

Approved by Provost: 9/23/2019

Approved by University Tenure and Promotion and Sabbatical Leave Advisory Committee: 9/9/2019
Approved by College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee: 8/23/2019
Approved by Department with College Tenure and Promotion Advisory Committee Suggested Revisions: 3/6/2019
Referred Back to Department by College Tenure and Promotion Advisor Committee for Revision: 1/29/2019
Approved by Department: 1/10/2019
Sent by Department Committee to Department for Consideration: 10/17/2018
Department Committee Formed to Develop Draft Criteria: 8/17/2018

CRITERIA FOR TENURE, PROMOTION, AND REGULAR NON-TENURE TRACK REVIEW

DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIOLOGY

The Department of Criminal Justice, Social Work, and Sociology recognizes a primary obligation to educate students as both job-ready practitioners and global citizens. Further, Faculty understand a responsibility to also produce knowledge in their discipline for either academic or professional audiences as well as provide service and the application of knowledge within the University, in the community, and through professional organizations related to their academic discipline. Further, the Department values the appreciation of diverse perspectives and its incorporation into teaching, professional growth, and service. To meet these responsibilities, Faculty in the Department of Criminal Justice, Social Work, and Sociology must be highly effective educators developing and maintaining strong classroom teaching skills grounded in a growing foundation of knowledge. The knowledge base results from serious intellectual activity including professional development, research/scholarship, and the exchange of information through peer-reviewed publication and/or presentation. Criminal Justice, Social Work, and Sociology Faculty also must contribute to the operation and wellbeing of the University as well as the community and professional organizations.

In order to maintain high standards, the Department engages in three forms of Faculty review: an annual evaluation for merit, a review for tenure, and a review for promotion. This document outlines criteria for achievement of tenure, promotion, and RNTT merit.

The Department recognizes these guidelines are designed to be flexible appreciating the mosaic of Faculty work, acknowledging unique contributions of individual productive Faculty, and allowing each individual to meet requirements by emphasizing his or her particular strengths in teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service. Thus, the various functions under each performance category constitute a frame of reference, not a complete prescription or formula for promotion. In the end, high quality teaching, professional growth, and service is the standard for promotion in the Department of Criminal Justice, Social Work, and Sociology.

In addition to the Department requirements outlined in this document, there are additional criteria and guidelines established in the *Faculty Handbook* that also apply to candidates seeking tenure and/or promotion. These requirements and criteria include, but are not limited to, the composition and functioning of related committees, peer evaluation, and adherence to calendars for the review process. A candidate who contractually is granted years toward tenure or exceptions related to rank should refer to the *Faculty Handbook* for specific criteria and procedures. Candidates should familiarize themselves early in the process with both this document and requirements stated in the *Faculty Handbook*. All criteria, policies, and procedures not found in this document but present in the *Faculty Handbook* apply.

In the case of discrepancies or ambiguities, criteria, policies, and procedures found in the *Faculty Handbook* supersede those in this document.

General Guidelines:

- When building a dossier, candidates may not use the same item under two different categories or subcategories.
- It is the candidate’s sole responsibility to provide clear supporting documentation for all claimed activities.
- The term “sustained” is defined as multiple accomplishments over the evaluation period and does not imply that particular accomplishments necessarily must occur every year.
- The candidate should include three letters of support from professional colleagues addressing the three areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth and service.
- All tenure-track and tenured Faculty are expected to have the terminal degree, which is an appropriate doctorate.
- Promotion to Associate Professor is linked with tenure; the criteria for both Associate Professor and tenure are identical.
- These terms are used in the department criteria and defined as follows:
 - sustained- the performance level is consistent over a period of time in current rank, particularly the last four years in that rank.
 - very high quality- the quality and quantity of achievements meet the department criteria at a level indicating impressive performance and eliciting the highest level of respect and admiration from peers.
 - high quality- the quality and quantity of achievements indicate a level above “quality” and demonstrate solid performance meeting the department criteria while eliciting admiration from one’s peers.
 - quality- the quality and quantity of achievements indicate acceptable and satisfactory meeting of department criteria.

Required Minimum Performance:

Post-Professorial	Two ratings of superior and one rating of outstanding.
Professor	Two ratings of superior and one rating of outstanding.
Associate Professor (with tenure)	Superior in at least two categories, one of which must be teaching. Good in the remaining category.
RNTT Merit	A rating of at least superior in teaching and a rating of good in service.

A rating of unacceptable in any one category results in an overall rating of unacceptable.

EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS

1. Evidence from students of sustained effective teaching. It is recommended, though not required, that this criteria be accomplished by using a University approved instrument in all classes for at least one semester each year. Faculty are free to provide other methods for establishing a student-based evaluation of quality and effective teaching.
2. Peer and/or Chair evaluations of teaching effectiveness including but not limited to:
 - a. Classroom observation.
 - b. Effective course planning activities such as course syllabi, course outlines, and student assignments.
3. Critical self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness and evidence of effectively implementing related quality improvement efforts.
4. Involvement in significant course and/or curriculum revision or development.
5. Quality Matters, or equivalent, certification for online courses.
6. Efforts at improvement of teaching (conferences, seminars, workshops, etc.) directly related to teaching effectiveness including evidence of implementation of obtained knowledge into the classroom.
7. Voluntary, secondary teaching activities not included in the regular semester or summer teaching load, including supervision of directed studies, internships, serving on a thesis committee, directing an honors student project, mentoring undergraduate research, etc.
8. Receiving teaching awards.
9. Other: This is an open category related to teaching. Activities clearly must be related to teaching and the candidate should submit documentation making a compelling case for significance and impact of the activities on improving and/or maintaining quality teaching.

Performance Levels:

Outstanding:	A sustained record of very high quality teaching documented through categories 1, 2, and 3 along with substantial accomplishment in at least two of the remaining categories.
Superior:	A sustained record of high quality teaching documented through categories 1, 2, and 3 along with demonstrated accomplishment in at least one of the remaining categories.
Good:	A sustained record of quality teaching documented through categories 1, 2, and 3.
Unacceptable:	A lack of documented quality teaching through categories 1, 2, and 3.

EVIDENCE OF PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Category I

- a. Book, monograph, or edited volume published by a recognized and reputable press (include evidence of publication).*
- b. Peer-reviewed publications (include copy of publications). The general expectation is an average of one peer-reviewed publication every two years (e.g., two publications within four years). If co-authored, the candidate must provide a narrative of their specific contribution to the publication.*
- c. Presentation of scholarly papers or posters at international, national, or regional conferences. The general expectation is an average of one presentation/poster per year. If co-authored, the candidate must provide a narrative of their specific contribution to the presentation/poster.*
- d. Funded grants or contracts (internal or external). If co-authored, the candidate must provide a narrative of their specific contribution to the proposal. *
- e. Production of scholarly media material. If co-authored, the candidate must document their specific contribution to the project.

Category II

- a. Recognition for scholarly contribution to the field of expertise (e.g. awards, honors, etc.).
- b. Organization of professional workshops, seminars, or the like.
- c. Reviews of articles and/or books.
- d. Demonstrated research projects in progress contributing to a coherent scholarly agenda.
- e. Non peer-reviewed publications. If co-authored, the candidate must document their specific contribution to the publication.*
- f. Submission of grant applications either under review or not funded. If co-authored, the candidate must document their specific contribution to the proposal.
- g. Discussant and/or chair at conference, symposium, or the like.
- h. Attendance at professional meetings, seminars, and workshops.
- i. Membership in professional organizations
- j. Maintain professional licensure.
- k. Professional experience contributing to effectiveness as a Faculty member and/or travel which is related to academic expertise and contributes to Faculty member's knowledge.
- l. Advanced study in the discipline.

m. Other: This category includes all other scholarly activities not included above. The candidate should make a compelling case for the significance of these activities.

* - If the manuscript is accepted for publication but not yet released, the presentation was accepted but the conference has not yet occurred, or the grant was accepted but funding is not yet received, these activities count within the respective category. Appropriate documentation must be provided in these cases.

Performance Levels:

Outstanding: A sustained record of very high quality professional growth demonstrated by accomplishment in Category I.a. or b. along with one additional area in Category I and three areas from Category II.

Superior: A sustained record of high quality professional growth demonstrated by accomplishment in Category I.a. or b. along with accomplishment in three of the remaining areas from either category.

Good: A sustained record of quality professional growth in Category I.a. or b. along with demonstrated accomplishment in any two of the remaining areas listed under either category.

Unacceptable: A lack of documented sustained record of quality in professional growth.

EVIDENCE OF SERVICE

Category I – University Service

1. Serving on or chairing active university committees, task force, or councils (provide a narrative describing committee activities and outcomes).
2. Faculty advisor of active campus academic organizations (e.g. Student Social Work Organization, Criminal Justice Association or other student organizations/groups).
3. Service on an active planning committee for a degree program.
4. Professional presentations to the University community (e.g. lecture series, dissemination of scholarly topics, etc.).
5. Active involvement in college programs such as graduations and other formal ceremonies, open house (e.g., Show Me Day, Transfer Orientation, Firststep, Athletic Recruiting, prospective student visits), seminars, and other programs designed for student recruitment, retention, and/or recognition.
6. University service awards.

7. Other: This is an open category related to university service. Candidates should provide documentation for the significance and impact of these activities.

Category II – Department/College Service

1. Departmental activities.
2. Membership on or chairing Department committees with demonstrated significant or impactful outcomes.
3. Service in extra-curricular departmental activities (seminars, lectures, Criminal Justice Association or Student Social Work Organization meetings and other activities).
4. Serving on or chairing a college committee with demonstrated or impactful outcomes.
5. Advising undergraduate or graduate students. Evidence of effective advising must be provided.
6. Achieving Master Advisor status.
7. Department or college service awards.
8. Other: This is an open category related to Department/college service. Candidates should provide documentation for the significance and impact of these activities.

Category III – Community Service

1. Professional contributions to community groups on the basis of Faculty member's professional knowledge and professional service to public agencies.
2. Professional consulting for special interest groups and/or organizations.
3. Development and/or administration of ongoing service organizations/programs.
4. Awards/recognition from the community and/or professional groups.
5. Appearances on television or radio for community service.
6. Community service awards.
7. Other: This is an open category related to community service. Candidates should provide documentation for the significance and impact of these activities.

Category IV – Professional Service

1. Professional organizations, associations, and advocacy groups as elected officer, committee member, consultant, etc.
2. Professional service awards.
3. Other: This is an open category related to professional service. Candidates should provide documentation for the significance and impact of these activities.

Performance Levels:

Outstanding: A sustained record of very high quality service in at least two areas from each of three categories. Candidates for Professor and Post-Professorial are expected to exhibit leadership.

Superior: A sustained record of high quality service in at least three areas from one of the categories and two areas from another category. Candidates for Professor and Post-Professorial are expected to exhibit leadership.

Good: A sustained record of quality service in at least three areas across two categories.

Unacceptable: A lack of documented sustained record of quality in service.