

BIENNIAL REVIEW
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINOLOGY & CRIMINAL JUSTICE
Approved: October 10, 2018

As specified by the university policy, the department personnel committee and the department chair will conduct independent evaluations of each eligible faculty member's performance in each of the three domains (1. Teaching, 2. Scholarship/Creativity, and 3. Service). The university policy presumes that most faculty members will be found to meet expectations, and the process will focus on identifying outliers for recognition or remediation.

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

It is expected that all Tenure-Track and Tenured faculty members will meet expectations in all areas of the evaluation (1. teaching, 2. scholarship/creativity, 3. service). The department review process will begin by determining the normal range of faculty productivity; much like examining a data set or grading on a curve. The normal range can be found by examining the distribution of faculty activity in each category. Anyone whose productivity is within the normal range of faculty activity should be identified as *Meets Expectations*. Anyone whose productivity is significantly lower than the normal range of faculty activity should be identified as *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

Instructors

It is expected that instructors will meet expectations in the area of teaching and other assignments such as advising when applicable. Anyone whose productivity is within the normal range of faculty activity should be identified as *Meets Expectations*. Anyone whose productivity is significantly lower than the normal range of activities should be identified as *Does Not Meet Expectation*.

While it is expected that faculty members will contribute in all areas, low productivity in one area may be balance with high productivity in another. For example, a faculty member who takes on a challenging and time consuming assignment or dedicates him/herself to exceptional success in one area may see a temporary decline in another area. It may be in the department's interest to balance the faculty member's deficiency with his or her success. Again it is expected that faculty members will contribute in all areas, so success in one area is not sufficient to make up for a lack of effort or an insignificant effort in other areas.

Next, an evaluation of the faculty members overall contribution will determine if he or she contributes to the level of *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*. This determination is based on the guidelines provided in the university's biennial review policy.

Teaching, Scholarship/Creativity, and Service

Individuals doing the performance evaluations shall focus on the quality of the work in each domain when determining whether the faculty member is meeting or not meeting expectations. Assigned ranks for each of the areas will then be applied to the performance evaluation to create an overall rating of *Contributing or Contributing below Expectations* (see Overall Performance Evaluation criteria).

1. Teaching:¹

a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. Content and activities in the courses fulfill expectations of the curriculum, syllabi and assignments are clear and reasonable. Faculty members meet with classes regularly and are accessible at designated and/or appointed times. Teaching evaluations suggest students are engaged and stimulated to learn.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member fails to meet his/her teaching responsibilities as laid out in section 310.1 of the University Handbook, or regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, interim or final grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues, or generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning .

*The Faculty Senate has endorsed a University policy that states that students have the right to evaluate teaching. That policy, however, does not imply that those evaluations should be the sole source of information regarding quality of teaching. The Faculty Senate strongly encourages departments and colleges to use teaching evaluation systems with multiple sources of input that includes student, peer, and chairperson evaluations.

2. Scholarship/Creativity:

a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. Has a peer-reviewed publication during the course of biennium, or presents a paper at a national or international conference, and has projects in progress or forthcoming. Submission of a manuscript for review, and demonstration of substantive progress on any scholarly project over the course of biennium. Overall evidence presented of sustained scholarly activity over the biennium leading to its dissemination through presentations, articles, or books.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member does not have a recent record of scholarship/creativity, and shows no progress on any project of significant magnitude. No project or activity forthcoming or in progress, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

¹ Teaching must be ranked either 1 or 2.

3. Service:

a. *Meets Expectations*: A faculty member meets his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. Contributes to the work of departmental committees as assigned or elected, or performs other assigned duties, or participates in service activities within the profession, discipline-specific service outside of the department and the university.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: A faculty member does not work with colleagues to advance the mission of the department, college, and/or University, or in other ways does not meet his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*.

Evaluations of Instructors:

a. *Meets Expectations*: An instructor his/her department's definition of *Meets Expectations*. Content and activities in the courses fulfill expectations of the curriculum, syllabi and assignments are clear and reasonable. Faculty members meet with classes regularly and are accessible at designated and/or appointed times. Teaching evaluations suggest students are engaged and stimulated to learn.

b. *Does Not Meet Expectations*: An instructor fails to meet his/her teaching responsibilities as laid out in section 310.1 of the University Handbook, or regularly engages in one or more of the following practices: teaches courses in a fashion that produces substantiated breaches of propriety or professionalism including failure to complete required attendance, interim or final grade reporting; refuses to have his/her teaching evaluated*; does not substantively cover the prescribed course content; has evaluations* well below those typical of departmental colleagues; does not meet the expectations of an advisor such as meeting office hours or engaging students in engagement leading to retention and graduation; or generally provides an environment inappropriate to facilitate learning.

Overall Performance Evaluation

Contributing: A faculty member's overall performance will be designated as "*Contributing*" if he or she has submitted the report and receives the rating of "Meets Expectations" in at least two domains, one of the two domains needs to be the first-ranked domain.

Contributing below Expectations: A faculty member's overall performance will be designated as "*Contributing below Expectations*" if he or she receives the rating of "Does Not Meet Expectations" (1) in his/her first-ranked domain or (2) if is similarly judged in two or more domains.

An instructor will be designated as *Contributing below Expectations* if he/she is judged “*Does Not Meet Expectations*” in his/her teaching or other assignment.

Faculty whose overall performance is rated as “*Contributing below Expectations*” will have the opportunity to discuss their evaluations with the Personnel Committee and the Department Chair before the evaluations are sent to the Dean.

Faculty who are not required to submit biennial reviews:²

- Pre-tenured faculty (Assistant Professors) who are reviewed yearly.
- Faculty promoted to Associate Professor or Full Professor during the review period
- Tenured faculty who have taken a one-year or more leave of absence during the review period.
- Instructors in their first six years of continual contracts who are reviewed yearly.

² Faculty members listed under the above criteria may opt not to participate in the biennial review.