

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE
College of Social Science
Michigan State University

BYLAWS

I. PROCEDURES

A. School Advisory Council (SAC) Meeting Procedures

1. Except where otherwise specified in the Constitution or Bylaws, the rules of procedure for the conduct of SAC meetings in the School of Criminal Justice (SCJ) shall be those set out in Roberts Rules of Order (Revised) insofar as they apply to the making and passage of motions, the keeping of minutes, and convening and ending meetings.
2. A quorum shall consist of one-half of the qualified voting members of SAC plus one.

B. Existing Policies and Procedures

Existing policies and procedures as stated in SAC meeting minutes and not inconsistent with these Bylaws shall continue in effect.

II. ELECTED STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC)

Purpose

The FAC is established in order to advise and consult with the Director of the School on a regular and timely basis and to perform such other duties as may be provided in the other governing documents of the School. FAC is responsible for development and implementation of the procedures for faculty annual reviews and merit/salary increases. These recommendations are shared with the Director.

Composition

The FAC shall consist of four (4) elected members of the regular faculty of the School. The members of FAC shall be represented as follows: when possible, there must be at least one representative from each rank (full, associate and assistant professor).

Members of the FAC shall serve for two-year terms, for up to two two-year terms (or 4 years). After the second term, members are ineligible to serve on FAC for one full term. In practice, this means that faculty can serve on FAC for 4 years with a 2-year break before serving again. Two seats on FAC will be up for election every year, so that there is continuity between years.

Elections

Two representatives of the FAC shall be elected annually by the regular faculty on a preferential ballot listing all candidates for that year. Eligibility to serve on FAC shall extend to all regular faculty of the School. Balloting shall be done by the Hare system, in which candidates are preferentially ranked by number starting with one and proceeding to higher numbers until all candidates are ranked. The candidates with the lowest numbers are elected to FAC as long as the rank composition criterion is met.

Any faculty member elected to FAC may petition the director to not serve. If the director grants the petition, the next lowest vote-getting faculty of the needed rank (or any rank if the remaining three members represent each rank) may be chosen.

The chairperson of FAC shall be elected by its members.

Officers of FAC shall be selected and meeting procedures for that committee shall be adopted at the first meeting of the academic year by methods which shall ensure fairness and due process. A quorum shall consist of any three (3) members.

Meetings

FAC shall meet at the call of the Director as often as may be necessary. FAC shall also meet at other times, as necessary, at the call of the chairperson of the committee, or any other member.

Any regular faculty member may attend the meetings of FAC with voice, but no vote, provided, however, that by a majority vote of those members present and voting, the members of FAC may exclude the Director and such other faculty members from all or part of any meeting. The foregoing provisions shall apply to any person serving as acting director or assistant director provided, however, that any vacancy in FAC created by the appointment of one of its members to the office of acting director, shall be deemed a temporary vacancy and shall not be filled by appointment or election.

At its meetings, FAC shall consider matters brought to the attention of the committee by the Director, by members of the committee, by students, and by qualified voting members of SAC. All action taken by FAC shall be reported to the Director and to SAC without undue delay.

III. APPOINTED STANDING COMMITTEES

The School shall have the following standing committees whose members are appointed by the Director. Each committee will have at least one student representative as a member, with the exception of the Admissions Subcommittee of the Graduate Committee, the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Advisory Sub-Committee, the Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Decision Making Committee, and the Awards Committee. Chairpersons of all committees/ subcommittees will be chosen by its membership, with the exception of the Graduate Committee, Undergraduate Committee, and DEI Committee, wherein the Graduate Program Director will serve as chair of the Graduate Committee (except when there is both a Ph.D. Program Director and a Master's Program Director, in which case they will serve as co-chairs), the Undergraduate Program Director will serve as chair of the

Undergraduate Committee, and the DEI Coordinator will serve as chair of the DEI Committee. Terms of appointment will be two years with initial appointments staggered to assure continuity. All appointments will be made at the end of the spring semester of the academic year for the upcoming academic year.

A. Graduate Committee

Purpose

The Graduate Committee is responsible for formulation, review, and recommendations concerning the graduate degree offerings, the quality of graduate education, and the quality of graduate admissions. Specifically, the Graduate Committee is responsible for:

- i. Overseeing the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of academic programs, certificates, or courses offered at the graduate level by the School and review of all proposed changes in curriculum to graduate degree programs, including certificates and specializations.
- ii. Overseeing the quality of graduate education, including establishment of processes for periodic review of graduate degree program(s) to assure program goals are accomplished based on evidence of student learning and appropriate metrics, such as time to degree, placement locations and rates, etc.
- iii. Reviewing applications for admission into graduate degree programs and recommendations for admission to the School Director.

Membership

The Graduate Committee will consist of seven members, including one academic advisor and one graduate student representative. The Graduate Program Director will serve as chair of the Graduate Committee (except when there is both a Ph.D. Program Director and a Master's Program Director, in which case they will serve as co-chairs). An academic advisor will consult on Master's program admissions processes. Student representatives are ineligible to take part in the admissions process.

B. Undergraduate Committee

Purpose

The Undergraduate Committee is responsible for formulation, review, and recommendations concerning undergraduate degree courses and the quality of undergraduate education. Specifically, the Undergraduate Committee is responsible for:

- i. Overseeing the establishment, modification, or discontinuance of courses, academic programs, or certificates offered at the undergraduate level by the School and review of all proposed changes in curriculum to undergraduate degree programs, including courses, certificates and specializations;

- ii. Overseeing the quality of undergraduate education, including establishment of processes for periodic review of the undergraduate degree program to assure program goals are accomplished based on evidence of student learning and appropriate metrics such as retention, progression and graduation rates, placement locations and rates, etc.

Membership

The Undergraduate Committee will consist of five members, including one academic advisor and one undergraduate student representative. The Undergraduate Program Director will serve as chair of the Undergraduate Committee.

C. Bylaws Committee

Purpose

The committee is responsible for ongoing review, updates, and maintenance of the Bylaws of the School, ensuring they are consistent with University and College Bylaws. Bylaws are to be formally reviewed every 5 years. As part of this review, the Bylaws committee will request each Standing Committee to review its purpose, membership, and structure to assure that such are accurate and functional.

Membership

The Bylaws Committee will consist of seven members comprised of three regular faculty, one fixed term faculty, one academic specialist, one undergraduate student representative, and one graduate student representative.

D. Awards Committee

Purpose

The committee is responsible for identifying awards within the University, from professional associations, and other prestigious organizations for which students, regular and fixed term faculty, or academic specialists may be eligible, and to facilitate the application(s) for such awards.

Membership

The Awards Committee will consist of two regular faculty members.

E. Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure Advisory Subcommittee

Purpose

This committee is responsible for assuring the School follows the actions outlined in its Reappointment Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Policy and Procedures (See Appendix A). This sub-committee is charged with holding an annual meeting at which untenured faculty and faculty not a full rank can seek guidance on standards for promotion and/or tenure,

processes and procedures for undergoing tenure review, and consultation on their individual progress towards promotion and/or tenure. This sub-committee is also charged with the preparation and submission of external reviewers for candidates undergoing promotion and/or tenure review to the Director, the presentation of the case of any candidate undergoing third year review or promotion and/or tenure review to the RPT Decision Making Committee, and the preparation and submission of recommendation letters for any candidate seeking re-appointment, promotion and/or tenure to the Director.

Membership

The RPT Advisory Subcommittee consists of three Professors and three Associate Professors, appointed by the Director, to serve for two-year terms in a rotating manner for consistency across the years.

F. Reappointment, Promotion & Tenure Decision-Making

Committee Purpose

This committee is responsible for assuring the School follows the actions outlined in its Reappointment Promotion and Tenure (RPT) Policy and Procedures (See Appendix A). This sub-committee is charged with voting on reappointment, tenure, and promotion for tenure system faculty in the School of Criminal Justice.

Membership

For cases involving reappointment and promotion to associate professor with tenure, the committee shall consist of all tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For cases involving promotion to Professor, the committee shall consist of faculty holding the rank of Professor.

G. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee

(DEI) Purpose

This committee is established to provide leadership to the School of Criminal Justice in promoting a safe, positive, and nurturing environment for all members of our community within the school and in the classroom. DEI Committee responsibilities include creating and promoting events to further the spirit of diversity and inclusion; engaging community members in conversations and trainings about diversity and inclusion; developing practices to recruit, support, promote, and retain community members with diverse experiences and attributes; assessing SCJ policies and climate with an equity mindset; and identifying and sharing resources that contribute to the development of inclusive environments and experiences in the classroom and beyond.

Membership

The DEI Committee will consist of a minimum of 8 members, including three tenure-

stream faculty members, one academic advisor, two student representatives (one graduate and one undergraduate), one staff member, and one fixed-term faculty member. The DEI Coordinator will serve as chair of the DEI Committee. Members are appointed by the Director (or may volunteer) to serve for two-year terms in a rotating manner for consistency across the years.

H. The Director may appoint other ad hoc committees as needed.

I. Officers or Positions

In cases where the School is called on to provide a representative, the Director shall appoint the representative.

IV. PERSONNEL POLICIES

A. General

1. The Director shall consult with FAC and other appropriate committees on personnel policies and decisions, including:
 - Appointment policy and standards
 - General criteria for appointment
 - The filling of new positions and of vacancies
 - Promotions, reappointments and promotion standards
 - Criteria for promotion and reappointment
 - Recommending staff members who, on the basis of the established criteria, deserve promotions
 - Salaries, salary scales, and salary increases
 - General policy regarding salary scales and increases
 - The criteria by which salary increases shall be apportioned among faculty member
 - Tenure and termination
 - Criteria regarding the granting of tenure
 - Terminations, except in those cases where such consultation would meet with the objection of the person whose termination is under consideration
 - Leaves, travel, and other absence
2. The Director shall make available to regular faculty, on request, salary and salary adjustments for each faculty member for each year.
3. When matters concerning promotion, reappointment, tenure, and dismissal are presented to the faculty or an advisory committee, care shall be exercised to assure that general standards of due process are preserved. These shall include notice to the affected faculty member of the meeting, an invitation for an appearance before the group, and the right to a presentation of the member's viewpoints.

4. At least once each academic year, the Director shall consult with FAC to discuss budgetary priorities and distribution of financial resources for the coming year.

- 5.

V. ANNUAL REVIEW OF TENURE SYSTEM FACULTY

Any School of Criminal Justice tenure system faculty member with the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor is to be provided with a clear statement of performance expectations and to have accomplishments reviewed annually. This annual review serves the basis of merit/salary increases. The principles and criteria guiding this annual evaluation is found in Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Merit/Salary Increases (See Appendix B).

VI: SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE FACULTY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

All faculty grievance procedures will be in accord with MSU's Faculty Grievance Policy.

VII: STUDENT FORUMS

I. STUDENT GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Student Grievance Procedures are adopted by reference to relevant university procedures as published in *Spartan Life* (or other media). The relevant documents include: *Academic Freedom for Students at MSU -- Basic Rights and Responsibilities* and *Graduate Students. Rights and Responsibilities*.

II. ADOPTION AND AMENDMENTS

These Bylaws shall be adopted when they are approved at a regularly scheduled Faculty Meeting with a previously distributed agenda by a majority of the qualified voting members. Amendments of the Bylaws shall be adopted by majority of the qualified voting members at a regularly scheduled meeting with a previously distributed agenda.

III. DOCUMENT HISTORY

These revised Bylaws of the SCJ GSF were approved and adopted, this date, the 6th of February, 1995.

These revised Bylaws of the School were approved at the regularly scheduled School Advisory Council meeting on November 20, 2017.

The Bylaws of the SCJ were revised and approved by the voting members of the School Advisory Council meeting on December 17, 2018.

The Bylaws of the SCJ were revised and approved by the voting members of the School Advisory Council on April 24, 2022.

The Bylaws of the SCJ were revised and approved by the voting members of the School Advisory Council on October 28, 2022.

The Bylaws of the SCJ were revised and approved by the voting members of the School Advisory Council on December 2, 2022.

The Bylaws of the SCJ were revised and approved by the voting members of the School Advisory Council on November 1, 2024.

APPENDIX A

SCHOOL OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

In the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (RPT) process, the School of Criminal Justice will adhere to all College and University schedules, policies, and procedures. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be familiar with these schedules, policies, and procedures, but she/he should feel free to consult the Director, the RPT committee, or other colleagues in the School for assistance. The following is a supplement to these schedules, policies, and procedures.¹

The Director of the School of Criminal Justice makes the recommendation to the College and Provost for reappointment, granting of tenure, promotion to associate professor with tenure, and promotion to professor. In making recommendations for reappointment at the third year, the Director will receive the RPT decision making committee's report and recommendation and the candidate's submitted materials. In making recommendations for tenure and/or promotion, the Director will receive the RPT decision making committee's report and recommendation, the candidate's submitted materials, and the candidate's file of letters solicited by the Director from external reviewers.

Scholarship is the primary concern for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and the quality of the candidate's scholarly work is expected to be outstanding. Excellent instruction and advising are also expected for promotion at each level of advancement, and expectations concerning service/outreach will be given increasing weight at each level of promotion. Because Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) are core values of Michigan State University, candidates should detail their DEI efforts, providing evidence of their activities and accomplishments in the context of research/creative activities, teaching, service, outreach, and engagement. Faculty should describe how these efforts are interwoven and enhance all other areas of faculty accomplishment. Recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion are based on a cumulative assessment of the candidate's pace of productivity, quality of work, and accomplishments across the School's mission. Because annual reviews do not take into consideration all applicable metrics such as impact in the field, the regular receipt of an annual review rating of "meeting expectations" or even "exceeding expectations" is a necessary, but not sufficient requirement for tenure or promotion.

CRITERIA

Recommendations to reappoint, to tenure, and to promote will be based on three key areas of performance: 1). Research & Scholarship, 2). Teaching, and 3). Service/Outreach. Faculty should describe how DEI efforts are interwoven into these areas and enhance all other areas of faculty

¹ There will be every effort made to ensure that School policy is consistent with College/University policy. In the event there are changes that have occurred to the latter that results in a conflict, the College/University policy represents the governing authority.

accomplishment. The standards highlighted below will be applied in such a way that ensures that the School of Criminal Justice accomplishes “the objective of continuously improving the academic strength and quality of the faculty” (see Faculty Handbook).

A. Research & Scholarship

The candidate is expected to have made sufficient impact in one or more areas of study so as to have established at least a national reputation for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor, and at least a national reputation for tenure and recognized leadership in a field of study for promotion to Professor. In addition, evaluations will consider whether candidates have fulfilled their responsibility for ensuring that their research methods adhere to all stated University policies for ethical standards and practices. Indicators of important, high quality contributions may vary in each case, but could include the following:

1. A significant body of high-quality, refereed published work. No specific number of publications guarantees promotion, but should at least be comparable to those in departments/schools at peer institutions ranked as the top doctoral programs at Research I universities. The candidate should also have a record that shows sustained productivity and scholarly contributions.
2. It is desirable that the candidate has demonstrated an ability to develop and lead research projects that contribute to her/his discipline. To demonstrate such initiative and leadership, at least a portion of the published work should be sole-authored and/or there should be several works that are first-authored (or an author order position that is the equivalent of first author). The candidate might also demonstrate initiative and leadership by specifically explaining responsibility for a significant role in particular projects.
3. There is an expectation that the record includes a sufficient number of published articles in the leading refereed outlets of the discipline or related disciplines to demonstrate the visibility, importance, and quality of the research record. There are several indicators that might demonstrate the quality of a journal, including rejection rates, circulation numbers, and impact factors. For scholarly books, publishers’ rejection rates and published evaluations by scholarly reviewers can also provide indicators of quality.
4. In terms of judging both the quality and impact of the candidate’s scholarship, significant emphasis will be placed on letters of evaluation from external reviewers that were solicited by the Director.
5. Other publications (i.e., peer-reviewed chapters in edited books, non-peer-reviewed books, edited books, research monographs, technical reports, reviews, book chapters) will be considered, but are of less value compared to refereed publications. The onus is on the candidate to make a case if she/he believes these other publications should be given added or equivalent weight.
6. Evidence of significant and successful sponsored research activity (e.g., number, prestige, and/or amount of award) assumes greater weight in the evaluation processes with each level of review for reappointment, promotion to associate professor, and promotion to full

professor. In general, it is not expected that candidates for promotion to associate professor with tenure will have an extensive record, but they must have applied for external resources. Candidates for promotion to professor with tenure should demonstrate considerable effort as well as success (receipt of awards).

7. Highly cited works and overall citation impact (e.g., in Google Scholar or relevant database).
8. Awards/recognition from the University or from professional organizations.
9. Involvement in the discipline (grant review panels, manuscript review. etc.).
10. Other evidence of scholarship (e.g., working papers, research databases, applied research reports for government or community agencies, scholarly presentations to university or community groups, etc.).
11. Research that aligns with diversity, equity, and inclusion, including, but not limited to: producing scholarship/creative work, leading scholarly and creative programs, and initiatives, applying for external grants, and generating new knowledge that focuses on DEI and engages with equity and inclusion issues.

B. Teaching

It is expected that the candidates be excellent in classroom teaching and mentorship. In addition, evaluations will consider whether candidates have fulfilled their responsibility for ensuring that their teaching methods and interactions with students adhere to all stated University policies, including those for ethical standards and practices. Teaching evaluations must be provided for all courses, but additional evidence can rely on a combination of these indicators to demonstrate excellence. Indicators of important, high quality contributions may vary in each case, but could include the following:

1. Student course evaluations (SIRs, etc.).
 2. Peer reviews of teaching.
 3. Contribution to the teaching mission of the School (e.g., teaching core doctoral courses, developing new courses in classroom and/or online environment, willingness to meet needs in low-level or ISS course offerings, attending teaching workshops, etc.).
 4. Innovation in the classroom with demonstrated impact on student learning. Candidates are encouraged to show innovation by referencing syllabi, course assignments, exercises, or other materials.
 5. Delivery of workshop and seminar participation.
 6. Publication and/or conference participation with graduate and/or undergraduate students.
 7. Mentorship (undergraduate and/or graduate) (e.g., number of dissertation/thesis
- School of Criminal Justice – Bylaws 11 – Updated 11/1/2024

committees, number chaired, engaging students in research activities, independent studies, etc.).

8. External funding for support of instructional activities.
9. Development of teaching resources.
10. Exhibit a commitment to DEI in teaching. Some examples include fostering inclusive learning environments and pedagogies, ensuring that students are provided with equitable opportunities for success, incorporating DEI into their curricula, and mentoring minoritized students.

C. Service/Outreach

It is expected that the candidate is a positive contributing member of the School, the community, and the profession and that her/his research has been infused into an outreach agenda. Such activities include the following:

1. Participation in official school activities (e.g., Dae Chang Symposiums, brown bag speakers/events, the Annual Career Fair, etc.).
2. Mentorship of junior faculty, graduate students and/or undergraduate students.
3. Editorial activities, including service on scholarly journals' editorial boards.
4. Membership and/or positions in professional organizations.
5. Committee leadership and service in the School, College, and/or University.
6. Collaborating and/or conducting training, research, or consultation with government or community agencies.
7. Scholarly or training presentation to university, community, or government agencies.
8. Media interviews that advance the mission of the School.
9. Systematic interactions with potential clients (government agencies, professional associations, foundations, industries) as well as donors.
10. Participating in on-campus DEI initiatives is a clear example of DEI university service, but there are other examples which include engaging with minoritized communities and promoting DEI values to the broader public or being involved in service activities that promote inclusive excellence.

PROCESS

A. Decision-Making Committee

For cases involving reappointment and promotion to associate professor with tenure, the decision-making committee will consist of all tenured faculty holding the rank of professor or associate professor. For cases involving promotion to Professor with tenure, the decision-making committee will be all tenured faculty holding the rank of Professor. The Director, the Associate Director, as well as other colleagues serving in administrative functions, such as Dean, Associate Dean, or Assistant Dean, will be excluded from these committees.

No decisions on tenure/promotion recommendations may be made by any committee unless a quorum is present at the time of the vote (51% of the eligible faculty, excluding faculty on sabbatical or on approved leave for any other reason).

B. Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Advisory Subcommittee

A subcommittee of 3 professors and 3 associate professors will be appointed by the Director. The term of service will be two years (September 1 through August 31). All eligible professors and associate professors will be rotated onto this subcommittee for service. In even numbered years, two professors will be rotated off of the committee, and two associate professors will be rotated off in odd numbered years. The Subcommittee Chair must be a Professor selected by vote from the members of the subcommittee. If there is a tie, committee members should be asked to vote again (and continue to vote until the tie is broken). Subcommittee members will only assist on issues related to those candidates at or below the member's current rank.

This subcommittee will perform a variety of duties.

Oversee the Review for Reappointment

First, the entire subcommittee will meet annually with all untenured faculty members. Professors on the subcommittee will meet with tenured associate professors or other faculty upon request.² The purpose of the annual meeting with untenured faculty members is to discuss the candidate's contributions to date, provide clarifications to the RPT policy, answer questions that she/he may have about the RPT policy or the schedules, policies, or procedures of the College and University, and discuss ways that the members of the subcommittee can support the faculty member's efforts. To facilitate this review, the candidate will provide to the Subcommittee Chair her/his vitae and a brief summary statement of activities (1 page) by September 15. These materials will be circulated to all members of the decision-making committee and any feedback on the candidate's performance should be provided to the Chair of the subcommittee by October 15. The meeting with the candidate and the subcommittee will be scheduled in order to provide feedback on his/her performance. This meeting with the candidate should occur after October 15, but prior to the end of the fall semester.

Second, the entire subcommittee will conduct an evaluation of untenured faculty in year three of the probationary period. Delay of the third-year reappointment review may be requested by the faculty member, and any faculty member considering this option is to consult with the Director. Each faculty member must submit a Review File (see Section D for specific elements) that contains all elements listed except for External Review Letters. Although the third year review will not

² 2 For all faculty with joint appointments, the committee will arrange for an appropriate representative from the other unit to be a participant in the advisory meetings. There will be also an effort in coordination so that the candidate will have only one such meeting.

include External Review Letters, the candidate's review file will follow the procedures described below (Section B, paragraphs 6-9). The timeline for submission of materials follows the same timeline as promotion and tenure decisions. As the due dates for materials varies slightly from year to year and is issued centrally by the University's Office of the Provost, the Director will provide candidates with the applicable RPT calendar deadlines.

Oversee the Review for Promotion and/or Tenure

For candidates who are seeking promotion and/or tenure, the subcommittee will prepare a list of potential external reviewers to be shared with the Director. This list of names, discussed in more detail below, should be solicited from all members of the decision-making committee. In the case of associate professors seeking promotion to full professor, this decision-making committee will be comprised of full professors with tenure only. In the case of assistant professors seeking promotion and/or tenure to associate, this decision-making committee will be comprised of associate professors with tenure and full professors with tenure.

Each candidate is required to prepare a personal statement, which describes their teaching, research, and scholarship. This statement is sent to external reviewers, along with the candidate's curriculum vitae and a minimum of three but no more than five works of scholarship authored by the candidate. If the candidate would like feedback on the personal statement prior to it being sent to the external reviewers, it must be submitted to the subcommittee by April 15. The subcommittee should provide feedback to the candidate by May 10th.

After the candidate's review file is complete, including the receipt of external review letters, the subcommittee will offer to meet with the candidate to provide information and ask/answer questions. The candidate can choose not to meet with the subcommittee.

After this meeting with the candidate occurs (or after the candidate declines to meet with the subcommittee), the Subcommittee Chair will schedule a meeting with all members of the decision-making committee. This meeting will occur on the Friday prior to final examination week (usually the second Friday in December). The Subcommittee will provide a brief summary of the candidate's contribution to the School in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and service/outreach, and the committee will discuss the candidate's record. The summary will also include a discussion of how DEI is interwoven into these other activities. After the meeting adjourns, each member of the RPT decision-making committee will have one week to submit her/his vote using a secure and anonymous online survey tool created by the RPT committee chair. The RPT committee chair compiles the votes and integrates any comments received. Votes are anonymous and will be tallied in secret. The vote will remain confidential and the totals will be noted in the recommendation to the Director. The subcommittee will prepare a brief written statement that includes the vote, outlining the rationale for the recommendation. This recommendation will be provided to the Director. If the majority on the committee vote not to support promotion and/or tenure, the Director will inform the candidate according to University policy.

C. Director

It is recognized that the Director plays a critical role in all stages leading up to a

candidate's reappointment, tenure, and promotion to either associate professor with tenure or professor with tenure. It is expected that the Director will meet annually with all faculty members to provide feedback about their scholarly, teaching, and, service/outreach contributions, DEI contributions, review performance, and discuss plans for professional growth. The Director will also make recommendations on possible mentors within the School, the discipline, or other schools/departments who might be sources of support and guidance to the candidate (see School's Faculty Mentoring Policy). The Director is also expected to be available to discuss the timeline of the process, and answer questions on the forms and documents that must be submitted. The Director is also responsible for working with the RPT subcommittee to develop a list of external reviewers.

The Director must conduct an independent review of the candidate, and is responsible for writing a letter that explains the Director's evaluation and recommendation concerning the candidate. The Director's report should specifically discuss the candidate's contributions in all areas of performance under evaluation. Although the Director must consider the RPT decision making committee's report as only advisory, she/he must note the committee's vote total in the report. If the Director makes a negative recommendation, the Director will inform the candidate according to University policy.

D. Review File

In this process, the School of Criminal Justice will adhere to all College and University schedules, policies, and procedures. Candidates must use appropriate forms, meet deadlines, and follow guidelines.

The candidate for associate professor with tenure or professor is responsible for assembling and presenting evidence related to research, teaching, and service/outreach in a five-page statement. This statement will be included with the materials sent to external reviewers. If the candidate would like feedback on the statement prior to being sent to the external reviewers, it must be submitted to the RPT committee by April 15. The RPT committee should provide feedback by May 10th. The candidate is also responsible for assembling the materials for the review file. The materials cited below should be provided to the Director by November 1. The Director will be responsible for assigning staff to assemble these materials and insert the external letters in the review file. The materials submitted to the College will include:

1. Brief Statement of scholarship, teaching and service/outreach contributions and how DEI has been embedded across these areas (five-page maximum);
2. University Required Forms (i.e., FORM D);
3. Current Vitae (clearly noting peer-reviewed publications and indicating the role the candidate played in publications with multiple authors; examples of schema used by faculty in prior years for making such designations are available from the Director);
4. Letters from External Reviewers (inserted by the Director);
5. Access to all Publications;
6. Copies of Grant Application Program Narratives; Total budget amounts.
7. Information on Other Scholarly Resources (i.e., databases);
8. Citation Report on the Candidate's Work;
9. Course Evaluations;
10. Peer Teaching Evaluations (if available);

11. Course Syllabi;
12. Evidence of Awards/Fellowships, etc.;
13. Evidence of DEI impact at the individual faculty level, at a programmatic unit level, and/or at an institutional or professional organizational level.
14. Any Other Evidence.

The candidate will also be responsible for any additional information required by the College or University.

E. Selection of External Reviewers

The Director, in consultation with the RPT subcommittee, will select at least 4 names but not more than six to perform an external review. Each candidate seeking promotion may submit up to four names to the Director for consideration by March 1st, but the Director ultimately decides who will be contacted to perform the review. At least four of the reviewers selected by the Director must be individuals who were not exclusively put forward on the candidate's list. Prior to the list being put together, the candidate can request that potential reviewers not be on the list because of a conflict. A brief explanation of the conflict should be provided to the Director.

The names on the list must consist of scholars from peer institutions who have the appropriate expertise to evaluate the candidate's scholarly research. The scholar must be at the Associate/Full level when reviewing candidates for promotion to Associate Professor. Candidates seeking promotion to Professor must submit names of scholars who have achieved at least this rank. If scholars' names are submitted as potential external reviewers and these individuals are not employed at a peer-university, they must have a scholarly record comparable to a university-employed scholar with appropriate expertise and accomplishments for conducting the review.

To be eligible for selection as a reviewer, the scholar must not have a close previous association with the candidate (e.g., mentor, collaborator, dissertation advisor). Each external reviewer will receive a minimum of three works of scholarship authored by the candidate, the candidate's research statement, and the candidate's vita. The candidate chooses which writings these will be. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide copies of the materials to the Director that will be sent to reviewers. The candidate has the option of including more than three articles but should not provide more than 5. For candidates seeking promotion to full professor, the sample publications should have been published after the most recent RPT review (e.g., after promotion to associate professor). These materials should be submitted to the Director by June 15th.

The external reviewers should be contacted by the Director no later than May 15th with a request to complete a review by October 1st. Here is language for the Director to consider for inclusion in the letter: MSU deeply values accomplishments aligned with diversity, equity, and inclusion, thus faculty members going up for tenure and promotion consideration are evaluated for evidence of such achievement. The primary focus of your review should be on the faculty member's scholarly/creative contributions, but we welcome any other comments that you would like to make about teaching, service or efforts related to DEI.

If the external reviewer fails to provide an evaluation, the Director can decide to contact other

potential reviewers or proceed with the evaluation based on the candidate's extant portfolio. The Director, however, must acquire at least four letters from reviewers whose names were submitted by the RPT subcommittee or who were nominated by the Director in consultation with the RPT subcommittee. The RPT subcommittee's review should not occur prior to all letters having been received or, alternatively, the decision has been made to move forward with the letters on file.

F. Document History: Approved October 26, 2015; revised June 2, 2016; revised April 24, 2022; revised 11/1/2024

APPENDIX B

Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Salary/Merit Increase

1. Fundamental Principles of Merit Consideration

- 1.1. The Annual Review and Merit/Salary increase criteria and procedures shall be consistent with the SCJ Mission Statement as adopted by the faculty.
- 1.2. The criteria to be applied for Annual Review and Merit/Salary will vary by faculty rank. The same expectations shall apply for all faculty members with the standard effort distribution within a given rank. Expectations for faculty with a non-standard effort distribution are governed by a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the faculty member and the SCJ Director. Annual Review and Merit/Salary decisions will consider the effort distribution of faculty members.
- 1.3. Faculty review materials (due annually on February 1) include an annual review form, an updated CV, and documentation of efforts, including copies of publications, reports, and conference papers. Activities that are listed in more than one review area must clearly indicate the area in which the faculty member wants credit. For example, because outreach is designed to cut across the teaching, research, and service mission, outreach may contain activities that are referenced elsewhere. Nonetheless, the faculty member is expected to note the area in which credit for a specific effort is requested.
- 1.4. An elected, representative body of faculty, the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), shall review annually each faculty member and advise the Director about each faculty member's performance. The review shall be based on the faculty member's activities and achievements for each calendar year. This review, as well as the Director's review, is to be conducted as specified in the Bylaws and should be completed early enough to allow for the resolution of appeals within the SCJ before the close of the spring semester.
- 1.5. Faculty members may appeal decisions in their final Annual Review Letter in writing to the Director within 30 days of the final version of the letter being provided to a faculty member. The affected faculty member and Director will meet in person to discuss the grounds of the appeal (i.e., areas of disagreement) within 30 days of the faculty member notifying the Director of the appeal. The Director will issue a written statement concerning a resolution to the appeal (i.e., adjustment to the annual review or maintaining original review) within 30 days of the in-person appeal meeting. If, at this point, the faculty member disagrees with the Director, they have a final opportunity to appeal to FAC. The faculty member will notify FAC in writing of the desire to appeal the Director's final annual review decision within 30 days of the Director's appeal decision. FAC and the faculty member will meet within 30 days of this written notice to hear the faculty member's concerns. FAC has 30 days after this meeting to provide a recommendation to the Director. The Director makes the final decision.

1.6. The Mission Statement of the SCJ imposes obligations on faculty to achieve excellence in outreach and public service as well as the traditional academic responsibilities of teaching and scholarship. Consistent with the mission of the SCJ, the Annual Review and Merit/Salary evaluation will address faculty performance within each dimension of the CJ mission: A) Teaching and Advising; B) School and University Administration; C) Service to the Public and the Profession; D) Outreach; E) Research; F) Scholarly Publications.

1.7. Faculty will be evaluated on an annual basis (i.e., a calendar year). The Annual Review and Merit/Salary provisions below define the expected level of performance by rank for each of the foregoing categories of activity and achievement that comprise the SCJ mission. Faculty members will be rated by FAC as “Not Meeting Expectations,” “Meeting Expectations,” and “Exceeding Expectations” for each of the six categories. As noted below, faculty cannot be rated as “Exceeding Expectations” in any of these areas if they are rated as “Not Meeting Expectations” in the superordinate DEI category.

FAC must use its judgment in determining each faculty member’s overall rating based on the combined ratings and overall performance record. Faculty members’ overall performance rating generally will be determined by the following metrics:

1.7.1. “Not Meeting Expectations” = not meeting expectations in 2 or more of the 6 review categories.

1.7.2. “Meeting Expectations” = meeting or exceeding expectations in all categories with not more than 1 category rated as not meeting expectations.

1.7.3. “Exceeding Expectations” = exceeding expectations in 3 of the 6 review categories (one of which must be in Teaching and Advising, Research, or Scholarly Publications), and meeting expectations in the other 3 categories.

1.7.4. “Greatly Exceeding Expectations” = an overall performance rating provided by FAC in especially outstanding circumstances.

1.8. In their research, teaching, and service, faculty members are expected to demonstrate their commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) as core values of Michigan State University. Specifically, our faculty are expected to make demonstrable efforts in working to eliminate barriers to success and access; challenge discrimination and bias; address past and present inequalities; and create and sustain a culture of safety that allows all to learn, work, teach, live, and visit in a community that values them.

In line with the University’s commitment to DEI, faculty will also be expected to demonstrate relevant efforts in three superordinate categories:

1.8.1. Teaching and Advising (*Subordinate Categories*: Teaching and Advising)

1.8.2. Service and Outreach (*Subordinate Categories*: School and University Administration, Service to the Public and the Profession, Outreach)

1.8.3. Research (*Subordinate Categories*: Research, Scholarly Publications)

During the annual review process, faculty members' DEI efforts will be rated by FAC as "Not Meeting Expectations," "Meeting Expectations," and "Exceeding Expectations" in each of the three superordinate categories. Faculty are encouraged to conceptualize these values broadly but are expected to explicitly show how they have engaged in relevant activities in all three areas of their work. Faculty who fail to meet expectations in any of the three superordinate areas cannot be rated as "Exceeding Expectations" in any subordinate areas (Research and Scholarly Publications within research; Teaching and Advising within Teaching; and School and University Administration, Service to the Public and the Profession, and Outreach within service).

1.9. In addition to submitting lists of activities and achievements each year, faculty members shall provide documentation, including copies of publications, reports, and conference papers. Faculty members shall also supply narrative explanations of research activities and other aspects of performance that are not fully explained by the lists of activities and achievements.

Appendix B Section 1 was last amended December 2, 2022

2. General Evaluation Criteria to be Applied at All Ranks

The following presents activities which may be considered by FAC in evaluating annual performance. These lists of activities are not exhaustive because faculty activities are expected to be highly diversified. Credit for each activity generally should only be granted in one category. Faculty members may seek to persuade FAC of the proper categorization but FAC will make the final determination.

2.1. Teaching and Advising

2.1.1. Faculty members in the SCJ are expected to strive for excellence in teaching and advising. FAC will evaluate faculty members on the quality, nature, and number of contributions to the teaching and advising mission of the SCJ. Summer teaching, which is separately compensated, will not be considered as teaching as an additional course. FAC may, however, credit new course preparation, innovative syllabi, and other extra activities related to the summer course that were conducted during the fall and/or spring semesters.

2.1.2. In evaluating performance in the teaching and advising category, FAC shall consider the following:

- student course evaluations, such as SIRS results
- number of students actively advised on guidance, thesis, and dissertation committees
- number of thesis and dissertation committees chaired
- number of students guided to completion of graduate theses and dissertations
- number of students supervised in independent study projects
- number of students supervised in special research programs (e.g., McNair/SROP, Dean's Assistantship, etc.)

- demonstrated efforts and achievements in involving students, both graduate and undergraduate, in gaining research skills and experience
- design of new courses
- preparation of new course that faculty member has not previously taught
- innovative syllabi and teaching techniques, including use of instructional technologies
- preparation of teaching materials for own courses
- preparation of instructional materials for national dissemination
- conference papers on teaching and curriculum issues
- publication of textbooks
- publication of revised editions of textbooks
- service as manuscript reviewer for textbook publisher
- participation in faculty development seminars and programs on teaching
- development of international programs related to teaching
- list other activities and products that show contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of teaching and advising that were not documented above.
- other documented activities/products that show special contributions to teaching and advising

2.1.3. In considering the above contributions to teaching and advising, FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (e.g., the number of graduate students advised or undergraduate students involved in research; students reaching milestones such as thesis or dissertation completions; the number of students publishing or presenting research and the prestige of the outlets; or evidence of innovative and substantive curricular and course development activities).

2.2. **School and University Administration**

2.2.1. Faculty members are expected to contribute conscientiously to School, College, and University Administration.

2.2.2. In evaluating performance in School and University Administration, FAC shall consider the following:

- service on School, College, and University committees
- leadership responsibilities on School, College, and University committees
- service as director/coordinator of degree programs
- active involvement in student recruitment and retention programs/activities
- advising of student organizations
- substantial responsibilities for special projects for the School, College, or University
- planning/organizing/leading programs and activities for School, College, or University
- contributions to international activities that advance School and University goals
- list other activities and products that show contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of school and university administration that were not documented

above

- other activities demonstrating service to School, College, or University

2.2.3. In considering the above contributions to school and university administration, FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (e.g., evidence of the time commitment, leadership role, one-time versus ongoing activities, or other indicators of high impact contributions).

2.3. **Service to Public and Profession**

2.3.1. As part of the mission of SCJ, faculty members are expected to be active in service to the public and to the academy of criminal justice scholars.

2.3.2. In evaluating performance in the Public and Professional Service category, FAC shall consider the following:

- service as section or conference organizer for academic or professional conference
- leadership position in academic or professional association
- service as panel chair at academic or professional conference
- speeches and invited talks to academic conferences and university audiences
- service as editor of scholarly journal or professional publication
- service as manuscript reviewer for academic or professional journal
- service as manuscript reviewer for scholarly book publisher
- authorship of published book reviews
- authorship of articles for newsletters or magazines of academic associations
- service as grant proposal reviewer
- service as external reviewer for promotion and tenure
- service as external program reviewer for academic department
- service as expert commentator for news media
- contributions to international professional and public service
- list other activities and products that show contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of service to the public and profession that were not documented above
- other evidence of service to public and profession

2.3.3. In considering the above contributions to the public and profession, FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (e.g., evidence of time commitment; number and prestige of activities; number and prestige of products).

2.4. **Outreach**

2.4.1. As part of the mission of SCJ, faculty are expected to be active in outreach initiatives. Outreach shall be recognized as consistent with the University's definitions and goals. MSU defines outreach as "a form of scholarship that cuts across teaching, research, and service. It involves generating, transmitting, applying,

and preserving knowledge for the direct benefit of external audiences in ways that are consistent with university and unit missions.” In addition, “the scholarly component of the project legitimizes the outreach effort as a university activity and makes it accessible to peer review.” The University aspires to have units evaluate the quality of faculty outreach efforts and accomplishments through products generated (e.g., reports and publications), measures of impact, and other indicators of quality and significance.

2.4.2. In evaluating performance in the Outreach category, FAC shall consider the following:

- service as advisor or event planner for criminal justice agency/organization
- speaker at professional association
- trainer at professional conference or criminal justice agency/organization
- research conducted for criminal justice agency/organization
- authorship of technical reports for criminal justice agency/organization
- evaluator of criminal justice programs or organizations
- authorship of articles for professional association newsletter or magazine
- contributions to international outreach activities
- list other activities and products that show contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of outreach that were not documented above
- other evidence of generating and transmitting scholarship for the benefit of external audiences

2.4.3. In considering the above contributions to outreach, FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (e.g., evidence of time commitment; number and prestige of activities; number and prestige of products).

2.5. **Research**

2.5.1. Research shall be recognized as activities in a process that seek to culminate in the generation of products that will ultimately be credited for Scholarly Publications, Outreach, Service, or Teaching. Pursuant to the mission of SCJ, faculty members are expected to be actively engaged in research.

2.5.2. In evaluating performance in the Research category, FAC shall consider the following:

- research grant applications
- research grants successfully obtained, with greater credit for larger grants
- research grants successfully obtained, with greater credit for fully funding graduate students (i.e., stipend, tuition, and healthcare)
- prestige of research granting institution
- annual narratives describing research-in-progress, including progress on multi-year research projects
- published technical report with national dissemination (e.g., published by NIJ)
- evidence of preparatory research work

- data collection efforts
- manuscript preparation and revision
- conference papers and presentations
- list other activities and products that show contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the area of research that were not documented above
- other evidence of research activity

2.5.3. In considering the above contributions to research, FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (e.g., evidence of time commitment; number of projects; evidence of interdisciplinary, international, or other challenging work environments).

2.6. **Scholarly Publications**

2.6.1. The SCJ faculty accepts that the blind, peer-review process of recognized journals and publishers is an important indicator of quality. In this context, a peer-reviewed journal is one in which manuscripts are sent to scholars and experts for blind review and comment so that the review/decision is not solely in the hands of the journal's editor(s). Scholarly journal articles each will be counted once for credit through the submission of a letter of acceptance containing a firm commitment to publish, through the submission of an online first version of the article, or through the submission of the article when it appears in an issue. Book chapters, books, and other publications will be counted when the publication is accepted. Publications will be counted as indicated by faculty member regardless of the copyright date as long as they have not been counted for scholarly credit in a previous year.

2.6.2. Level 1 Publications

- Peer reviewed journal article
- Publication of initial edition of book with a university/scholarly/academic press
- Publication of the initial edition of an authored original, scholarly book/monograph with a commercial press
- Publication of an edited scholarly book
- Faculty may request that FAC consider for credit as a Level I publication any scholarly publications not listed here.

2.6.3. Level 2 Publications

- Non-refereed scholarly journal publication
- A chapter in an edited book or an original article in an anthology
- Publication of revised edition of an authored scholarly book
- Publication of the initial edition of an authored, original textbook
- A scholarly paper in published conference proceedings

2.6.4. Implementation of Publication Evaluation: Beginning in 2005, faculty were given the option to have their publication productivity evaluated on the basis of a single calendar year or a rolling three-year average. Expectations for level of productivity

when evaluated on either a single calendar year or a rolling three-year average are specified in the General Criteria for Merit Evaluation by Rank.

2.6.5. In considering the above contributions to service to scholarly publications, FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (e.g., evidence of quality, prestige, or impact).

Appendix B Section 2 was last amended October 28, 2022

3. General Criteria for Merit Evaluation by Rank

3.1. **Assistant Professor**

Evaluation of assistant professors is based on the expectation that their efforts are leading to the development of a national reputation and recognition for scholarly work in their major area of interest consistent with the mission of the SCJ. While assistant professors should be willing to contribute to and demonstrate activity in School and University Administration, Public Service, and Outreach, their efforts should emphasize Teaching and Advising, Research, and Scholarly Publications. Demonstrated success in these latter three categories are central to tenure and promotion considerations at MSU.

Below is a general guideline of activities that could constitute “meeting expectations” or “exceeding expectations.” This is not an exhaustive list because faculty activities are diverse. Moreover, activities across the entire category will be considered (i.e., one activity alone is not necessarily sufficient to constitute a particular rating, and failure to engage in one activity is not necessarily sufficient to constitute not meeting a particular rating). FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort in a manner consistent with the above discussion for each review category and based on professional standard expectations for someone at the rank of assistant professor in our field.

3.1.1. Teaching and Advising

3.1.1.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Satisfactorily teaching assigned courses each semester. This includes satisfactory teaching evaluations.
- Willingness to serve on thesis and dissertation committees.
- Engaging undergraduate and/or graduate students in research (or related) projects.

3.1.1.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Service as advisor to graduate students.
- Serving on thesis or dissertation committees.
- Chairing thesis or dissertation committees.

- Actively engaging undergraduate and/or graduate students in research (or related) projects that lead to high-quality reports, presentations, and/or publications.
- Preparation of a new course.
- Development of new, high quality teaching materials
- Other activities listed under General Evaluation

Criteria. 3.1.2.School and University Administration

3.1.2.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Willingness to serve on School, College, and University committees as assigned by the Director.

3.1.2.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- In addition to the criteria for meeting expectations,
- Serving on School, College, and University committees that require moderate (or higher) time commitment.
- Substantial contributions or leadership role in significant projects/tasks undertaken by School, College, or University committees.
- Other activities listed under General Evaluation Criteria

above. 3.1.3.Service to Public and Profession

3.1.3.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Evidence of activity such as manuscript reviews.
- Panel chair at conference.

3.1.3.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Significant activity as a manuscript reviewer.
- Leadership or significant activity as section organizer for conference.
- Editorial board member.
- Journal editor (including guest editor).
- Officer in professional association.
- Other activities listed under General Evaluation Criteria above.

3.1.4.Outreach

3.1.4.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Contributor as speaker, advisor, planner, or writer for an outreach-related activity; or comparable role for training and other

knowledge-generating and disseminating events, activities, and products in the field of criminal justice.

3.1.4.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Significant involvement in outreach activities that generate products (e.g., reports and publications).

3.1.5. Research

3.1.5.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Presentation of a scholarly paper at one regional, national, or international conference.
- Evidence of an active research agenda (e.g., projects at various stages of completion).
- Assistant professors are encouraged to make plans to submit proposals for research grants. However, submission of proposals is not required to meet expectations.

3.1.5.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Writing grant proposals.
- Gaining funding for research.
- Presentation of multiple papers at scholarly conferences

3.1.6. Scholarly Publications

3.1.6.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- At least two Level 1 publications.

3.1.6.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Publication of an academic press book.
- Or, publication of at least one manuscript in a high impact outlet. Faculty should describe why the outlet should be considered “high-impact” for its field (inclusive of all disciplines in the various social sciences, business, medicine, and hard sciences) on the basis of its impact factor, ranking, and/or other indicators of quality and prestige. Such an outlet will be within the top 10 scholarly journals for the field/sub-area for its current or three-year running average impact factor. For instance, in criminology/penology this would include *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Criminology & Public Policy*, *Law & Human Behavior*, *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *Crime*

& Delinquency, Journal of Experimental Criminology, and British Journal of Criminology.

- Or, three or more Level 1 publications.
- Or, at least two Level 1 publications and at least one Level 2 publication.

3.1.7. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

3.1.7.1. *Meeting Expectations*

- Teaching
 - Maintain an inclusive and safe learning environment (e.g., accessible and encouraging to all students, engage respectfully with difficult and sensitive subject matter, student identities are validated).
 - Respect the terms of RCPD's Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations documents (VISAs).
- Research
 - Facilitate a safe and accessible work environment to minimize barriers to conducting research or creative work.
- Service
 - Maintain certification in DEI trainings (e.g., mandatory DEI and RVSM training).

3.2. **Associate Professor**

Evaluation of associate professors is based on the expectation that they will make continuing progress toward solidifying and enhancing their national reputations and recognition. Faculty at this level are expected to broaden their involvement in School and University Administration, Service, and Outreach while continuing their productivity and achievements in Teaching and Advising, Research, and Scholarly Publications. More weight will be given to service activities with leadership responsibilities, but FAC will consider situations where the body of work is considerable even without leadership.

Below is a general guideline of activities that could constitute "meeting expectations" or "exceeding expectations." This is not an exhaustive list because faculty activities are diverse. Moreover, activities across the entire category will be considered (i.e., one activity alone is not necessarily sufficient to constitute a particular rating, and failure to engage in one activity is not necessarily sufficient to constitute not meeting a particular rating). FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort in a manner consistent with the above discussion for each review category and based on professional standard expectations for someone at the rank of associate professor in our field.

3.2.1. Teaching and Advising

3.2.1.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Satisfactorily teaching assigned courses each semester. This includes satisfactory teaching evaluations.
- Active service on graduate guidance, thesis, or dissertation committees and/or engagement of undergraduates in independent studies or undergraduate research opportunities (or related projects).
- Contributions to curriculum development and assessment of student learning.

3.2.1.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Exemplary service as advisor to graduate and/or students. Exemplary service is determined by indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (see General Evaluative Criteria above).
- Leadership role in the development of curriculum revision and new courses.
- Development of new, high-quality teaching materials.
- Supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate student research that culminates in high-quality presentations or publications.
- Other activities listed in General Evaluation Criteria

above. 3.2.2. School and University Administration

3.2.2.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Active service as assigned to and selected for multiple School, College, or University committees or to a single committee that that requires more than a minimal time commitment.

3.2.2.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- In addition to criteria for meeting expectations, substantial contributions to or serving in a leadership role on School, College, or University committees.
- Other activities listed in General Evaluation Criteria

above. 3.2.3. Service to Public and Profession

3.2.3.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Multiple professional service activities, such as service as manuscript reviewer for several papers, panel chair at conference, author of scholarly book reviews, and/or other activities as listed in General Evaluation Criteria.

3.2.3.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Leadership or demonstrably significant effort in public and professional service- focused activities, such as section organizer for conference, journal editor (including guest editor), officer in professional association, and/or other activities listed in General Evaluation Criteria.

3.2.4. Outreach

3.2.4.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Contributor as speaker, advisor, planner, or writer for an outreach-related activity or comparable role for training and other knowledge-generating and disseminating events, activities, and products to the scholarly academy or to the field of criminal justice.

3.2.4.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Leadership or demonstrably significant involvement in outreach activities that generate products (e.g., reports and publications).
- Outreach-focused activities that require sustained collaboration with partner organizations that demonstrably focuses on advancing the mission of partner organizations (as distinct of research or other academic goals).

3.2.5. Research

3.2.5.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Present a scholarly paper at one national and/or international conference.
- Evidence of an active research agenda (e.g., projects at various stages of completion).
- Activity with the end goal of grant-writing is expected.

3.2.5.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Submission of external grant proposals.
- Securing external

3.2.6. Scholarly Publications

3.2.6.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- At least two Level 1 publications.

3.2.6.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Publication of an academic press book.
- Or, publication of at least one manuscript in a high impact outlet. Faculty should describe why the outlet should be considered “high-impact” for its field (inclusive of all disciplines in the various social sciences, business, medicine, and hard sciences) on the basis of its impact factor, ranking, and/or other indicators of quality and prestige. Such an outlet will be within the top 10 scholarly journals for the field/sub-area for its current or three-year running average impact factor. For instance, in criminology/penology this would include *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Criminology & Public Policy*, *Law & Human Behavior*, *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *Crime & Delinquency*, *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, and *British Journal of Criminology*.
- Or, three or more Level 1 publications.
- Or, at least two Level 1 publications and at least one Level 2 publication.
-

3.1.7. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

3.1.7.1. *Meeting Expectations*

- Teaching
 - Maintain an inclusive and safe learning environment (e.g., accessible and encouraging to all students, engage respectfully with difficult and sensitive subject matter, student identities are validated).
 - Respect the terms of RCPD’s Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations documents (VISAs).
- Research
 - Facilitate a safe and accessible work environment to minimize barriers to conducting research or creative work.
- Service
 - Maintain certification in DEI trainings (e.g., mandatory DEI and RVSM training).

3.3. Full Professor

Evaluation of full professors is based on the expectation that they will make continuing efforts to maintain their national reputations and recognition. Faculty at this level are expected to broaden further their involvement in School and University Administration, Service, and Outreach while continuing their productivity and achievements in Teaching and Advising, Research, and Scholarly Publications. Such further involvement may include leadership roles in national associations, serving as editors of scholarly journals, or national recognition for the dissemination of knowledge to criminal justice practitioners and the public.

Below is a general guideline of activities that could constitute “meeting expectations” or “exceeding expectations.” This is not an exhaustive list because faculty activities are diverse. Moreover, activities across the entire category will be considered (i.e., one activity alone is not necessarily sufficient to constitute a particular rating, and failure to engage in one activity is not necessarily sufficient to constitute not meeting a particular rating). FAC will consider indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort in a manner consistent with the above discussion for each review category and based on professional standard expectations for someone at the rank of full professor in our field.

3.3.1. Teaching and Advising

3.3.1.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Satisfactorily teaching assigned courses per semester. This includes satisfactory teaching evaluations.
- Active service on graduate guidance, thesis, or dissertation committees and/or engagement of undergraduates in independent studies or undergraduate research opportunities (or related projects).
- Contributions to curriculum development and assessment of student learning.

3.3.1.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- In addition to the criteria for meeting expectations, exemplary service as advisor to graduate and/or students. Exemplary service is determined by indicators of quality and impact as well as distinctive effort (see General Evaluative Criteria above).
- Leadership role in the development of curriculum revision and new courses.
- Development of new, high-quality teaching materials.
- Supervision of graduate and/or undergraduate student research that culminates in high-quality presentations or publications.

- Other activities listed in General Evaluation Criteria

above. 3.3.2.School and University Administration

3.3.2.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Active service as assigned to and selected for multiple School, College, or University committees or service on a single committee that that requires more than a minimal time commitment.

3.3.2.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Leadership on or demonstrably substantial contributions to School, College, or University committees.
- Other activities listed in General Evaluation Criteria

above. 3.3.3.Service to Public and Profession

3.3.3.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Multiple professional service activities, such as service as manuscript reviewer for several papers, panel chair at conference, author of scholarly book reviews, and/or other activities as listed in General Evaluation Criteria.

3.3.3.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Leadership or demonstrably significant effort in public and professional service- focused activities, such as section organizer for conference, journal editor (including guest editor), officer in professional association, and/or other activities listed in General Evaluation Criteria.

3.3.4.Outreach

3.3.4.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Contributor as speaker, advisor, planner, or writer for an outreach-related activity; or comparable role for training and other knowledge-generating and disseminating events, activities, and products in the field of criminal justice.

3.3.4.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Leadership or demonstrably significant involvement in outreach activities that generate products (e.g., reports and publications).
- Outreach-focused activities should involve sustained collaboration with

partner organizations that focus on advancing the mission of partner organizations (as distinct of research or other academic goals).

3.3.5. Research

3.3.5.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- Present a scholarly paper at one national and/or international conference.
- Evidence of an active research agenda (e.g., projects at various stages of completion).
- Involvement in grant-writing activity is expected.

3.3.5.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Submission of external grant proposals.
- Securing external

funding. 3.3.6. Scholarly Publications

3.3.6.1. *Meeting Expectations:*

- At least two Level 1 publications.

3.3.6.2. *Exceeding Expectations:*

- Publication of an academic press book.
- Or, publication of at least one manuscript in a high impact outlet. Faculty should describe why the outlet should be considered “high-impact” for its field (inclusive of all disciplines in the various social sciences, business, medicine, and hard sciences) on the basis of its impact factor, ranking, and/or other indicators of quality and prestige. Such an outlet will be within the top 10 scholarly journals for the field/sub-area for its current or three-year running average impact factor. For instance, in criminology/penology this would include *Criminology*, *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Criminology & Public Policy*, *Law & Human Behavior*, *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *Crime & Delinquency*, *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, and *British Journal of Criminology*.
- Or, three or more Level 1 publications.
- Or, at least two Level 1 publications and at least one Level 2 publication.

3.1.7. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

3.1.7.1. *Meeting Expectations*

- Teaching

- Maintain an inclusive and safe learning environment (e.g., accessible and encouraging to all students, engage respectfully with difficult and sensitive subject matter, student identities are validated).
- Respect the terms of RCPD's Verified Individualized Services and Accommodations documents (VISAs).
- Research
 - Facilitate a safe and accessible work environment to minimize barriers to conducting research or creative work.
- Service
 - Maintain certification in DEI trainings (e.g., mandatory DEI and RVSM training).

Appendix B Section 3 was last amended December 2, 2022

IV. THE DIRECTOR OF THE SCHOOL

A. Administrative Responsibilities

1. The Director is the chief executive officer responsible for advancing the School's educational, research, service, outreach, and personnel development goals.
2. Among the Director's responsibilities are matters regarding the School's budget, physical facilities, and personnel, in accordance with mandated procedures and reporting requirements in SCJ and other university bylaws.
3. At the all-School fall retreat or the first SAC meeting of the fall semester, the Director shall make a comprehensive report on School programs, goals, and objectives for the academic year, including details of the School's budget.
4. The Director is responsible for representing the School effectively within the College of Social Science and the University as well as with the School's external constituencies.
5. In accordance with SCJ bylaws provisions concerning FAC, the Director can call meetings of FAC and bring matters to the attention of that committee.
6. The Director shall solicit input from relevant School committees concerning changes in programs, policies, and practices relevant to each committee's jurisdiction.
7. The Director or the Director's designee shall chair SAC and all-School meetings.

B. Appointment Authority

1. The Director shall appoint the members of Standing and ad hoc committees in accordance with membership specifications in these bylaws (except FAC, which is a body elected through specified procedures).
2. The Director shall appoint an Associate Director and program directors who shall serve at the pleasure of the Director.

C. Personnel Policies

1. Upon the resignation of the Director or the completion of the Director's term in office, FAC shall consult with the Dean's office on developing procedures to ensure input from faculty, staff, and students in the selection of the next Director.
2. In accordance with University bylaws, FAC shall consult with the Dean's office on developing procedures to ensure input from faculty, staff, and students in evaluating the Director at the conclusion of each renewable term in office. Each renewable term is not to exceed five years.
3. The Director shall solicit input from SAC on proposals for new tenure-stream faculty positions and the wording of job advertisements for new or replacement faculty appointments.
4. The Director shall make recommendations to the College and Provost for faculty retention, promotion, and tenure in accordance with College and University policies as well as RPT procedures specified in Appendix A of the School's bylaws.
5. The Director shall conduct annual performance reviews of faculty and staff in accordance with University procedures and Appendix B of the School's bylaws, including consideration of advisory assessments of faculty from FAC.
6. Upon completion of the annual review process, the Director shall distribute to faculty a memo that provides an overview of the criteria for and distribution of merit raises.