

**J. William Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences**

**Personnel Document  
Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice**

**Approved by the faculty of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, January 13, 2011.**

**I. Personnel Committee**

A Personnel Committee is elected annually, early in the Fall semester, by secret ballot of eligible voting faculty. Faculty will elect three representatives to the Committee from a list of eligible faculty; the tenured faculty member receiving the largest number of votes shall be appointed Chair of the Committee. Tenured and tenure-track faculty who have completed the third year review are eligible to serve on the Committee but the Chair shall be tenured. Faculty members who are candidates for promotion or tenure are not eligible to be elected. The general responsibilities of the personnel committee include making recommendations to the chair regarding annual reviews of tenured and tenure-track faculty, reappointment decisions, third-year reviews of untenured faculty, and reviews for promotion and tenure.

**II. Personnel File**

All information pertaining to the annual review, conferences, and the like shall be kept in the faculty member's personnel file for as long as the faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter. Personnel files are kept in the custody of the department chairperson. Faculty members will be given access to their file upon request. (See also University Personnel Document section II.B.5.)

**III. Work Assignments**

**A. Standard Workload**

The standard workload for tenured and tenure-track faculty is 40% research, 40% teaching, and 20% academic service. Reasons for which the chair might assign additional teaching or service work include failure to minimally meet expectations in research and scholarship. Reasons for which the chair might grant a temporary course reduction include increased research or administrative obligations, or to facilitate the research productivity of untenured or recently hired faculty members. Adjustments to the standard workload may be requested by faculty.

**B. Summer Teaching**

Summer courses will be allocated to faculty members prioritized on the following criteria:

1. Departmental need – student demand and programmatic requirements must be met first.
2. All full-time faculty members, regardless of rank or time in service, will be offered the opportunity to teach at least one course, if funding is available.
3. Additional courses will be made available to faculty members at the discretion of the chair – with consideration given to seniority and scholarly productivity.

#### **IV. Initial Appointment**

##### **A. Qualification for initial appointments of Sociology and Criminal Justice faculty.**

1. For the rank of Lecturer, a Master's degree is normally expected and experience in teaching the specific courses for which a vacancy exists. For Criminal Justice faculty, professional certification in the area of instruction may be considered sufficient.
2. For the rank of Instructor and for temporary appointments, a Master's degree is required. Alternatively, for Criminal Justice faculty, professional certification in the area of instruction may be considered sufficient for a temporary appointment.
3. For Assistant Professor, the Ph.D. is required with specialized graduate level training in the specialty for which the vacancy exists and evidence of potential for excellence in teaching and for establishing a significant scholarly/research program.
4. For Associate Professor, the Ph.D. degree, relevant training and a record of excellence in teaching as well as an established program of research, and a record of publication are required.
5. For Professor, the Ph.D. degree, relevant training, with a record of excellence in teaching, an established program of research, a record of publication, and national recognition as a scholar are required.
6. For Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, and Adjunct Professor, the general criteria are the same as the standards for appointment to the corresponding professional rank without the prefix of "Adjunct." In special cases for the Criminal Justice program Juris Doctorate with specialized experience may be substituted for the Ph.D. degree.
7. For Visiting Assistant Professor, Visiting Associate, and Visiting Professor, the general criteria are the same as the standards for appointment to the corresponding professional rank without the prefix of "Visiting." In special cases for the Criminal Justice program Juris Doctorate with specialized experience may be substituted for the Ph.D. degree.

Other ranks are described in the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

##### **B. Procedures for selection of tenure-track faculty.**

Few decisions affect the course and strength of an academic department or graduate program as profoundly as does the recruitment and selection of tenure-track faculty. Accordingly, the department chairperson and the faculty shall work collectively to determine hiring priorities for the department. Factors to consider when determining hiring priorities, both with regard to rank and substantive area of expertise, should include programmatic needs as well as the need to maintain a diverse and well-balanced academic environment.

The Chair will appoint a search committee to conduct a nation-wide search for all tenured and tenure-track positions in the department. The search committee will review all applications and will provide the Chair with the names of the top candidates. With the advice and consent of eligible voting faculty, the candidate(s) may receive an on-campus interview. Following the interview(s), the eligible voting faculty will vote on the candidates by secret ballot, and the candidate receiving the largest number of votes will be recommended for the position. The chair will make a recommendation for initial

appointment to the Dean of Fulbright College. The initial appointment will usually be at the assistant professor level. Exceptions will follow the usual procedures for appointment at ranks other than assistant professor.

C. Procedures for the selection and appointment of non tenure-track faculty.

Part-time non-tenure track appointments may be made at the discretion of the chair. Full time non-tenure track appointments shall be made with the consent of the faculty. The chair shall notify the faculty of all recommendations for the appointment of non tenure-track faculty in a timely manner.

## **V. Successive Appointments and Annual Review**

### **A. Procedures for Annual Review and Reappointment of Tenured and Tenure-track Faculty**

Procedures for annual review and reappointment of tenured and tenure-track faculty are described in detail in the University Personnel Document, section II. B. Faculty members should review these procedures carefully. In addition, the following departmental procedures apply:

1. On or before January 15th each year, each faculty member shall submit a review packet. The packet includes a current cv, an annual faculty resume update, which may include a self-summary (expository statement to include research, teaching, and service), and any additional evidence demonstrating the criteria defined in Section II. A. 1, 2, and 3 of the University Personnel Document. Peer evaluations of these materials will be made by the department's personnel committee using the criteria set forth in Section VI of this document and Section II of the Fulbright College Personnel Document. The packet, along with the recommendations by the personnel committee, will be used by the chair to determine merit ratings in the areas of teaching, research and service.
2. The chairperson shall provide the departmental personnel committee with all documents submitted by the faculty for their annual evaluations. The committee shall evaluate faculty performance in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The committee shall also make a recommendation to the department chair regarding reappointment of untenured faculty. The committee recommendations will be provided to the chairperson for use in the annual evaluation and reappointment process. The chair will use the annual evaluations to recommend priorities to the faculty member in future years and to determine work assignments.
3. If a faculty member disagrees with the chairperson's proposed final recommendation to the dean, and having followed the procedures described in the University Personnel Document (Sec II. B.7), the faculty member may request that the personnel committee and chairperson meet to reconsider the evaluation before the chairperson submits the final recommendation to the dean.

### **B. Procedures for Review and Reappointment of Non tenure-track faculty**

The criteria for the evaluation of non tenure-track temporary faculty shall be determined at the time of hiring. Normally, temporary faculty will be evaluated only for teaching performance, following normal review procedures. Non tenure-track faculty will not be assessed in terms of the same

quantitative criteria and procedures as used for tenured and tenure-track faculty, but will be given an appropriate qualitative assessment by either the chair or principal investigator.

All faculty, including part-time faculty, are evaluated annually but part-time faculty will not be required to submit an annual resume update. However, part-time teaching faculty will be required to submit a course syllabus and evaluations for each course taught. All information shall be kept in the faculty member's personnel file.

## **VI. Evaluative Criteria**

### **A. General Guidelines**

1. The criteria described below are intended as a guide for individual faculty members, the department personnel committee, and the department chairperson in the annual review of faculty members' teaching, research, and service. The examples describe the range of professional activities in which faculty in the department typically engage. They do not constitute an exclusive or exhaustive list. Faculty members may also submit for consideration evidence of professional activities and achievements not included in these examples.

2. The criteria assume a typical work assignment (40% teaching, 40% research, 20% service). For faculty whose work assignment differs from the typical division, expectations to meet each level of performance should be adjusted to reflect their workload assignment. The criteria are intended to reflect both the quantity of activities and the relative weight accorded a faculty member's achievements.

3. The personnel committee and the chair shall consider the faculty members' rank and specific work assignment when applying the evaluative criteria. For example, expectations for service and graduate training typically will be lower for untenured faculty.

### **B. Evaluative Criteria in Teaching, Research, and Service**

In accordance with the Fulbright College of Arts and Sciences "Criteria, Procedures, and Standards" Sec. II B faculty members' performance will be rated using the following scale: "exceeds expectations," "meets expectations fully," "minimally meets expectations," and "does not meet expectations."

#### **1. Teaching**

A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" indicates excellence in teaching. Examples may include a combination of the following: teaching awards or nominations; very good student evaluations; or student success as evidenced by awards, publications, or presentations at professional conferences; making substantive and innovative contributions to teaching; chairing one or more graduate student theses; teaching above and beyond the required teaching load; or exceptional engagement in mentoring students. A rating of exceeds expectations would also be warranted for faculty who make substantial contributions to the department's teaching mission over and above what is normally expected.

A rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” indicates strong performance in teaching. Examples may include: good student evaluations; new course preparation; innovative course development; supervising independent studies, undergraduate honors theses, or serving on thesis or dissertation committees.

A rating of “Minimally Meets Expectations” indicates satisfactory performance in teaching. Examples may include: fair student evaluations; syllabi suggest course content is adequate in terms of rigor; professor is minimally available to students for consultation. A faculty member who completes assigned teaching responsibilities but does not meet the criteria for a rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” typically will be rated as “minimally meets expectations.”

A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory performance in teaching. Examples may include: routinely not holding classes, refusing a reasonable teaching assignment, documented failure to direct progress of graduate students for whom the faculty member serves as thesis chair. Other examples include exceptionally poor student evaluations, teaching misconduct and/or failure to treat students with professionalism. Refusal to participate in the student evaluation process or to submit grades according to stated deadlines will result in an automatic rating of “does not meet expectations” in teaching.

## 2. Research

A rating of “Exceeds Expectations” indicates excellence in research and scholarship. Examples may include a combination of the following: publication in well-regarded, peer-reviewed journals; publication of a book from an academic or university press; national research awards; award or management of significant or multi-year external funding; invited presentations as a keynote speaker or subject matter expert for national or international meetings, Congressional or federal agencies, or highly acclaimed symposia.

A rating of “Meets Expectations Fully” indicates strong performance in research and scholarship. Examples may include: publication in peer-reviewed journals or edited volumes; competitive external or internal funding; or award of a book contract from a reputable academic or university press. Faculty presenting several examples of scholarly activity that, in isolation, would minimally meet expectations may warrant a rating of “meets expectations fully.”

A rating of “Minimally Meets Expectations” indicates satisfactory performance in research and scholarship. Examples may include: evidence of progress on a major project (e.g., data collection or analysis, preparation of a manuscript for submission to a journal or publishing house, preparation of a funding proposal), presentation of a paper at a regional or national conference, publication of a book review or encyclopedia entry or participation in research workshops and/or professional training. A rating of “Minimally Meets Expectations” is warranted when clear evidence of research or other scholarly activity is present, but when such activity has not resulted in the publication of original research or external funding awards.

A rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations” indicates unsatisfactory research and scholarship. Examples may include: breaches of professional ethics, such as plagiarism or falsifying research; no evidence of research presented at professional meetings, submitted works for review, research reports, grant proposals; and/or organized research activity.

It should be noted that the criteria above are not simply meant to be quantitative counts of a faculty member's work. In addition, the evaluation of research activity would include such qualitative features as the reputation of the journal or publisher, the nature of reviews, the source of funding, and type of professional meeting.

### 3. Service

A rating of "Exceeds Expectations" indicates excellence in service. Examples may include a combination of the following: chairing of a standing or ad-hoc committee, election to national office, service on review panels or editorial boards, awards, evaluation by peers for service activities, or other signs of recognition for contributions to the discipline, university, or community relevant to the university's mission as a land-grant institution.

A rating of "Meets Expectations Fully" indicates strong service to the department, college, university and/or academy. Examples may include: service membership on two or more committees, service to the profession through activity such as editorial duties, reviewing for peer review journals or funding agencies, service to professional societies or organizing sessions at professional meetings. Service may also be defined as contributing specific professional expertise for non-profit and government agencies and/or community outreach efforts as per the mission of a land-grant institution.

A rating of "Minimally Meets Expectations" indicates satisfactory service to the department, college, and/or university. Examples may include: service as a member of a standing or ad-hoc committee and participation in departmental affairs.

A rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" indicates unsatisfactory service and may be given when no evidence of service exists or when a faculty member refuses to submit such evidence or to carry out assigned duties or demonstrates an unwillingness to serve.

## **VII. Promotion and Tenure**

### A. Procedures for third year review of untenured faculty

1. For all faculty in their third year of tenure-track appointments, additional evaluations are made. The review in the third year will be used to determine if the faculty member is making adequate progress towards tenure.

2. The chairperson and personnel committee ask all third-year faculty to submit information following the Faculty Review Checklist. The committee reviews these documents, individually and collectively, and makes its recommendation for reappointment to the chairperson. These documents are also available for review by the tenured faculty members before they vote.

3. Tenured members of the department are informed in writing of the recommendation of the personnel committee, and are given a ballot to vote on reappointment. Each ballot is returned

in a plain sealed envelope to the chairperson. A simple majority vote is required for a positive recommendation.

4. The chairperson considers the recommendations of the personnel committee and of the members of the department. The chairperson will incorporate the faculty recommendation into his or her recommendation to the dean unless there is a significant, unresolved difference of opinion, in which case both recommendations may be submitted.

5. Appeals of the chairperson's evaluations are to be made to the department's personnel committee. The department personal committee will make a recommendation to the chairperson, which the chairperson will consider in providing a final evaluation to the dean. The chairperson will provide a copy of his or her final recommendation to the faculty member and the dean, and the faculty member shall be given a reasonable opportunity to submit a written response, which shall be forwarded to all subsequent levels of review. If the pre-tenure review determines that insufficient progress toward a positive recommendation for granting tenure has been made, a recommendation for non-reappointment may be made to the dean, in which case the procedures and deadlines regarding nonreappointment, including provision for appeals, as prescribed in Section II of the campus personnel document, "Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure" (hereafter "Evaluative Criteria") and Section IV.B of Board Policy 405.1, must be followed. The Chair will recommend non-reappointment in a letter to the Dean, with a copy to the faculty member, by the applicable deadline established in Board Policy 405.1.IV.B.

## B. Criteria and Procedures for Promotion and Tenure.

### 1. Criteria

a. While the criteria for recommending promotions are the same as the criteria for reappointment contained in Section VI above, the relative emphasis and the levels of achievement differ. Outstanding performance in teaching, research and service are required before a recommendation to promote can be made.

b. Tenure is a long-term commitment by the department, college and university to a faculty member and is of fundamental importance. Although the general criteria used for promotion form the basis of tenure review, the potential for future contributions to research, teaching and service is the central criterion in this decision.

c. Promotion and tenure decisions shall not be based solely on the candidate's prior annual evaluations, but shall consider the candidate's total record of accomplishments in teaching, research, and service.

### 2. Procedures

Promotion procedures for tenured and tenure-track faculty are described explicitly in the University Personnel Document section III.B. Additional departmental procedures are described below. The procedures for the granting of tenure are the same as the procedures for promotion.

a. The chairperson shall review the department, college, and university tenure and promotion procedures with the faculty member early in the review process, prior to review materials being submitted or forwarded to the personnel committee.

b. The University Personnel Document, Section III. B. 10, states that following the recommendation of the department personnel committee, the tenured faculty both meet and vote independently of the chair. In addition, voting by the tenured faculty members in the Department shall be by secret ballot. A simple majority vote is required to be considered a positive recommendation.

c. Following the procedures described in the University Personnel Document section III. B. 11, but prior to the chairperson forwarding his or her recommendation to the dean, the candidate may appeal the chairperson's recommendation to the department's personnel committee. The personnel committee shall decide whether to ask the chairperson to reconsider his or her recommendation. If unresolved on the departmental level, the candidate may include a written response in his or her file to be forwarded to the dean and the college review committee.

CLINICAL FACULTY  
ADDENDUM A  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
APPROVED 01-21-2015

### **III. Work Assignments**

#### **A. Standard Workload**

The standard workload of visiting faculty in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice is 80/10/10 for teaching, research, and service. Visiting faculty in the department are typically assigned to teach four classes per semester.

The standard workload of clinical faculty in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice is 80/10/10 for teaching, research, and service. Clinical faculty in the department are typically assigned to teach four classes per semester.

### **IV. Initial Appointment**

#### **A. Qualification for initial appointments of Sociology and Criminal Justice faculty.**

8. For Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate, and Clinical Professor, the general criteria are the same as the standards for appointment to the corresponding professional rank without the prefix of "Clinical." In special cases a person who is a doctoral candidate, or for the Criminal Justice program, a Juris Doctorate with specialized experience may be substituted for the Ph.D. degree.

Other ranks are described in the Fulbright College Personnel Document.

## **V. Successive Appointments and Annual Review**

### **C. Procedures for Review and Reappointment of Non tenure-track Clinical Faculty**

Clinical faculty will undergo the review and reappointment procedures described in the Sociology and Criminal Justice Personnel Document Section V. A.

## **VI. Evaluative Criteria**

The general guidelines and evaluative criteria for clinical faculty are identical to those for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

## **VII. Promotion and Tenure**

3. The general guidelines and eligibility of clinical faculty for promotion are described in the Academic Policy Series 1405.102. Faculty members should review these procedures carefully. In addition, the procedures stated in Section VII. B. 2 of the Sociology and Criminal Justice Personnel Document as well as the following criteria apply:

Promotion to Clinical Associate Professor:

- a. Ph.D. in Sociology or the criteria stated in Section IV.8 of the Sociology and Criminal Justice Personnel Document.
- b. Demonstrated excellence in teaching, including teaching at an advanced level in the candidate's area of expertise.
- c. Record of publication or creative work of high quality that suggests a foundation for a scholarly career.
- d. Service contributions on departmental, college, or university committees; community service; and professional organizations.

Promotion to Clinical Professor:

- a. Ph.D. in Sociology or the criteria stated in Section IV.8 of the Sociology and Criminal Justice Personnel Document.
- b. Demonstrated excellence in teaching at all levels of appropriate degree programs.
- c. Substantial record of publication or creative work of high quality.
- d. Competent service in one or more of the following: departmental administration; College or University committees; community service; and professional organizations.

COLLEGIALITY  
ADDENDUM B  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
APPROVED 01-21-2015

**VI. Evaluative Criteria**

4. Each faculty member should be a collegial contributor to the life of the department and should exhibit respect and cooperation in shared academic and administrative tasks. Collegiality should not be confused with sociability or likability. Standard collegiality language for the annual review is: "Professor \_\_\_\_\_ is meeting expectations for collegiality in each of the three areas of evaluation: teaching, research, and service." Departmental procedures for collegiality statement are as follows:
- a. Personnel Committee includes an affirmative statement of collegiality, except in cases of the most egregious conduct (see Faculty Handbook).
  - b. Department Chair writes a statement on collegiality for each faculty member's annual review.
  - c. Prior to a negative evaluation, the Chair will consult with and provide the faculty member with evidence-based documentation to be included in the annual review.