

**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. 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. The standards highlighted below will be applied in such a way that ensures that the School of Criminal Justice

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.

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 should 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 include 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.).

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. Note that a candidate is not expected to provide evidence of teaching excellence from all of the items listed below. Teaching evaluations must be provided for all courses, but additional evidence can rely on a combination of these indicators to demonstrate excellence. There are numerous ways that a candidate can demonstrate excellence.

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 committees, number chaired, engaging students in research activities, independent studies, etc.).
8. External funding for support of instructional activities.

9. Development of teaching resources.

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 interaction with potential clients (government agencies, professional associations, foundations, industries) as well as donors.

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 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.

²For 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.

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. 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, 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 (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). 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 four names but not more than 6 to perform an external review. Each candidate seeking promotion may submit up to four names to the Director for consideration, 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 on the list by the candidate. 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 the rank of professor. 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 personal 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 five.

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 August 1.

The external reviewers should be contacted by the Director no later than June 15 with a request to complete the review by October 1. 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