

DRAFT 12/1/15

Guidelines for Annual Reviews and Tenure and Promotion

Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

Annual reviews

The department uses a five-level scale to evaluate faculty performance in teaching, research, and service. The scale defined in the *Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)* ranges from “far exceeds expectations” to “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” “below expectations” and “unsatisfactory.” This document provides guidelines from the department for performance evaluations of faculty. Reviews of faculty are performed annually by the Department Chair on the basis of work done during the previous calendar year. A written report using guidelines from the Collective Bargaining Agreement is provided to faculty along with a ranking of work using the scale described above.

The department aspires to have faculty members perform consistently at the level of “far exceeds expectations” and “exceeds expectations”. Minimum expectations for performance for faculty will be a score of meets expectations or more in all appropriate categories. Lecturers are not expected to do research.

A rating of “unsatisfactory” performance is based on a judgment about the quality and quantity of work and/or the failure to meet basic responsibilities as outlined in this document and described in the *Collective Bargaining Agreement*. A rating of “below expectations” will invoke some development plan to encourage improved faculty performance. A rating of “below expectations” in teaching/advising, research, or service is below the minimum expected by the department and would result in some remedial action. Sustained “unacceptable” performance in teaching/advising or research would be the basis for recommending termination in accordance with University policies and procedures.

Teaching Minimum Quality and Quantity:

Annual Evaluation of teaching is focused on teaching effectiveness as assessed through multiple sources including but not limited to: materials prepared for the course such as syllabi, exams, written assignments, rubrics, student exercises, and student evaluations.

Formal student evaluations (UNF’s Instructional Satisfaction Questionnaire) are only one method of determining teaching effectiveness and one component of the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. UNF provides resources for faculty in development of their courses:

http://www.unf.edu/ofe/teaching_learning/Syllabi.aspx

Faculty members are encouraged to submit evidence of teaching effectiveness in their annual

self-evaluation materials, including, but not limited to:

- Peer observations
- Student exams, papers, or assignments
- Teaching portfolios including student work
- Course syllabi
- Discussion of efforts for continuous improvement of instruction

A faculty member must exceed all minimum quantity and quality teaching/advising performance standards listed below:

- Three courses per semester (four for instructors), unless assignment is changed by Department Chair.
- Attending class is expected unless ill, at a professional conference, or fulfilling some other professional obligation as agreed upon with the Department Chair. When unable to attend class, a faculty member is responsible to make sure that the absence does not detract from students' academic progress.
- Availability for office hours
- Show evidence of high quality teaching through student responses on University of North Florida course evaluations, peer reviews of teaching, syllabi generated for new courses and materials produced for existing courses.
- Mentoring of both graduate and undergraduate students.

A ranking of exceeds expectations means that the faculty member has demonstrated the standards for meets expectations in quantity and quality of teaching and they have demonstrated efforts beyond conduct and preparation of courses. A ranking of far exceeds expectations will be a judgment that the faculty member is doing multiple additional efforts beyond teaching their courses in a manner that is substantially more than exceeds expectations for teaching. Criteria for Exceeding or Far Exceeding Expectations in the area of teaching may include many of the following, evidence of which is to be presented by faculty members in their annual evaluation materials to the Department Chair.

Well-structured courses feature detailed instructional agendas that may include assigned readings, in-class exercises, group projects, student writing assignments, guest speakers, field trips, and multiple methods of learning outcomes assessment without reliance upon only one method when possible (e.g. exams, quizzes, essays, student papers, etc). Course expectations should be set at a level appropriate to the course's role in the overall curriculum.

Well-structured syllabi are professionally presented with clear deadlines and made available to students on-time and posted on Blackboard. Syllabi should include clear articulations of course expectations, assigned readings, a detailed calendar/timeline, clearly-stated learning outcomes, attendance policy, behavioral expectations, faculty contact information, office hours, meeting times/locations, and criteria for evaluation of student performance.

Continuous Engagement of Faculty member attends all scheduled classes prepared for instruction. Faculty members make arrangements for missed classes or provide instructional

alternatives, which may include guest speakers, online assignments, et cetera.

Continuous Improvement: Faculty member demonstrates continuous attention to course improvement, develops new courses or extensively re-formats an existing course, adds additional lectures and readings, and/or devises new exercises. Faculty may voluntarily participate in formative or collaborative peer teaching review processes intended to improve pedagogy and instructional versatility. Faculty members may also publish textbooks or book chapters designed specifically for classroom instruction.

Supplemental Instruction may include faculty participation in supplemental instruction through provision of individual graduate/undergraduate honors thesis work or directed independent studies.

Student evaluations of faculty member demonstrate, across a range of courses, student satisfaction with instruction as expressed in both comments and scoring from students on the ISQ.

This is not an exhaustive list of meritorious instructional activity. Faculty members should highlight **additional activities** and work products related to teaching performance for consideration in the Annual Evaluation process.

Research Activity Minimum Quality and Quantity:

The Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice values scholarship conducted in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary environments. Research productivity is measured over a one-year time period. A rating of performance is based on a judgment about the quality and quantity of work. A tenured or tenure-track faculty member must demonstrate active engagement in scholarly activity in order to “meet expectations.” The Tier 1 and Tier 2 categories shown on the following page provide further guidance for rating of research products.

A rating of “far exceeds expectations” is a judgment that the faculty member has one product in the Tier 1 category.

A rating of “exceeds expectations” is a judgment that the faculty member has two or more products in the Tier 2 category.

A rating of “meets expectations” is a judgment that the faculty member demonstrates active engagement in scholarly activity.

A rating of “below expectations” is a judgment that the faculty member has limited active engagement in scholarly activity. This falls below the minimum expected by the department and will result in a development plan to encourage faculty performance.

A rating of “unsatisfactory” is a judgment that the faculty member has no active engagement in scholarly activity. Unsatisfactory performance is based on the failure to meet basic responsibilities as outlined in this document and described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Tier 1 Category (examples of major scholarship indicators)

Publication of a research book or monograph, author or editor
Publication of a Peer-Reviewed journal article
Publication of a Peer-Reviewed book chapter
Federally funded or major private grant or contract award
Other with supportive documentation

Tier 2 Category (examples of additional scholarship indicators)

Publication of a textbook
Conference paper/presentation
Submission of article to a Peer-Reviewed journal
Publication of a non-peer reviewed paper or report
Internal grant award
Submission of a federal funded or major private grant contract application, PI or Co-PI (pending or unfunded)
Major book revision
Award for research/scholarship
Other with supportive documentation

Service Minimum Quality and Quantity:

Faculty members are expected to demonstrate appropriate activity in one or more areas listed below, in order to rate performance as part of the service requirement. Both the quantity and quality of activities may be considered for this purpose. The attached list of activities, using two tiers, provides guidance to rate quality and type of such service.

One or more leadership activities in Tier 1 may be considered equivalent to a higher number of activities in Tier 2 in order for a faculty member to qualify for a rating of either “Far Exceeds Expectations” and “Exceeds Expectations.” At a minimum, a faculty member is expected to serve the department and attend departmental meetings in order to qualify for a rating of “Meets Expectations.” Failure to demonstrate activities, as further outlined below, shall result in a lower rating. Faculty members are encouraged to supply information to the Department Chair that support a self-evaluation of their service activities for the rating period.

- Faculty members are expected to serve the department on committees, to attend department meetings, and to be part of departmental administration.

- Faculty members are expected to be active in local, national, international professional, scholarly, and/or community associations.
- Faculty members are expected to serve on committees and participate in cross-disciplinary activities that support the college and university.
- Faculty members are expected to support the department, college and university in ways that are positive for the university.
- Faculty members are expected to promote a positive, collegial, student-centered environment.
- Faculty members are expected to be engaged in professional development.

Tier 1 – Examples of Major Service Activities (includes department, college, university, community, and professional/scholarly)

Leadership role on committee
 Director of a program
 Faculty Advisor for Club
 Professional Association Officer
 Planner of major event/conference
 Major role in Program Review, Accreditation, and Assessment
 Leadership role in private sector or government position
 Major Keynote address
 Major Award or recognition for service
 Major fundraising for Department
 Organizer of Academic or Professional Conference
 Primary or Co-Editor of Journal
 Other with supportive documentation

Tier 2 – Examples of Other Service Activities (includes department, college, university, community, and professional/scholarly)

Committee membership
 Club and event participation/organization
 Participation in department, college, or University activities
 Conference participation as session chair, or discussant, or department representative
 Professional Association membership
 Fundraising activities
 Recruiting to benefit the department
 Open houses/fairs/graduations
 Mentoring of students/faculty
 Assist students with future endeavors
 Guest lectures/speeches/presentations
 Continuing Education participation
 Community involvement
 Media appearances/news mention/Op-Eds

Scholarly Journal Editorial Board member
External reviewer of a journal manuscript, book/chapter, grant, tenure/promotion, etc.
Other with supportive documentation

Tenure and promotion

The tenure and promotion process goes beyond a summation of annual reviews.

The bases on which promotion and tenure decisions are made need to be stated as clearly as possible since decisions arising from such evaluations have great personal relevance to the careers of individual faculty members and to the long-term quality of the faculty community making the evaluations. Therefore, the following guidelines have been developed to try to make more explicit the criteria for evaluation for promotion, tenure and annual evaluation decisions.

The guidelines presented here are necessarily broad and some are difficult to translate into operational terms. The critical point is that each faculty member desiring promotion or tenure be aware of the rules and criteria that are employed. The participation by each candidate must be an active process with the candidate providing essential information to the promotion and tenure committee.

The method for evaluating the faculty member will be consistent with the procedures outlined in the CBA.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty

Teaching, scholarship, and service constitute the three areas of focus for promotion and tenure decisions for faculty in tenure-earning positions. Each faculty member who anticipates promotion or the receipt of tenure is advised to: 1) study ways in which the three areas are most appropriately evaluated for him or herself, 2) discuss these points with the Chair and other senior colleagues well in advance of his/her expected promotion or tenure, and 3) provide the department with concrete evidence satisfying each criterion.

Because an Assistant, Associate or Full Professor are eligible for tenure after the third year of tenure-earning service, no credit toward tenure from service at another institution is awarded (See CBA, 19.4(a)). However, faculty members may use accomplishments at another institution, particularly in the area of research/scholarship/creative activity, in support of their candidacy for tenure (and promotion) (See CBA, 19.4 (a)).

A candidate for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor is expected to meet the following criteria:

1. Possess the appropriate terminal degree from an accredited institution in his/her instructional discipline or related area.
2. Demonstrate that he/she is an effective teacher (student evaluations shall be an integral part of demonstrating that one is an effective teacher) and that he/she is likely to remain so throughout his/her career.
3. Demonstrate evidence of sustained productivity of high quality scholarship.

4. Convince (by performance primarily) colleagues that he/she will likely be a productive scholar throughout his/her career.
5. Established her/his proficiency in research, publication, and/or other forms of scholarly activities indicating substantial progress towards the attainment of a national reputation in her/his field.
6. Possess a minimum of three years of professional experience in the field of criminology and criminal justice.
7. Provide good Departmental and/or college and/or University and/or community and/or professional service.

In all of the above, demonstration of quality is the responsibility of the candidate.

Recent cases of promotion and tenure to Associate Professor were successful for faculty demonstrating teaching success at a level that exceeds expectations, scholarship with between six and ten peer reviewed publications, and service at levels that exceeded expectations.

A candidate for promotion to Professor is expected to meet the following criteria:

8. Possess the appropriate terminal degree from an accredited institution in his/her instructional discipline or related area.
9. Demonstrate that he/she is an effective teacher (student evaluations shall be an integral part of demonstrating that one is an effective teacher) and that he/she is likely to remain so throughout his/her career.
10. Demonstrate evidence of sustained productivity of high quality scholarship.
11. Convince colleagues that he/she will likely be a productive scholar throughout his/her career.
12. Possess a national reputation in the discipline. The faculty member should be recognized as a mature scholar who is an expert in her/his field and as an individual who has made important contributions to the advancement of knowledge in the discipline.
13. Possess a minimum of ten years of professional experience in the field of criminology and criminal justice.
14. Provide Departmental leadership in his/her specialty areas.
15. Provide extensive, high quality service to the Department, college and university and some high quality service to his/her profession and the community.

Note that promotion to professor is only awarded to faculty who have demonstrated long term and high quality scholarship that has made a significant contribution to the discipline and earned the candidate a national reputation for excellence. Promotion to professor is not granted on the basis of one significant work nor made on the basis of longevity of work in the discipline.

Instructors

Teaching and service constitute the two areas of focus for promotion for faculty in instructor positions. Each faculty member who anticipates promotion is advised to: 1) study ways in which the three areas are most appropriately evaluated for him or herself, 2) discuss these points with the Chair and other senior colleagues well in advance of his/her expected

promotion, and 3) provide the department with concrete evidence satisfying each criterion. and/or service).

Note that promotion will only be considered for instructors who consistently exceed expectations or above for performance in teaching and service. Note, again, the method for evaluating the faculty member will be consistent with the procedures outlined in the CBA.