic Articles* IV, 5, (a). Unlike the promotion to associate professor or professor, the promotion to chaired professor does not occur through nomination. The department chairperson should periodically review faculty to determine whether any merit promotion to chaired professor. In such cases, the chairperson will consult with the Dean about the feasibility of the promotion. If the chairperson and the Dean agree about the feasibility of promotion, the chairperson will constitute a committee of chaired professors of English to review the case. As in all promotions, the committee will consider the individual's scholarly achievements, teaching, and service. This committee will solicit six external evaluations of scholarship from leading scholars in the field. The committee will conduct a meeting at which it will first discuss the merits of the candidate and then vote on the promotion to chairperson, following the procedures for other promotions. The committee will also produce research, teaching, and

service reports. The Chair will forward these to the Dean along with the external letters, copies of teaching evaluations, any other required documentation, and a letter setting out his or her own view of the case.

III. Searches and Appointments

1. Advertised Searches:

- A. For all advertised searches, the department chairperson will appoint a search committee. The committee may include faculty from other departments, but must have a majority of faculty from the Department of English.
- B. The search committee will review applications and select candidates for interviews. In the case of a senior-level appointment, interviews may be omitted, and the committee selects finalists for campus visits.
- C. The chairperson will ensure that as many members of the search committee as possible will participate in the interviews of candidates. The chairperson may also participate and/or invite other faculty to participate in the interviews. As far as is possible, all members of the interview team should participate in all interviews.
- D. As soon as possible after the initial interviews have been conducted, members of the search committee will meet to discuss and rank the candidates interviewed for the purpose of inviting candidates for campus visits. If the committee does not reach a consensus, it will select candidates by majority vote.
- E. The chairperson shall call a meeting of the CA at the earliest convenient date following the last campus visit. At this meeting, the CA will discuss each candidate. After the discussion is complete, the CA will vote by written ballot for the candidate that they wish to rank first. If no candidate receives a majority of the votes cast, there will be a run-off between the two candidates receiving the most votes. After this vote, the CA will continue to rank candidates in this fashion, voting for the second, and when appropriate third, or fourth, etc. candidate. After the candidates have been ranked, the faculty will determine by a majority of votes cast which candidate(s) it is willing to appoint (i.e., the cut-off point in the ranking).

2. Special Opportunity Appointments:

- A. The chairperson of the department will appoint a separate standing long-term recruitment committee for each area identified as a priority in departmental discussions, which may be based, as relevant, on any recent internal and/or external review. The appropriate committee also considers individuals recommended by the internal review, external review, area committees, individual faculty from this or other departments, administrators, or contacts from individuals interested in joining the Notre Dame faculty. If there is no appropriate

standing recruitment committee for a particular individual, the chair will appoint an ad hoc committee, which decides whether to present the candidate to the department for its consideration.

- B. Depending on the circumstances, the committee or ad hoc committee will enable the members of the department to acquaint themselves with the candidate and his/her work.
- C. After departmental discussion has indicated a favorable response to a particular candidate, with the timing at the discretion of the chairperson, each candidate will be questioned about the possibility of leaving his/her current position and coming to Notre Dame.
- D. If the administration and the candidate prove willing that the case be considered, information concerning the candidate will be formally presented to the CA by the appropriate recruitment committee or the ad hoc committee. The CA votes "yes" or "no" on the question of whether to recommend the candidate for an appointment to the faculty.

3. Visiting Faculty Appointments

Proposals for full-time visiting faculty positions of one or two semesters will be reviewed by a committee appointed by the Chair. If the Committee decides to recommend making an offer for a visiting faculty position, it will circulate to the CA a brief description of the purpose in bringing the visitor and for making the recommendation, together with the visitor's curriculum vitae. The CA will have one week to comment on the proposed visiting position. Upon receiving comments from the department, the ad hoc committee will vote formally on whether to extend an offer. When circumstances make it impossible to consult the CA, the chairperson may make a short-term appointment to fill a vacancy or meet department teaching needs.

VI. Provisions for Amendment

- 1. Any amendment to this organization plan may be adopted by the absolute majority vote of the regular faculty of the department. The amendment must be discussed at a department meeting, as outlined in the sections below. All votes will be by secret written ballot.
- 2. Upon a written petition by at least ten members of the regular faculty of the department (as defined by I.1), the department chairperson will call a meeting for the purpose of considering proposed amendments.
- 3. The proposed amendment or amendments are submitted to the department chairperson in writing so that they can be included among the agenda in the notice announcing the

meeting. This provision applies to a regular department meeting of the faculty as well as to one called by petition.

4. Amendments which are adopted must be in accord with the Faculty Handbook and are subject to the approval of the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and the Provost or Provost's designee.

Approved by majority vote of the faculty of the Department of English on December 6, 2019:

Jesse M. Lander 12/6/19
Jesse M. Lander Date
Chairperson

Approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters:

Sarah A. Mustillo 12/6/19
Sarah A. Mustillo Date
I. A. O'Shaughnessy Dean

Approved by the Provost or Provost's designee:

Mama Ryz 1/20/20
Date