

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME

DEPARTMENT of POLITICAL SCIENCE

September 12, 2014

Amended:

September 9, 2016

October 14, 2016

April 30, 2020

May 5, 2023

**ORGANIZATION PLAN FOR THE COMMITTEE ON
APPOINTMENTS AND THE COMMITTEE ON
REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Committee on Appointments/Committee on Reappointments, Promotion, and Tenure	
Purpose and Membership	2
Confidentiality.....	4
Election Procedures.....	4
Renewal and Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	
Standards	5
Timing and Procedures	5
Non-obligatory Promotions.....	7
Materials to be provided by the candidate	7
CRPT Procedures and Guidelines	7
Research	8
Teaching	14
Service	16
Further Provisions	17
Promotion to Full Professor	
Full Professor Committee	18
Standards	18
Procedures	21
Named Chairs	23
Non-Tenure Track Faculty	
Types of Non-tenure track faculty	23
Standards for Promotion	23
Procedures for Promotion.....	25
Review of Untenured Faculty	26
Organizational Plan	27

COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS/COMMITTEE ON REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE

Purpose and Membership

A. The Committee on Appointments

1. The Committee on Appointments (CA) consists of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members of the Political Science Department, regardless of rank and regardless of the rank to which the candidate would be appointed. In the case of an appointment as a non-tenure track faculty member, the Department Chairperson may appoint non-tenure track faculty of the same rank or higher to the CA. Any non-tenure track faculty named to the CA will have the same responsibilities and voting rights as the other members of the CA for the purposes of that appointment. The Department Chairperson chairs the CA and serves as an ex-officio member.

The CA makes recommendations for appointments to the regular faculty as defined in Article IV, Section 1, subsection a (1-7) of the Academic Articles: Tenured and Tenure-Track, Teaching, and Professors of the Practice. Qualifications for appointment to the regular faculty at the rank of instructor, assistant professor, Associate Professor and professor are specified in Article IV, Section 3, Subsections (a-g) of the Academic Articles.

The procedure for appointments to the faculty as University Named Chair are described in Article IV, Section 5/Subsection (a) of the Academic Articles.

If away from campus at the time of the meeting in which the CA deliberates on appointment cases, faculty who serve on a search committee may participate in the meeting via telephone or video. Other department members who cannot attend the meeting may send written comments to be read at the meeting. However, only department members physically present at the time the vote is called may cast a ballot. Graduate student opinion about candidates for appointment may also be considered by the Committee. College and University regulations require the Chair to convey an independent opinion in all of these matters in a letter addressed to the Dean.

Meetings of the CA require a 2/3 quorum of all eligible faculty in that semester, specifically all tenured and tenure-track faculty not currently on leave.

B. The Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

2. The Committee on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (CRPT) consists of all members of the tenured faculty of the Department or School 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 Associate Professor.

When a non-tenure track faculty member is being considered for reappointment or promotion, the Department Chairperson may also appoint other non-tenure track faculty of the same rank or higher to serve on the CRPT. Any non-tenure track faculty named to the CRPT will have the same responsibilities and voting rights as the other members of the CRPT for the purposes of that reappointment or promotion case.

Upon request of at least one-half of the membership of the CRPT, the Dean may appoint a tenured faculty member from outside of the Department who has an area of expertise related to a particular candidate's research to serve as a voting member in that candidate's appointment or promotion review.

3. There shall also be an Executive Committee (EC), to consist of three tenured members elected by all members of the department for two year staggered terms.
4. The EC consists of the Chairperson of the department who serves as the *ex officio* Chairperson of the EC and three members of the department.
5. Each Individualized Promotion Committee (IPC) includes the members of the EC and two *ad hoc* members appointed by the Department Chairperson with the approval of the EC. The Department Chairperson, with the approval of the EC, shall appoint *ad hoc* members to supplement the EC as appropriate, e.g., by providing field representation. The relevant field may be asked to submit a recommendation to the IPC for members. *Ad hoc* members are to be full participants in the entire review of a candidate for tenure. The IPC prepares reports on the research, teaching, and service of each candidate, and deliberates on the case. A summary of those deliberations (i.e. minutes) is made available to the CRPT.
6. *Mutatis mutandi* for Full Professor promotion decisions, but with a special election for Full Professor EC (FEC) if and as necessary, i.e., if the EC contains members below the rank of Full Professor.
7. EC shall conduct the annual spring review and the contractual third year review of untenured faculty.
8. Eligibility to serve: All members of the CRPT must hold the rank of associate professor or professor, and must have tenure, and must be appointed as members of the department.
10. Term: The regular term for the elected members of the EC is two years and begins after the Spring election. But the membership of the EC will be staggered to ensure continuity from year to year.

11. The EC may serve as an advisory body to the Chairperson and to the Department in all other departmental matters.

Confidentiality

12. CRPT, EC, and Full Professor CRPT (FCRPT) meetings are confidential. However strong the temptation may be to inform colleagues or others of Committee deliberations, such action represents a violation of the Academic Code. If a faculty member does not support this policy, he or she can work with appropriate legislative bodies, such as the Academic Council, to implement change. If a faculty member is unable or unwilling to act according to this policy, he or she should withdraw immediately from all CRPT and FCRPT deliberations.

Meetings of the CRPT require a quorum of 2/3 of all faculty eligible for the CRPT in that semester, specifically all tenured faculty not currently on leave.

Election Procedures

13. The EC is elected annually. The regular tenure and tenure track faculty elect up to three members by plurality from among the tenured faculty of the Department late in the Spring semester. A faculty member who is leaving the department and will not be present the subsequent fall is not eligible to vote. Balloting normally takes place during Finals week at the end of spring semester, with ballots returned by noon on the Friday of Finals week. If the elected EC contains one or more Associate Professors, the Full Professors who gained the next highest number of votes will constitute the Full Professor EC.
14. The names of all tenured professors and Associate Professors appointed to the department and eligible for election will appear on the ballot for the EC. Faculty who are promoted to Associate Professor with tenure during the Spring in which the election is held are eligible for EC service in the following year. At the time of the election, faculty who know they will be on leave for either semester of the following year are not eligible for EC service. No individual may serve on the EC more than four consecutive years or more than four years in any period of six consecutive years.
15. Voting for the EC is secret. Ballots for the election of the EC members are counted by the senior administrative assistant; the three candidates receiving the most votes are announced. Ballots will be retained until the end of May and are available for inspection by any eligible voter. In case of a tie, the person with the *least* amount of service on EC over the preceding 10 years will be the one elected. The administrative assistant records (but does not announce) which faculty member received the fourth most votes; if an elected EC member becomes ineligible for some reason during the year, the faculty member who received the next most votes joins the EC. In the event the EC contains one or more Associate Professors, the senior

administrative assistant will record votes for the Full Professors separately so as to constitute a Full Professor EC if necessary.

RENEWAL AND PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH TENURE

Standards

16. The University sets the standards for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure in the Academic Articles, Article IV, Section 3, Subsection (a). "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."
17. A candidate for early tenure may receive full consideration of her/his case, as specified by the guidelines from the Dean's office regarding all non-obligatory promotions (see paragraphs 42-44 below). But when this review is not contractually mandated and the candidate has requested and received review the preceding year, the CRPT may decline to do a full review the second year if it does not consider the reasons for the second request to be justified.

Timing and Procedures

18. Candidates for tenure or promotion will be reviewed by a process that combines outside evaluation of scholarship with an independent CRPT assessment. Candidates may submit up to three names of external scholars whom they would like to serve as reviewers of their writings and two names of reviewers who will be excluded from being contacted. These names should be submitted by the first Monday in March for the review process that will take place during the subsequent fall semester. The EC, in consultation with other faculty with relevant expertise, will generate a list of reviewers as well and the Chair will then solicit reviewers. No more than two of the reviewers may be selected from the candidate's list but the EC may decide to solicit none of those recommended by the candidate. A minimum of six outside reviewers is required.

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. Outside evaluations of candidates for promotion and tenure should normally be solicited from faculty in leading or peer programs; if not, justification for their selection is necessary. Rare exceptions may occur, for example, if a strong argument can be made concerning the need for specialized knowledge;

however, even in such cases, the University is interested in the candidate's broader impact on the field. The final choice of the outside referees will be determined by a discussion and vote within the EC.

The Committee makes every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting referees. The dissertation advisor of a candidate may not serve as a referee, not even as an extra 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 should be avoided. Any compelling exception is discussed with, and approved by, the Dean and disclosed in the description of the reviewers.

Between the final spring meeting of the EC and the end of July, the Chairperson corresponds with the referees, supplying the updated curriculum vitae of the candidate in order to indicate the material to be reviewed and assessed, and stipulating a date of the first Tuesday in September as the deadline for receipt of the external letters. 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. If such a conflict of interest becomes known after the solicitation of external letters, all letters are included in the promotion packet, the conflict of interest is disclosed in the description of the reviewers, and additional external letters are sought so that six outside evaluations from reviewers who have no perceived or potential conflict of interest are available to the Committee in their deliberations.

There should be consistency in the requests sent to all the reviewers for the same candidate and consistency in the requests sent to reviewers for different candidates from the same department. The instructions to the reviewers and the evaluations of the candidates must be in writing. The letter to external evaluators is based on the standard letter included in the *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guide*, which is updated regularly by the Office of the Provost; changes from the standard letter must be approved by the Dean.

The candidate will designate the items of written work to be evaluated by the outside referees, and the Chairperson will seek the outside evaluations. All publications designated by the candidate are sent to the outside referees. Such designation is in no way meant to limit the Committee or the outside evaluators from making a complete assessment of the rest of the candidate's work.

An IPC member will be assigned to prepare a research report on the candidate's scholarship. All IPC members will examine the candidate's writings, but in the normal case the IPC reports along with the external reviewers' letters, will serve as the basis of the IPC and CRPT discussions.

19. The candidates submit their full tenure files/packets to the Chairperson by the first Monday in June. The candidate and the Chairperson should discuss the process of

tenure/promotion review preferably in the spring semester prior to the review year, with particular attention paid to the materials submitted for review.

20. Candidates for renewal submit their renewal files/packets to the Chairperson by the second Monday in September.

Non-Obligatory Promotions

21. Promotion and tenure cases which are not mandated, for example, early tenure 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 exact same slate of reviewers must be used as in the previous year, or an entirely different set of reviewers must be introduced.

Materials to be Provided by the Candidate

22. The material to be included and specific formatting are University requirements. These requirements may be found in the *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guide*, available from the Provost's Office, or provided by the Chairperson's senior administrative assistant.

CRPT Procedures and Guidelines

23. Each year before deliberations begin, the CRPT will discuss criteria for renewal and promotions to each rank. The recommendation of the committee concerning reappointments and promotion is based on a careful and objective evaluation of
 - (a) the quality and quantity of the candidate's publications as evidence of a growing intellectual maturity and professional standing in his/her field;
 - (b) the candidate's teaching;
 - (c) the candidate's service to the department, the university, and to the profession.

The University sets the standards for renewal, tenure, and promotion as excellence in the three areas of research, teaching, and service. Although mathematical precision is not attainable in measuring contributions in these areas, the rule of thumb used in the Department is 40%-40%-20% respectively for the three areas of research, teaching and service for Associate and Full Professors; the standard for Assistant Professors is 50-40-10 respectively.

The CRPT has an obligation to ensure that it has all relevant information from a candidate to guarantee a fair review. When the committee identifies the need for specific points of information, the Chairperson will ask the candidate to supply the information. If necessary, the committee may also invite the candidate to a conference regarding aspects of the dossier that are subject to interpretation.

24. After receiving the external evaluations on the candidate's work (in the case of tenure and promotion) and the IPC evaluations on research, teaching, and service, the CRPT discusses the merits of the case. The Committee's final vote is forwarded to the Dean, along with other materials in the packet.
25. The CRPT summary containing its recommendation concerning a candidate should contain information that supports the vote of the committee; specifically, there should be enough information to enable subsequent readers to understand why the CRPT voted as it did. Summaries of CRPT deliberations are taken by someone other than the Department Chairperson. The CRPT will use open ballots when voting whether to recommend a candidate's promotion, tenure, or reappointment and votes will be reported by name. If away from campus at the time of the meeting in which the CRPT deliberates on promotion cases, faculty who serve on a candidate's IPC may participate in the meeting via telephone or video. Other CRPT members who cannot attend the meeting may send written comments to be read at the meeting. However, only CRPT members physically present at the time the vote is called may cast a ballot. In the course of the CRPT's meetings, the Chairperson shall share with the CRPT his/her views about the candidate for tenure. A separate letter from the Chairperson accompanies the summary from the CRPT.

Research

Please note that the research standards for renewal and promotion to Associate Professor with tenure that appear below apply to any faculty member who joined the Notre Dame Political Science Department as an Assistant Professor during or after the 2021-2022 academic year. Any untenured tenure-track faculty member who joined the department as an Assistant Professor prior to the 2021-2022 academic year will be evaluated for tenure under the standards included in the "Organization Plan for the Committee on Appointments and the Committee on Reappointments, Promotion, and Tenure for the Department of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame" that was amended on April 30, 2020.

26. In addition to the publication materials submitted by the candidate, committee members consider:
 - (a) candidate's research statement
 - (b) internal reader's report: The EC selects one member of the committee to carefully read and to provide a written evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. The purpose of the additional members of the *ad hoc* IPC is to ensure that it contains an adequately qualified member to prepare such an assessment. The EC may solicit relevant field input into the naming of these individuals.
 - (c) external reviewers' reports.
27. Tenure and promotion cases require outside evaluations. The work of renewal candidates is normally not evaluated by external reviewers.

28. Factors Judged in the Evaluation Process: Research

Research achievements are extremely important in the assessment of faculty members for renewal, tenure, and promotion. Three important indicators of research and publication achievements in the discipline of Political Science are quality of research and publication, quantity of research and publication, and evidence of a promising research trajectory. Of these indicators, the quality of the work is the most important characteristic of the research record.

i. Components of the Research Record

The primary components of a research record are books, refereed journal articles, and chapters in edited books.

A book refers to a published volume of original research in one of the fields of Political Science. Under ordinary circumstances, a textbook does not count as a book, although in unusual cases exceptions might be made if the text makes an original contribution to the field. Normally, volumes edited or co-edited by the Assistant Professor do not count as significantly as an authored book toward meeting the research standards in a tenure decision. Items such as scholarly monographs and translations, which can vary between article and book length, must be judged on their individual merit.

An article is a work of original research, or a reinterpretation of existing research, which has appeared in or been accepted by a refereed academic or professional journal. In general, articles in journals that employ double-blind peer review are strongly preferred. Other types of refereed articles that either do not employ peer review (e.g. articles in law reviews) or double-blind review (e.g. peer-reviewed chapters in edited books) typically do not count as significantly as articles in peer-reviewed academic journals. However, all publications are assessed on their individual merit.

Chapters in edited books may be valuable components of a faculty member's research record. However, in light of the varying degrees of pre-publication refereeing of contributions to edited volumes, careful consideration regarding the quality of such work is necessary. As a general matter, the more rigorous the review process, the more credit a chapter in an edited volume will receive. Accordingly, peer-reviewed chapters in edited books count more than non-peer-reviewed chapters in edited books.

In addition to its preference for high-quality work that undergoes a rigorous review process, the department also encourages Assistant Professors to publish in the most visible and impactful outlets available. Books published by top-tier presses and articles in highly regarded journals generally are preferred to contributions to edited volumes in most fields of political science.

Indications of scholarly promise, prominence, and trajectory (e.g. obtaining external grants, giving lectures or conference papers, publishing in non-academic venues such as blogs or op-eds) may bolster a tenure case, but cannot substitute for the publication of original research.

ii. Quantitative Guidelines

It is impossible to state a rigid number or mix of books and articles needed for tenure. However, it may be useful to describe what form an initially plausible case for tenure might take. That standard might be either:

- (a) A book and 3-5 peer-reviewed articles and/or peer-reviewed chapters in edited books, or
- (b) 8-10 peer-reviewed articles and/or peer-reviewed chapters in edited books

However, books, articles, and book chapters may be weighted differently based on the standards described in section 28.i.

An initially plausible case is understood to be one in which the candidate's quantity meets or exceeds the departmental standard. Falling short of this standard does not necessarily preclude a favorable tenure decision, nor does having an initially Plausible case guarantee a favorable decision.

It is also important to note that the department expects a significant number of a tenure candidate's publications to appear in top-tier outlets—in other words, books and book chapters published by highly regarded presses and articles published in highly ranked journals.

iii. Qualitative Assessments

The department recognizes that individual metrics for assessing the quality of research may be subject to potential biases along the lines of gender, race, ethnicity, and other characteristics. Accordingly, the department assesses the quality of scholarship broadly, employing a variety of different metrics, while recognizing these sources of bias. In general, evaluations of the quality of published work are based on five main factors:

- (a) The prestige of the outlet (press, journal) in which the work is published, as indicated in rankings of presses and journals, journal impact factors, etc.
- (b) The assessments of the external letter writers asked to review the faculty member's scholarship.

(c) The independent judgment of the tenured faculty in the department. It is expected that all CRPT members read the published research in a tenure candidate's dossier and make an independent judgment of its quality.

(d) The visibility and impact of the work as indicated in citation counts and other markers of visibility and impact. Taking into account that there may be biases in citation counts on the basis of gender and other characteristics, citation counts, such as those provided by Google Scholar and the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI), are a standard gauge of the visibility and impact of published research and they will be taken seriously in assessing Assistant Professors in all substantive fields of Political Science. The department also considers other indicators of research visibility and impact. These include the number and prestige of invited lectures, mentions of research in major media outlets, citation in Supreme Court cases and congressional testimony, among others.

(e) Published scholarly assessments such as published book reviews and scholarly exchanges in journals.

The specific criteria by which the quality of books, journal articles, and chapters in edited books (or edited books themselves) is evaluated are as follows:

Books:

(a) The prestige of the press. Presses vary in reputation and the department takes these differences seriously, given that the more prestigious presses use the most demanding standards for publication. Quality of press provides independent evidence of the quality and importance of research. In assessing the prestige and quality of presses, the department generally employs *published* rankings of political science publishers *as well as its own understanding of which presses publish the best work in political science and in various subfields*.¹ However, the department also recognizes that the prestige and quality of presses varies across subfields and encourages Assistant Professors to publish with the best publishers in their research area.

(b) Assessments of the external letter-writers

(c) Independent judgements of CRPT members

(d) Citation counts (Google Scholar or SSCI) and other indicators of visibility and impact

¹ *The most recent published ranking of the quality of presses in political science is James C. Garand and Michael W. Giles, "Ranking Scholarly Publishers in Political Science: An Alternative Approach," PS: Political Science and Politics (April 2011). See especially p. 378, table 1.*

(e) Published book reviews

Journal Articles:

- (a) Prestige of journal. Assistant Professors are encouraged to publish as much of their article-length work as possible in journals with the strongest reputations and highest standards. The department assesses journal quality and prestige both through the disciplinary reputation of journals and through their ranking based on Journal Impact Factor (as published in the annual Journal Citation Report).² Assistant Professors are encouraged to publish in disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals with the strongest long-term reputations. More generally, the department encourages Assistant Professors to publish in disciplinary and interdisciplinary journals that are highly ranked based on Journal Impact Factor.

The department recognizes that articles published in specialized journals and some less highly ranked journals may make important scholarly contributions in particular fields and subfields. Accordingly, while the department expects a number of publications in top outlets, it does not penalize tenure candidates for publishing some of their work in specialty journals. In these cases, faculty members should seek to publish their research in the best available journals in a given subfield.

Because Political Science is a discipline with many interdisciplinary connections, the department also supports publication in interdisciplinary journals and journals in other disciplines. As with disciplinary publications, faculty members should seek to publish in the interdisciplinary journals and journals in other disciplines with the strongest reputations and highest standards.

- (b) Assessments of the external letter-writers
- (c) Independent judgements of CRPT members
- (d) Citation counts (Google Scholar or SSCI) and other indicators of visibility and impact
- (e) Published scholarly correspondence or exchanges in journals

² <https://jcr-clarivate-com.proxy.library.nd.edu/jcr/home>

Edited books/chapters in edited books:

- (a) Edited books and chapters in edited books that are peer-reviewed are strongly preferred over edited books and chapters that are not peer-reviewed.
- (b) The prestige of the press publishing the book.
- (c) Assessments of the external letter-writers
- (d) Independent judgements of CRPT members
- (e) Citation counts (Google Scholar or SSCI) and other indicators of visibility and impact
- (f) Published book reviews

The quality of other types of published research (e.g. law reviews, monographs, reports) is assessed on the basis of a similar set of factors: the prestige of the outlet in which the work is published, citation counts and other indicators of visibility and impact, published reviews or scholarly exchanges, the assessments of the external letter-writers, and independent judgements of CRPT members.

iv. Assessing co-authored work

Co-authorship has become increasingly common in Political Science. It is the norm in some areas of the discipline, while remaining uncommon in other areas. Accordingly, while the CRPT encourages Assistant Professors to publish single-authored work, it also welcomes co-authorship.

CRPT understands that there is a wide range of possible co-authoring relationships among scholars of different rank and that these may make determining the appropriate level of credit for a given piece of scholarship difficult. Therefore, CRPT will evaluate each co-authored project in light of the specifics of the situation. Among the factors that CRPT will consider are the relationship among the co-authors and the degree to which each contributed to the final product. To determine the latter, CRPT may seek input from both tenure candidates and their collaborators about the degree to which each contributed to the final product. Co-authorship with scholars who are junior to the faculty member and particularly with graduate students is strongly encouraged and is rewarded in tenure evaluations.

v. Evidence of a Promising Research Trajectory

An important consideration in the evaluation process is the degree to which the candidate for tenure has a promising long-term research trajectory, suggesting

continued productivity and high-quality scholarship after they earn tenure. That typically means evidence of a research agenda that is evolving beyond the candidate's doctoral dissertation research.

Over the first two or three years of their career, an Assistant Professor's first publications are usually derived from doctoral research. It is important, however, for a candidate to demonstrate ability to move beyond such research. Therefore, publications from one's dissertation alone, no matter the quality or quantity, do not provide an initially plausible case for tenure.

The Assistant Professor must demonstrate an ability to develop an evolving intellectual agenda. Of course, this may well be related to the intellectual concerns of the dissertation. Normally, this new direction should be demonstrated with publications and/or securing external grant funding.

vi. Research Standards for Renewal of Untenured Faculty Members

Research standards for renewal of untenured faculty members are more fluid, for the department recognizes that junior scholars may follow different research trajectories early in their careers. The chief criterion that CRPT will apply to renewal decisions is that the candidate be on a trajectory that promises to produce a prima facie tenurable case at tenure review time. This normally will take the form of evidence of an active and successful research record, as shown by publications, conference and similar presentations, grants to support research, and so on.

Teaching

29. Each CRPT member assesses the strength of the candidate's teaching record on the basis of the candidate's teaching portfolio, the TCE or CIF history, and the IPC report on teaching.
30. One member of the IPC (different from the internal reviewer of scholarship) is designated to write an evaluation of the candidate's teaching. This evaluation is based on TCEs, CIFs, the candidate's written statement, a personal interview with the candidate, review of course syllabi, and class visitation(s).

All courses taught by candidates for renewal or tenure at Notre Dame will be considered by the CRPT, but only courses being taught during the semester in which the review is taking place will be visited by IPC members. The exception to the above is the case where the candidate will be on leave during the review semester. In that case, class room visitation will be undertaken the semester preceding the leave.

Classroom visitation will be conducted by the IPC member assigned to report on the candidate's teaching. Dates for such visits will be agreed on by that IPC member and

the candidate. Teaching during the classroom visitation will be evaluated using a standard template, as provided by the dean's office. This template can be amended by the CRPT. The candidate's teaching will also be assessed on the basis of the written teaching material submitted by the candidate. These materials are to include the candidate's teaching statement, syllabi, copies of examination questions, paper assignments, and such other materials as the candidate believes will give CRPT a good understanding of his or her teaching goals and methods, including, for example, representative graded student work, and senior theses.

The CRPT written report will include information on the following points (not in order of importance). A statement concerning range of courses offered and course enrollments; willingness to carry his/her share of Department's required undergraduate/graduate courses; importance of courses to Departmental needs; number of new preparations; summary of TCEs and CIFs with examination of strong and weak points, with special emphasis given to areas of improvement (a summary of grades is also helpful); service to graduate students; service to undergraduate students (e.g. departmental advising, special studies; area studies, senior honors theses); evaluation of the individual's philosophy about teaching, and how these ideas are incorporated into courses, including methodologies, practices found successful and not successful; etc; and the individual's future teaching goals.

31. Factors Judged in the Evaluation Process: The Department of Political Science, like the University as a whole, takes teaching excellence seriously as a criterion for renewal, tenure, and promotion. University policy mandates that CRPT consider the following matters in assessing teaching:

COURSE DESIGN: Are the learning goals for the course meaningful and clearly articulated? Is the course design rigorous, current, relevant to students' needs, and consonant with the department's curricular requirements and needs?

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?

EVALUATION OF STUDENT WORK: Does the faculty member employ reliable and 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?

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?

In addition, candidates for promotion are encouraged to consult the Teaching Guidelines provided by the Advisory Committee to the Provost on the Evaluation of Teaching, available from the Provost's Office.

Service

32. Service is an extremely important part of a faculty member's responsibilities in the department. The general guidelines provide service expectations for faculty members at different ranks: Assistant Professors, 10%; Associate Professors and above, 20%.

In assessing service, Committee members consider the information provided on the vitae, the candidate's service statement, the IPC's service report, and their personal knowledge to evaluate the candidate's willingness to make her/himself available to students, willingness to assist in departmental business, and the quality of the candidate's service contribution to the department. As with the areas of research and teaching, one IPC member will prepare a report on the candidate's service record.

33. It is the policy of the department to shield non-tenured faculty from service on university committees and the policy of the department not to appoint junior faculty as chairs of departmental committees, except in unusual circumstances.

Department Chairpersons might ask an Assistant Professor to serve on one or two departmental committees, e.g., a departmental committee on policy and one search committee. The College recommends that Assistant Professors not participate in College or University committee work 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 may not be asked to serve in a major departmental administrative position without the permission of the Associate Dean for Social Science.

Since our department is also organized by fields and since many events in the department are field events, it should be understood that service in the department includes active contributions to one's field, including attending field meetings, program activities, and other field events. An important part of service to the department is attendance at occasional events as assigned by the Director of Graduate Studies or the Director of Undergraduate Studies.

Just as it is important that faculty members fulfill their service obligations, it is equally important they not be overburdened with obligations to multiple units. Chairs, institute directors, center and program directors, and faculty members themselves are urged to keep total service commitments for any individual within the guidelines stated above. Although untenured faculty are expected to contribute to service in the department, it is imperative that they not be overloaded by service and distracted from research and teaching. The Department Chairperson is

responsible for insuring that untenured faculty remain within the 10% allocated for their service contribution, (i.e., an average of four hours per week spread over the academic year). Accordingly, no untenured tenure and tenure track faculty member may take on or be assigned any service task outside the department without consent of the Department Chairperson.

34. Service to the broader discipline and nation is also valued. It is wise for an assistant professor to become active in the discipline, especially in ways that foster the faculty member's development, although we caution against any service obligations that impede the Assistant Professor's ability to publish. For example, while occasionally reviewing a few manuscripts for a journal in a given year might be a wise idea, a large number of reviews over a short period of time should be avoided.

Assistant Professors who have the desire to reach out beyond the academy as public intellectuals are encouraged to do so in advance of tenure only if the time commitment is very slight or if their records in teaching and research are already superior. While such activities are viewed positively and are included as part of the mosaic of a case, they are not expected of Assistant Professors and cannot replace core contributions in teaching, research, and departmental service.

35. If a candidate for renewal, tenure, or promotion 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 IPC deliberations concerning service.
36. If the Chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the CRPT vote, he or she will meet with the Committee to discuss the opposing viewpoints prior to forwarding the final packet to the Dean. There is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the Committee or between the Committee and the Chairperson.

Further Provisions

37. When a faculty member's tenure or reappointment has been denied, the Chairperson will deliver the letter and inform the faculty member that, upon request, the Dean will meet with the candidate and give as full a report of the reasons for the denial as possible without violating the rules of confidentiality.

PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

Please note that the standards for promotion to Full Professor that appear below apply to any Associate Professor seeking promotion to Full Professor in or after the 2024-2025 academic year. Any Associate Professor seeking promotion to Full Professor in the 2023-2024 academic year will be evaluated for promotion under the standards included in the "Organization Plan for the Committee on Appointments and the Committee on Reappointments, Promotion, and Tenure for the Department of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame" that was amended on April 30, 2020.

Full Professor CRPT (FCRPT)

38. For appointments to the rank of Full Professor, the Full Professors on the CRPT will constitute a separate FCRPT to consider and vote upon promotions to that rank. There should be at least three Full Professors on the Full Professor EC. If there are fewer than three Full Professors elected to the EC, the Full Professors receiving the next highest number of votes will serve on the Full Professor EC for the specific purpose of full professor review(s).
39. The recommendation of the committee concerning promotions is based on a careful and objective evaluation of (a) the quality and quantity of the candidate's publications as evidence of a growing intellectual maturity and professional standing in his/her field; (b) the candidate's teaching; (c) the candidate's service to the department, the university, and to the profession.
40. FCRPT procedures, including assembling the Full Professor IPC, are the same as the ones used by CRPT in tenure reviews.

Standards

41. The Academic Articles (Article IV, Section 3, subsection a) state: "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."

For promotion to Full Professor, the standards articulated within the Academic Articles shall be interpreted as follows.

Gained Widespread Recognition as a Scholar

As with tenure (see above), it is impossible to state a rigid number or mix of books and articles needed for promotion to Full Professor, as the quality and impact of the promotion candidate's research is a more important consideration than mere quantity. That, of course, is true for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, but it is even

more true for promotion to Full Professor. The department expects candidates for promotion to Full Professor to have developed strong national and international reputations for producing high quality and important scholarly work. However, the quantitative standard reflects the need to demonstrate a strong research record following tenure. To that end, the quantitative criteria for an initially plausible case for promotion to Full Professor are similar to those for promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure. Thus, an initially plausible case might include the following.

Following tenure:

- (a) A book and 3-5 peer-reviewed articles and/or chapters in edited books
- (b) 8-10 peer-reviewed articles and/or chapters in edited books
- (c) Two books

However, books, articles, and book chapters may be weighted differently based on the standards described in section 28.

As with tenure, an initially plausible case is understood to be one in which the candidate's quantity meets or exceeds the departmental standard. Falling short of this standard does not necessarily preclude a favorable promotion decision, nor does having an initially plausible case guarantee a favorable decision. It is also important to note that the department expects a significant number of a promotion candidate's publications to appear in top-tier outlets—books and book chapters published by highly regarded presses and articles published in highly ranked journals. Moreover, because the department expects faculty to publish in the most visible and impactful outlets available, books published by top-tier presses and articles in highly regarded journals generally are preferred to contributions to edited volumes.

Evaluations of the quality of published work represent the most important component of the department's evaluation of a promotion candidate's research record. It is imperative that candidates for promotion to Full Professor publish scholarly work of the highest quality in highly visible and high quality outlets. To that end, evaluations of research quality are based on five main factors. Those are the same five factors employed by the department for assessing research quality in tenure evaluations:

- (a) The prestige of the outlet (press, journal) in which the work is published, as indicated in rankings of presses and journals, journal impact factors, etc.
- (b) The assessments of the external letter writers asked to review the faculty member's scholarship.
- (c) The independent judgment of the Full Professors in the department. It is expected that all members of the FCRPT read the published research in a promotion candidate's dossier and make an independent judgment about that research.

(d) The visibility and impact of the work as indicated in citation counts and other markers of visibility and impact. Citation counts, such as those provided by Google Scholar and the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI), are a standard gauge of the visibility and impact of published research and they will be taken seriously in assessing faculty in all substantive fields of Political Science. The department also considers other indicators of research visibility and impact. These include the number and prestige of invited lectures, mentions of research in major media outlets, citation in Supreme Court cases and congressional testimony, among others.

(e) Published scholarly assessments such as published book reviews and scholarly exchanges in journals.

The specific criteria by which the quality of books, journal articles, and chapters in edited books (or edited books themselves) is evaluated can be found in the section of this document on research standards for tenure. The language in that section about the assessment of co-authored work also applies for consideration for promotion to Full Professor.

Maintained Excellence in Teaching

The candidate for promotion to Full Professor will have continued to meet the same expectations for teaching as required for tenure (see above). In addition, the candidate is expected to have a record of mentoring graduate students, including activities such as serving on and chairing doctoral committees, coauthoring with graduate students, or teaching core graduate courses. Full Professor candidates should also advise undergraduate senior theses and other undergraduate projects (capstone papers, independent research papers, etc.).

Given Significant Service to the Academic Unit, the University, and/or Discipline

Service expectations for promotion to Full Professor are much higher than for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure. At a minimum, all faculty are expected to participate fully in the life and governance of the department. Expected departmental activity includes, but is not limited to, service on departmental committees, participation in the CA and CRPT, full involvement in faculty recruitment (such as attending job talks and meeting with candidates), and full involvement in graduate student recruitment (such as participation in recruitment weekend and contacting graduate student recruits). Beyond these minimal service expectations, candidates for promotion to Full Professor are expected to provide further service to the department, college, or university, through administrative assignments, committee service, and participation in faculty governance. *Any candidate who fails to contribute to the functioning of the department, college, or university will not be promoted to Full Professor.*

In addition to service within the university, candidates for promotion to Full Professor are also expected to provide service to the profession, such as serving as a referee for journals and academic presses, a tenure and promotion reviewer for other institutions,

a journal editor, conference organizer, or providing other significant service to a professional organization.

Procedures

42. In Spring 2003, the College set into place a new practice for non-obligatory and early tenure promotion cases. For non-mandatory cases, which include promotions to Full Professor, candidates are strongly encouraged to submit materials to the Dean's Office—through their chairpersons—for an airing before the Dean's Advisory Committee for Non-Mandatory Promotions. The committee serves as an advisory group to the Dean, who provides feedback to the chairperson who, in turn, informs the prospective candidate. The feedback may take various forms; for example, it might be an exhortation to proceed; it might attempt to dissuade the candidate from proceeding; or it might indicate that the committee was split and that a candidate should take this into account when deciding whether to proceed. In cases where the feedback is not an endorsement to proceed, the committee will assist the Dean in formulating recommendations for the candidate's development so that the candidate may build a stronger case. Faculty retain the right to proceed no matter what the recommendation is from the Committee, provided that they proceed within the guidelines set out by the Provost's Advisory Committee and incorporated into departmental CRPT documents.
43. Faculty members who are interested in having their cases considered by the non-mandatory promotion committee should speak to the Chairperson by late fall. A submission to the committee consists of three pieces of material: a current C.V., a TCE/CIF history (ordered from the Provost's Office), and a letter from the Chairperson. The evaluation is non-binding and is intended to help faculty assess their current standing. Promotion and tenure cases which are not mandated may be withdrawn at any point in the process but only with the candidate's approval.
44. In cases that move forward for consideration, the FCRPT has an obligation to ensure that it has all relevant information from a candidate to guarantee a fair review. When the committee identifies the need for specific points of information, the Chairperson will ask the candidate to supply the information. If necessary, the committee may also invite the candidate to a conference regarding aspects of the dossier which are subject to interpretation.
45. In instances where the Chairperson is an Associate Professor and her or his case is under review for promotion to Full Professor, the Chairperson will refrain from participation in the deliberations and decision. In such a case, the FCRPT will serve as the sole official voice of the department.
46. A minimum of six letters of evaluation by scholars outside the university is required for promotion to Full Professor. The candidate may provide a list of up to three potential evaluators. A maximum of two outside letters are from evaluators

suggested by the candidate. The candidate's list and FCRPT's list are mutually exclusive, i.e., FCRPT cannot use a name on the candidate's list, even if arrived at independently. The expectation is that all reviewers will be Full Professors. The candidate may provide a list of up to two persons to whom he/she objects as outside reviewers; the department will not contact these two people. The final choice of the outside referees will be determined by a discussion and vote within the committee.

The Committee makes every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting referees. The dissertation advisor of a candidate may not serve as a referee, not even as an extra 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 should be avoided. Any compelling exception is discussed with, and approved by, the Dean and disclosed in the description of the reviewers.

Between the final spring meeting of the FCRPT and the end of July, the Department Chairperson corresponds with the referees, supplying the updated curriculum vitae of the candidate in order to indicate the material to be reviewed and assessed, and stipulating a date of September 1st as the deadline for receipt of the external letters. 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. If such a conflict of interest becomes known after the solicitation of external letters, all letters are included in the promotion packet, the conflict of interest is disclosed in the description of the reviewers, and additional external letters are sought so that six outside evaluations from reviewers who have no perceived or potential conflict of interest are available to the Committee in their deliberations.

47. There should be consistency in the requests sent to all the reviewers for the same candidate and consistency in the requests sent to reviewers for different candidates from the same department. The instructions to the reviewers and the evaluations of the candidates must be in writing. The letter to external evaluators is based on the standard letter included in the *Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Guide*, which is updated regularly by the Office of the Provost; changes from the standard letter must be approved by the Dean.
48. The candidate will designate items of written work to be evaluated by the outside referees, and the Chairperson will seek the outside evaluations. All publications designated by the candidate are sent to the outside referees. The FCRPT may also determine materials to be sent to external reviewers and to be considered by FPIPC itself. Such designation is in no way meant to limit the committee or the outside evaluators from making a complete assessment of the rest of the candidate's work.
49. Deliberations concerning promotion to Full Professor require thorough review of the candidate's research by all members of the committee, and an equally

comprehensive review of the candidate's teaching and service. The procedures are just same as for tenure reviews.

50. If a candidate for promotion to Full Professor 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 his or her duties, the Chairperson will solicit from the director of that unit a letter explaining the faculty member's contribution. The letter will be weighed in the internal FCRPT deliberations concerning service.
51. The Chairperson does not vote with the FCRPT on cases of promotion to Full Professor. The Chairperson's individual recommendation to the Dean of the College is reported in a separate letter. If the Chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the FCRPT vote, he or she will meet with the Committee to discuss the opposing viewpoints prior to forwarding the final packet to the Dean. There is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the Committee or between the Committee and the Chairperson.
52. When a faculty member's promotion has been denied, the Chairperson will deliver the letter and inform the faculty member that, upon request, the Dean will meet with the candidate to give as full a report of the reasons for the denial as possible without violating the rules of confidentiality.

NAMED CHAIRS

53. Guidelines for appointments as Named Chairs are delineated in College documents and in the Academic Articles (Article IV, Section 5, Subsection a) and are drawn upon as appropriate and in consultation with the Dean of the College.

NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY

Types of Non-tenure track faculty

54. Non-tenure track faculty include Teaching Professor and Professor of the Practice. Requirements for each type of non-tenure track faculty are described in the Academic Articles (Article IV, Section 3, subsections b-g).

Standards for Promotion

55. Associate Teaching Professor
According to the Academic Articles, the Associate Teaching Professor "should ordinarily have demonstrated outstanding teaching ability, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence on colleagues and students, service to the academic unit, the University and/or his or her discipline, and standing among colleagues."
56. Teaching Professor (full)

As per the Academic Articles, in addition to the qualifications of an Associate Teaching Professor, a Teaching Professor “should have given significant service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline, and should ordinarily have made significant academic contributions beyond the faculty member’s own courses (more generally, within that faculty member’s academic unit, at the University level, or through national organizations).”

Associate Professor of the Practice

According to the Academic Articles, the Associate Professor of the Practice “should possess an appropriate advanced degree and/or distinguished practice experience relevant to the field in which that faculty member will teach and/or research. The Associate Professor of the Practice should ordinarily have demonstrated outstanding teaching and/or research ability, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence on colleagues and students, service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline, and standing among colleagues.”

Professor of the Practice (full)

As per the Academic Articles, in addition to the qualifications of an Associate Professor of the Practice, a Professor of the Practice “should ordinarily have given significant service to the academic unit, the University, and/or his or her discipline; and should ordinarily have made significant academic contributions beyond the faculty member’s own courses (more generally within that faculty member’s academic unit, at the University level, or through national organizations) or achieved widespread recognition in his or her field.”

If there is no expectation for research, the evaluation of a Professor of the Practice will be based on teaching and service only.

If the contract for a Professor of the Practice includes an expectation for research, both the quality and quantity of their publications should be consistent with the criterion that they have achieved “widespread recognition in his or her field.” To that end, candidates should publish their work in high-profile, high-impact journals and presses. An *initially plausible* case for promotion to Associate Professor of the Practice requires either a book with an academic press or 3-5 peer-reviewed articles. Promotion to the rank of Professor of the Practice requires a comparable number of publications in the time since promotion to the rank of Associate Professor of the Practice. (Definitions of books and articles are the same as described above in the standards for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure).

However, promotion to either rank is not based solely on the number of publications, as the EC will also evaluate the quality and scholarly impact of the research.

These criteria for promotion to each respective rank will be evaluated by the EC, as described below.

Procedures for Promotion, Teaching Faculty and Professors of the Practice

56. Individual requests for promotion must be made to the Chairperson in writing no later than first day of classes for Teaching faculty. For Professors of the Practice, the deadline is the first Monday in March for the review process that will take place during the subsequent fall semester. The EC will review every request submitted. A candidate for promotion has a right to receive, upon request, full consideration of his/her case starting with the department and proceeding through to a consideration by the President. If the candidate has requested review the preceding year, he/she must present sufficient reason to justify the second request. Subsequent action by the EC will be based on the merit of the candidate's justification.
57. When reviewing a promotion case, the Department Chairperson may appoint one or more other non-tenure track faculty of a higher rank as an *ad-hoc* member(s) of the EC.
58. Promotion cases may be withdrawn at any point in the process, but only with the candidate's approval.
59. Both Teaching faculty and Professors of the Practice will write a letter developing and summarizing his/her goals and accomplishments and also submit a teaching portfolio. Excellence in teaching may be gauged by means of the CIFs and other relevant materials: for example, statement of teaching philosophy; course syllabi; participation in course design, revision, and development; course coordination; student evaluations. Excellence in administration will be established by applying comparable parameters. The deadline for submission of all these materials is the second Monday in September. Furthermore, one member of the EC or another faculty member appointed by the Department Chairperson will visit his/her class at a mutually agreed upon occasion during the Fall semester. EC procedures for reviewing the teaching of non-tenure track faculty are the same as for reviewing the teaching of tenure candidates.

If a Professor of the Practice's contract includes an expectation for research, he or she will provide a research statement, comparable to the statement required of tenure-track faculty when they are reviewed for promotion.

60. In all cases, the chairperson will arrange an interview with the candidate prior to the committee's deliberations to explain to the candidate principal aspects of the review procedure, the official schedule of the review, and the handling of materials submitted, and, when appropriate, to provide the candidate with feedback about the materials submitted by the candidate so that the candidate may improve them. The EC has an obligation to ensure that it has all relevant information from a candidate to optimize a fair review. When the committee identifies the need for specific points of information, the Chairperson will ask the candidate to supply the information. If

necessary, the committee may also invite the candidate to a conference regarding aspects of the dossier which are subject to interpretation.

61. For promotions of Teaching faculty, in most cases only an internal review of a candidate's file is conducted while, as described below, the promotion of a Professor of the Practice also includes outside letters. In both cases, the EC summary report will provide a comprehensive review of the candidate's teaching, service, research (if applicable), and other aspects of the file. If a candidate for promotion 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 his or her duties, the Department Chairperson should solicit from the director of that unit a letter explaining the faculty member's contributions. The letter will be weighed in the internal EC deliberations concerning service.

For promotions of Professors of the Practice, the Chairperson will solicit letters from external reviewers with the relevant expertise (the number determined by the annual guidance provided by the Office of the Provost). These reviewers may include scholars, practitioners, or both. Candidates may submit up to two names of external scholars or practitioners whom they would like to serve as reviewers of their work and one name of a reviewer who will be excluded from being contacted. These names will be provided by the first Monday in March for the review process that will take place during the subsequent fall semester. No more than one of the reviewers may be selected from the candidate's list but the EC may decide to solicit none of those recommended by the candidate. The EC will weigh these letters as they would for a promotion case of a tenure-track faculty member.

62. When a promotion or reappointment has been denied, the Chairperson will deliver the letter and inform the candidate that, upon request, the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Professional Development will meet with the faculty member to give as full a report of the reasons for the denial as possible without violating the rules of confidentiality.

REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY

63. Procedures for annual review of untenured faculty are as follows: Untenured faculty members will be reviewed each year by EC. An EC member is assigned to prepare a report for the EC on the scholarship, teaching, and service of each untenured faculty member. That EC member will assess scholarship on the basis of the untenured member's annual activity report and available writings, and teaching on the basis of a class visit (if wished by the candidate) and other teaching materials. The EC member will also have a conversation with the untenured faculty member, a conversation to include discussion of the candidate's scholarship, teaching and service. The assigned EC member will present a report to EC, which serves as the

64. The EC will also handle contractual (“third year”) renewals for untenured faculty in a similar fashion to the tenure review outlined in paras. 23-36 save for the fact that outside letters will usually not be solicited as part of the process.

Department procedures will conform to standards articulated in the current *Reference Guide for Arts and Letters Chairpersons and Faculty* and the Academic Articles. Any amendments to the Organizational Plan can be initiated by the Chairperson or by a written petition to the Chairperson, signed by at least two-fifths of the full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty. The Chairperson will call a meeting to vote on the proposed amendment; proposed amendments to the organizational plan will be circulated to tenured and tenure-track faculty one week in advance of the meeting at which they will be considered. All amendments must be adopted by an absolute majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty. All faculty members of the department will have access to the Organizational Plan.

Approved by vote of the faculty of the Department of Political Science on May 5, 2023.

5/25/2023

Sarah Mustillo
I.A. O'Shaughnessy Dean
College of Arts and Letters