

DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES



**Department of Criminology
University of South Florida**

**Adopted October 10, 1997
Revised Version Adopted March 21, 2003
Revised Version and Approved August 12, 2015
Approved by Dean Serovich, August 26, 2015
Revisions Requested by Provost's Office, March 15, 2016
Approved by Provost's Office, November 1, 2016
Revised Version and Approved November 4, 2022
Approved by Dean Lister, February 6, 2023
Approved by Provost's Office, February 15, 2023**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS
DEPARTMENTAL GOVERNANCE PROCEDURES**

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. MISSION STATEMENT	1
II. PRECEDENCE OF RULES	2
III. CONDUCTING DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS	3
A. Departmental Meetings	3
B. Minutes of Faculty Meetings	3
C. Voting Procedures	4
1. Eligibility for Voting	4
2. Quorum	4
3. Procedure	5
IV. DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATORS	6
A. Department Chair	6
1. Appointment	6
2. Charge	6
3. Evaluation	7
B. Associate Chair & Campus Chairs	7
1. Appointment	7
2. Charge	8
3. Evaluation	8
C. Director of MA and PhD Programs	8
1. Appointment	8
2. Charge	8
3. Evaluation	9
D. MA and PhD in Program Coordinator	9
1. Appointment	9
2. Charge	9
3. Evaluation	10
E. Graduate Coordinators (MACJ, concentrations within MACJ, and MA CyberCrime Programs)	10
1. Appointment	10
2. Charge	10
3. Evaluation	10
F. Internship Program Coordinators	11
1. Appointment	11
2. Charge	11
3. Evaluation	11
G. Undergraduate Program Coordinator	11
1. Appointment	11
2. Charge	12
3. Evaluation	12

V.	DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES	13
A.	Standing and Ad Hoc Committees	13
B.	Executive Committee	13
	1. Purpose	13
	2. Appointment	14
	3. Meeting Schedule	14
C.	Faculty Evaluation Committee	14
	1. Selection	14
	2. Responsibilities	15
D.	Tenure and Promotion Committee	16
	1. Selection	16
	2. Responsibilities	16
E.	Instructor Promotion Committee	17
	1. Selection	17
	2. Responsibilities	17
F.	Faculty Search Committee	18
	1. Selection	18
	2. Responsibilities	18
G.	MA & PhD in Criminology Graduate Committee	19
	1. Selection	19
	2. Responsibilities	19
H.	Development/Scholarships Committee	20
	1. Selection	20
	2. Purpose	20
I.	Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Committee	21
	1. Selection	21
	2. Responsibilities	21
J.	MA Comp Exam Committee	21
	1. Selection	21
	2. Responsibilities	21
VI.	FACULTY WORKLOADS AND ANNUAL ASSIGNMENTS	22
A.	FIS Default Workloads	24
B.	Faculty Workload Assignment Process	24
C.	Annual Faculty Evaluations	25
	1. Research	25
	2. Teaching	28
	3. Service	30
VII.	TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDELINES	32
A.	Philosophy and Principles of the Department	34
B.	Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor	35
	1. Criteria Areas	35
	2. Scholarship	36
	3. Teaching	37
	4. Service	37
C.	Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor	38

D. Tenure & Promotion Criteria Checklist	39
1. Research	39
a. Required Evidence	39
b. Preferred/Additional Evidence	39
c. Indicator Explanations	40
2. Teaching	44
a. Required Evidence	44
b. Preferred/Additional Evidence	44
c. Indicator Explanations	45
3. Service	48
a. Required Evidence	48
b. Preferred/Additional Evidence	48
c. Indicator Explanations	49
VIII. INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION GUIDELINES	51
IX. ADJUNCT SCREENING PROCESS	52
X. SUMMER APPOINTMENT POLICIES	54
XI. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND BEHAVIORAL MISCONDUCT BY STUDENTS	56
A. Academic Dishonesty	56
B. Behavioral Misconduct	56
C. Disenrollment from the Criminology Major as a Sanction	56
XII. DEPARTMENTAL LINES OF COMMUNICATION	58
XIII. PROCEDURES TO AMEND THE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT	61

I. MISSION STATEMENT

Criminology is defined as the interdisciplinary scientific study of crime, criminal behavior, and the social control of crime. The Department of Criminology provides a scientific, philosophical, and humanistic approach to the understanding of these subjects in contemporary society. The Department is committed to a liberal arts education, believing that this pedagogy best prepares students for whatever choices they might make upon graduation. Accordingly, faculty strive to achieve excellence in the dissemination of knowledge, to be at the cutting edge of advances in the field, and to participate with both public and private agencies involved in the prevention and control of deviant behavior. The faculty is dedicated to ensuring that the perspectives of the academic criminologist, the criminal justice professional, the offender, the victim, and society are each critically examined within an academic/scholarly framework. The Department of Criminology is committed to supporting the University of South Florida's affirmative action policies and diversity policies. The Criminology Department recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university. The Department currently operates undergraduate (B.A.), master's (M.A., MACJ, and MA CyberCrime), and doctoral (Ph.D.) degree programs.

II. PRECEDENCE OF RULES

The general rules of governance as presented in the various USF policies, regulations, handbooks, and catalogues, the various collective bargaining agreements in effect, and the various governance documents within the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences shall all take precedence over the rules established by the Department of Criminology in this Governance Document in all cases where the Governance Rules of the Department are found to be in conflict with those of the University of South Florida and/or the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences. By inserting this statement, it is the intention of the faculty of the Department of Criminology to be able to continue doing ordinary business following the rules of the College should any of the Department's Governance Rules be found to be out of order. The Department shall correct, at its earliest convenience, Governance Rules that are inconsistent with those of the University and/or College.

Conflict of Interest Statement: Following USF policies on conflicts of interest, spouses/partners may not evaluate each other. In these cases, the reviewer with the conflict must recuse her/himself.

III. CONDUCTING DEPARTMENTAL BUSINESS

A. Departmental Meetings

1. **Regular Faculty Meeting.** The department's faculty meets on a monthly basis, subject to deferral or omission if pertinent business does not warrant a meeting. The Department Chair is expected to provide notice of the meeting two weeks in advance; this may be accomplished by distributing a projected set of meeting dates each semester to the faculty and posted to the department website and/or publicly posted in the department.
2. **Special Meetings.** As needed, special meetings may be called; if circumstances permit, at least two days' notice shall be given for special meetings. Announcements of special meetings must be posted as in III (A)(1).
3. **Meeting Agenda.** The Chair is responsible for developing and distributing a tentative agenda prior to all meetings. A meeting agenda should be circulated to the faculty and, to meet the requirements of the Sunshine Law, posted on the department bulletin board one week prior to Regular Faculty Meetings. The exception to this provision relates to ongoing business of the faculty, such as deferred items, and in the case of personnel decisions, such as hiring, which is an ongoing process that may require special meetings announced on short notice to facilitate hiring. Faculty members may add to the agenda upon request.
4. **Responsibility for Conduct of Meeting.** The Chair is responsible for conducting departmental meetings; however, if circumstances dictate, the Associate Chair may conduct meetings or portions of meetings.
5. **Governance of Meetings.** Consistent with the College Governance Document, meetings shall be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order.

B. Minutes of Faculty Meetings

1. Minutes of all departmental faculty meetings, whether regular or special, shall be kept.
2. Minutes are distributed to faculty members, preferably within one week following the meeting at which they were recorded. This may be accomplished by posting faculty minutes to the department website or bulletin board. Applicable Florida law shall be followed in the description of sensitive materials in the minutes.

3. Faculty members may request changes to the minutes at the next scheduled meeting. In cases where there is dispute regarding changes to the minutes, proposed changes approved by 2/3 faculty vote will be incorporated into the final minutes. Final approval of the minutes requires a majority vote of the faculty.

C. Voting Procedures

1. Eligibility for Voting

- a. For purposes of decision-making, only full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty, including the Department Chair, faculty who hold the rank of Instructor, and the various program Directors and coordinators may vote on departmental matters.
- b. Regarding faculty personnel decisions, (1) only tenured faculty vote on decisions to tenure and promote non-tenured tenure line faculty members, and (2) only Full Professors vote on decisions to recommend promotion to Full Professor. In the case of instructor promotions, all faculty at or above the instructor rank for which the candidate is being considered are eligible to vote.
- c. Throughout this governance document, reference is made to "Instructors." Instructors constitute a broader class of department faculty whose titles are officially designated as Assistant Professor of Instruction, Associate Professor of Instruction, Professor of Instruction and/or designated as Assistant /Associate/ Senior Instructors.

2. Quorum

A simple majority of eligible faculty not on leave constitutes a quorum. The individuals constituting a quorum must be physically or electronically present at a meeting. A quorum is required for a vote to be held on any matter. Throughout the remainder of this document, all proportions required for faculty approval refer to those faculty members present at a meeting, assuming that the necessary numerical quorum has been achieved. Proxy votes do not count in determining a quorum.

3. Procedure

- a. Votes on any matter may be conducted by voice, by a show of hands, or by secret ballot. Personnel and election decisions require secret ballots. Pending any vote,⁷

faculty members may request an alternative voting procedure, subject to approval by 2/3 of the faculty. Voting on any matter must be done at a called regular or special faculty meeting. Proxy votes are acceptable. The recording of votes (for, against, abstained) on all matters voted upon shall appear in the meeting minutes.

- b. Following Robert's Rules of Order and concerns that online voting violates the ideal of democratic participation, email and other online voting procedures are discouraged. It is recognized, however, that such a procedure may be needed from time to time to complete resolution of on-going faculty business that has already been discussed in person (e.g., the need for immediate voting on faculty recruitment when the short-term window of opportunity precludes a meeting). If faculty members cannot attend a meeting in person, they may vote electronically via a virtual meeting application (e.g., Microsoft Teams). Under those circumstances, online voting shall be allowed.
- c. The Department shall hold elections whenever the Faculty Senate seat for the department is vacant. The results of the election will be sent to the Senate.

IV. DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATORS

A. Department Chair

1. Appointment:

Chair recommendations shall be made by majority vote of the faculty to the Dean of the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences who shall follow procedures in the College Governance Document for appointing a Chair. Eligibility for the Chair position is restricted to fulltime (1.00 FTE), tenured faculty, preferably Full Professors. While it is recognized that the Chair serves at the behest of the Dean, it is recommended that a Chair's service be limited normally to two consecutive terms of 3 years each. The department's recommendation for renewal will be made in the next-to-last year of the Chair's appointed term and is subject to 2/3 vote. The vote for Chair renewal shall be conducted by the Associate Chair.

2. Charge:

The Department Chair, with the assistance of other department administrators and committees, directs the administration of the department, devises policy, supervises all personnel, advising, scheduling and budgets and remains responsible to the Dean of the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences for all issues relevant to the department.

The Chair is charged with implementing University and College policies and procedures and developing internal policies and procedures consistent with them. The Chair serves as the primary link between the department and other academic and administrative units on and off campus, acting as representative of the department's faculty, staff and students. In collaboration with other Chairs and Directors and the Dean, the Chair participates in the development and implementation of policy and procedures within the College.

3. Evaluation:

The Chair shall be evaluated annually by both the department's Faculty Evaluation Committee and by the CBCS Dean. In addition, the faculty may initiate a process for the Chair's removal via a vote of no confidence obtained via a 2/3 vote of the voting faculty

at a faculty meeting called for this purpose and chaired by the Associate Chair or designee appointed by the Executive Committee. Voting shall proceed via secret ballots.

B. Associate Chair and Campus Chairs

1. Appointment:

The department shall have one Associate Chair. This officer is appointed by the Dean upon nomination by the Chair, subject to majority affirmative vote of approval by the faculty, and the consent of the appointee. The Associate Chair shall be fulltime (1.00 FTE) tenured-faculty. The terms of office are fully, or in part, concurrent with that of the Chair, but periods of appointment cannot exceed that of the serving Chair unless the Chair has resigned and the Associate Chair is designated to carry out the Chair's duties until a new Chair can be appointed. During a Chair's term of service, a different Associate Chair may be appointed through the process described above. Compensation is negotiable with the Dean of the College, subject to approval by the Chair.

The department shall have Campus Chairs at each branch campus. These officers are appointed by the Dean upon nomination by the Chair, subject to majority affirmative vote of approval by the faculty housed at their respective campus, and the consent of the appointee. The Campus Chairs must be fulltime (1.00 FTE) tenured-faculty housed at their respective campuses. The terms of office are fully, or in part, concurrent with that of the Chair, but periods of appointment cannot exceed that of the serving Chair. During a Chair's term of service, different Campus Chairs may be appointed through the process described above. Compensation is negotiable with the Dean of the College, subject to approval by the Chair.

2. Charge:

The Associate Chair and the Campus Chairs assist in the administration of the Department, in implementing University and College policies and procedures, and in initiating and implementing internal policies and procedures. These officers will have primary responsibility for course scheduling, undergraduate curriculum issues, administering faculty assigned duties/activities reports, and university assessment/evaluation procedures required of departments. The Associate Chair shall also serve as the Department's Undergraduate Program Director and the Campus Chairs shall also serve as both the Department's Undergraduate Program Director and

Graduate Program Coordinators for their home campus. Campus Chairs will make recommendations to the Department Chair regarding course schedules and faculty teaching assignments on their respective branch campuses, annual faculty evaluations, and both tenure and promotion and lecturer promotion evaluations. The Associate Chair shall represent the Chair and the Department, faculty, students, and staff at meetings where the Chair is unable to attend.

3. Evaluation:

The Associate Chair and Campus Chairs shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair. The evaluation of Campus Chairs shall also include the consultation and participation of a designee of the branch campus' upper administration. The Associate Chair and/or Campus Chairs may be removed from their position by the Chair with a showing of cause.

C. Director of the MA and Ph. D. Programs in Criminology

1. Appointment:

The Director of the MA and Ph. D. Program in Criminology (also referred to as "Graduate Director") is appointed by the Chair with prior consent by the appointee, subject to majority affirmative vote by the faculty. Eligibility is restricted to fulltime (1.00 FTE) tenure-line faculty. The term of service is concurrent with that of the Chair, but Graduate Directors may be changed during a Chair's term by the process described above. The appointment may not exceed the serving Chair's term but may be extended by successive Chairs. Normally, however, the Director should not serve more than two terms of 3 years each unless another agreeable candidate cannot be found among the faculty. Typically, the Graduate Director is released from teaching one course each semester of the regular academic year, and is expected to receive additional financial compensation for duties performed during the period between the Spring and Fall semesters if such duties fall outside of the Director's normal contract (i.e., if the Director is on a 9 month contract).

2. Charge:

The Graduate Director oversees the various aspects of the graduate programs in criminology, with the exception of the MACJ and CyberCrime programs. The

Graduate Director oversees: student recruitment, admissions, and orientation; the graduate curricula; the student handbook; produces periodic reports for faculty and others; implements the comprehensive exams; keeps, reviews and disseminates criteria/qualifications for teaching in the graduate program, and ensuring these criteria are met in the assignment of graduate classes. S/he chairs the Graduate Committee, teaches the courses linked to this role, monitors the progress of students, facilitates the periodic review of the graduate programs and represents the department at any required College and University meetings related to the graduate program. The MACJ and CyberCrime program shall have independent program coordinators responsible for recruitment, admissions, course scheduling, and other curricular responsibilities, including all of those associated with the duties of the Director of the MA and Ph. D. Programs in Criminology.

The Graduate Director should also maintain a five year plan, updated annually, indicating trends in applications, admissions, and registrations, which should be made available for faculty use on the department website, and include discussions of potential issues that the Graduate Director feels need to be addressed by the faculty or by the Director in her/his role.

3. Evaluation:

The Graduate Director shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair. The Graduate Director may be removed from their position by the Chair with a showing of cause.

D. MA and Ph. D. in Program Coordinator

1. Appointment:

A Graduate Coordinator shall be appointed to assist the Graduate Director in the varied tasks assigned to the Graduate Director at the Tampa campus given it is the primary location for the doctorate program. Eligibility is restricted to fulltime (1.00 FTE) permanent faculty. The Graduate Coordinator position is appointed by the Chair and serves at the discretion of the Chair.

2. Charge:

The Graduate Coordinators' charge includes the followings tasks: preparation of 12

admission files; review, evaluation, and admission decisions regarding MA applications; sitting on appropriate graduate committees; assistance in the preparation of annual reports; updating graduate program requirements; recruitment of students; and counseling students, including the conduct of annual or semester meeting with graduate students. The Graduate Coordinator may represent the Graduate Director at faculty meetings when the Graduate Director is unable to attend, and may sign various paperwork and fulfill other functions for the department when the Graduate Director is unavailable.

3. Evaluation:

The Graduate Program Coordinator shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair in consultation with the Graduate Director. The Graduate Program Coordinator may be removed from their position by the Chair with a showing of cause.

E. Graduate Coordinators (MACJ and MA CyberCrime Programs)

1. Appointment:

The MACJ (and tracks/concentrations within) and MA CyberCrime Program Coordinators are appointed respectively to administer all matters relating to the MACJ, CyberCrime programs by the Chair and serve at the pleasure of the Chair. Eligibility is restricted to fulltime (1.00 FTE) permanent faculty.

2. Charge:

These Coordinators oversee the following components of their respective programs: recruitment, the admissions process, course scheduling, program curricula, mentoring and monitoring student progress, facilitating the periodic reviews of the program, serving on appropriate committees, collecting student exit data as well as any other data pertinent to advancing their program or otherwise useful to the department. The Coordinators typically teach in the program and have voting rights normally afforded to faculty members in the department.

3. Evaluation:

These Program Coordinators shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair.¹³

The Evaluation of Program Coordinators housed on a branch campus shall also include the consultation and participation of the Campus Chair from that branch campus. These Program Coordinators may be removed from their position by the Chair with a showing of cause.

F. Internship Program Coordinator

1. Appointment:

The internship Program Coordinator is appointed by the Dean upon nomination by the Chair with the consent of the nominee. Internship Program Coordinator must be fulltime (1.00 FTE) faculty (instructor or tenure-line). The term of office is indefinite but may be terminated by either the Coordinator or the Chair at their discretion. Compensation is negotiable with the Dean and/or appropriate branch campus administrator subject to approval by the Chair.

2. Charge:

The Internship Program Coordinator shall develop and adhere to a unified and common process for (a) establishing and maintaining internship partnerships with agencies, (b) for recruiting, preparing, placement, and evaluation of student interns, and any and all other aspects of the internship program.

3. Evaluation:

The Internship Program Coordinator shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair. The Program Coordinator may be removed from their position by the Chair with a showing of cause.

G. Undergraduate Program Coordinator

1. Appointment:

The department shall have a single Undergraduate Program Coordinator appointed by the Dean upon nomination by the Chair, subject to a majority affirmative vote of by the faculty and the consent of the appointee. The Undergraduate Program Coordinator must be a fulltime (1.00 FTE) faculty member (instructor or tenure-line). The term of office is

concurrent with that of the Department Chair, but periods of appointment cannot exceed that of the serving Chair. Compensation is negotiable with the Dean or appropriate branch campus administrator subject to approval by the Chair.

2. Charge:

The duties of the Undergraduate Program Coordinator shall include, but not be limited to the following: (1) evaluate the teaching effectiveness of adjuncts on a per semester basis and make recommendations to the Chair regarding their continuation, (2) handle undergraduate student complaints, grievances, and misconduct charges, (3) work with the Chair and Associate Chair to coordinate the scheduling of courses and teaching assignments on the Tampa campus, (4) work with the Associate Chair regarding the development, execution, and revisions of Academic Learning Compacts and SACS plans and reports for the undergraduate program, (5) administer the department's undergraduate honors program, (6) respond to inquiries regarding the undergraduate program, (7) review transfer credits, (8) notify instructional personnel of important pending dates and deadlines, and (9) work with the Associate Chair as needed concerning any other matters regarding the undergraduate program.

3. Evaluation

The Undergraduate Program Coordinators shall be evaluated annually by the Department Chair in consultation with the Associate Chair. The Undergraduate Program Coordinator may be removed from their position by the Chair with a showing of cause.

V. DEPARTMENT COMMITTEES

A. Standing and Ad Hoc Committees

The department's standing committees are as follows: (1) Executive Committee; (2) Faculty Evaluation Committee; (3) M.A. and Ph.D. in Criminology Graduate Committee; (4) Development/Scholarship Committee; (5) Community Affairs Committee; (6) Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Committee; and (7) MA Comprehensive Exam Committee. All other committees shall be treated as Ad hoc committees. Standing committee members are elected by majority vote of the faculty at the first faculty meeting of the academic year.

Ad hoc committees, including but not limited to Tenure & Promotion, Instructor Promotion, and Search Committees are either elected by majority vote of the faculty at a regular faculty meeting as needed, or appointed by the Chair when an Ad Hoc committee is required to serve a given, short term administrative function within the department. Search Committees must include at least one representative from each campus; searches for faculty to be housed on a branch campus must also include the Regional Chancellor or her/his designee. Regional Chancellors or their designee will serve as a voting member on all search committees for faculty hiring on branch campuses. All faculty promotion committees (i.e., T&P and Instructor) should include at least one representative from each branch from which an applicant for promotion is housed.

All meetings of Standing and Ad Hoc committees should be announced in advance. Members can attend electronically.

B. Executive Committee

1. Purpose:

The Departmental Executive Committee assists the department in five major ways: (1) helps establish and support the implementation of departmental policies, (2) serves as a mechanism for student, faculty, and staff expression of their views on issues important to departmental functioning, (3) carries out specific tasks the department may at times be required to complete, (4) addresses student, staff and faculty grievances when asked to serve in this manner by a member of the department, and (5) convenes in matters of academic dishonesty when requested by the Chair in conformance with departmental policies and procedures.

2. Appointment:

The Executive Committee is comprised of five (5) tenured faculty members elected to three-year staggered terms by majority vote of the faculty with at least one member from a branch campus. Executive Committee members elect the Committee Chair. Executive Committee members whose terms expire are required to wait one year before being considered for reappointment. An additional non-tenured faculty member will be asked to join the Executive Committee when it functions as an Ad hoc Grievance Committee.

3. Meeting Schedule:

The Executive Committee meets on an as-needed basis. Executive Committee meetings may be called by the Chair, Associate Chair, Campus Chair(s), or individual members of the Executive Committee. When possible, notification of the meeting will be posted publicly a week before the meeting. Given the important function the Executive Committee serves for the faculty, the Executive Committee should notify the faculty of its meetings and the content of those meetings.

C. Faculty Evaluation Committee

1. Selection:

The Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be comprised of at least nine (9) faculty members: seven (7) tenured faculty, one (1) Assistant Professor, and one (1) Associate Professor of Instruction. The committee must also include at least one tenured faculty member from each campus. The non-tenured faculty members who sit on the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall participate in the evaluation process, but will only vote on the evaluations of the other non-tenured faculty. The purpose of appointing non-tenured members to this committee is to represent, as widely as possible, the views of all ranks in the department. The voting limitation for the non-tenure members is protective. Terms of the tenured committee members are for three years, but are staggered so that, if possible, the committee is comprised of faculty in their first, second, and third years of appointment. First-year members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are elected by majority vote for eligible positions at the first meeting at the beginning of the academic year.

2. Responsibilities of the Faculty Evaluation Committee:

- a. The Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair will advise all faculty members via memo which may be distributed by email when they are to submit their materials to the committee.
- b. The Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair will provide each faculty member with the necessary guidelines and forms to be completed for the Annual Faculty Evaluation.
- c. The Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair will collect all materials provided by the faculty members and review them before a meeting with the whole committee to be certain that all the materials requested have been provided and are in proper order.
- d. Once the Faculty Evaluation Committee meets, the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair will be responsible for summarizing the comments of the committee members. If there is a disagreement among the committee members regarding a faculty member's evaluation, minority opinions will be included with the committee's comments.
- e. Once the Faculty Evaluation Committee has completed their assessment, their evaluation scores and narratives will be distributed to each faculty member. Faculty members who are in disagreement with their evaluation have the right to provide a written response. Faculty members may choose to have this written response included in their evaluation materials. When this information is provided to the FEC Chair, s/he shall share these objections with other committee members. The FEC may reconsider their assessment and revise the faculty member's evaluation accordingly. In either case the faculty member shall be advised of the final decision of the committee.
- f. When the Faculty Evaluation Committee is to meet on issues of policy, the Faculty Evaluation Committee Chair should notify all non-committee members of such and invite their participation in the discussion of such policies.
- g. Regional Chancellors or their designee will provide formal written input prior to a College Dean or Vice President completing the performance appraisal for branch campus faculty.

D. Tenure and Promotion Committee

1. Selection:

- a. The Tenure and Promotion Committee will meet when necessary (i.e., one or more faculty members require an evaluation for tenure and/or promotion, or a faculty member is eligible for mid-tenure review).
- b. The Department shall elect a Tenure and Promotion Committee consisting of at least 5 eligible faculty (consistent with the level of promotion under consideration). In any year in which there is one or more cases applying for promotion in rank from Associate Professor to Professor, the Tenure and Promotion Committee shall be comprised of all faculty at the rank of Professor and shall comprise a “committee of the whole.” The Department T&P Committee serves in an advisory role for the whole of the faculty and the Department Chair. Branch campus faculty are eligible for the Department T&P Committee membership at any time, but if a branch faculty member is being considered for mid-tenure review, tenure and/or promotion, at least one eligible branch campus faculty member (if available) should serve on the T&P committee. Instructors and untenured faculty members are not eligible to be on the Department T&P Committee nor vote on tenure and/or promotion applications. The Department T&P Committee shall elect a committee chair.

2. Responsibilities of the Tenure and Promotion Committee:

- a. The purpose of the Department T&P Committee is to conduct the mid-tenure reviews (including evaluation and vote), and to provide an initial summary evaluation and preliminary recommendation for candidates' applications for tenure and/or promotion prior to the whole of faculty vote.
- b. The chair of the Department T&P Committee guides the initial assessment and preliminary evaluation of the candidate's application, drafts a preliminary narrative, records the Committee's recommendation, and provides the Committee's recommendation to the faculty and Department Chair, records the whole of the eligible faculty vote (by secret ballot), records the results of the faculty vote in the official application packet, and signs on behalf of the faculty.

- c. Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for faculty members on branch campuses prior to a College Dean completing and forwarding a recommendation to the Provost (see USF Consolidation Handbook).

E. Instructor Promotion Committee

1. Selection

This committee is referred to as the Departmental/School Instructor Promotion Committee (DS-IPC) in the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path, and that acronym will be used below. The term instructor will be used to refer to both faculty who hold titles of Professors of Instruction and faculty who hold titles of Instructor. **The Department will make decisions about promotion for Instructors in accordance with the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path CBCS Instructor Promotion Guidelines.** As needed, the Department Chair will appoint a DS-IPC to review applications and enter the vote. Refer to the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path for further information.

2. Responsibilities:

- a. The Department Chair will appoint the DS-IPC Committee when an instructor or professor of instruction at any level requires an evaluation for promotion.
- b. The committee will consist of four eligible faculty members, including instructors or professors of instruction who hold a higher rank than the candidate and tenure-track faculty at any rank. If possible, three of the four members should hold a position as instructors. Branch campus tenure-track faculty and instructors are eligible to serve on the committee, but if the candidate is from a branch campus, a higher-ranking instructor or tenure-track faculty member from that campus should serve on the committee.
- c. Per the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path, “the DS-IPC committee **shall select the DS-IPC Chair** who shall be responsible for writing the evaluation of the majority opinion of the DS-IPC committee, entering the vote of the committee into the promotion application, noting the evaluations made by the DS-IPC

Committee (e.g., Outstanding, Strong, etc.) and signing the application on behalf of the DS-IPC”.

F. Faculty Search Committee

1. Selection:

The committee shall consist of at least four members appointed at the Department Chair’s discretion. The Department Chair will appoint the Chair of the Search Committee. Whenever possible, this person should have expertise in the substantive area related to the position to be hired. The search committee will include at least one full-time faculty member from each of the three campuses and one graduate student representative.

The Department’s faculty hiring emphasizes diversity and knowledge/skills, not only for affirmative action goals but also because of our values and mission. Faculty hiring will reflect these goals in both the membership of the search committee as well as the recruitment process and applicant pool.

2. Responsibilities:

- a. The Faculty Search Committee Chair will immediately consult with the Unit HR Coordinator to ensure compliance with all Human Resources rules and regulations and arrange a meeting with the search committee and the Human Resources Office.
- b. All Search Committee members must complete HR Recruitment Training—USF Employee Learning—before serving on the search committee.
- c. The Faculty Search Committee will develop the search plan and draft the job ad. The Human Resources Office will place the ads at the direction of the Faculty Search Committee.
- d. The Faculty Search Committee Chair will be responsible for all communication with prospective candidates except for negotiations with the final candidate, which the Department Chair will handle.

- e. Subject to input from the Dean's Office, committee members shall establish procedures for obtaining and reviewing all submitted materials.
- f. The committee members will review all submitted materials and share their feedback with faculty at faculty meetings. The list of finalists will be presented in alphabetical order and will not be rank ordered. The faculty will determine an initial group of candidates it wishes to interview and may also designate a second group if it deems appropriate. The committee will designate applications deemed inappropriate for the search to the College's HR office.
- g. The committee will be responsible for coordinating the scheduling and conducting of the interviews, assisted by Department Staff.
- h. After a campus visit(s), the Committee shall list strengths and concerns about each candidate for the faculty's consideration. The tenure-track faculty will meet to consider the order of their preference. The Department Chair will communicate the order of candidates to the Dean for approval to make an offer.
- i. The Department Chair will advise and work with the CBCS Dean to make and negotiate any offers with the final candidates.

G. M.A. and Ph.D. in Criminology Graduate Committee

1. Selection:

This M.A. and Ph.D. in Criminology Graduate Committee is comprised of five (5) faculty members. The Graduate Director will be Chair of the Graduate Committee. The other four members of the committee shall be nominated by the Graduate Director and approved, on an individual basis, by majority vote of the faculty for a term of three years or the remainder of the Director's term, whichever is less. Committee member replacements may be named by the Graduate Director, subject to majority vote of the faculty. The Graduate Director may serve as an ex-officio member of the committee without voting rights.

2. Responsibilities:

- a. Review applications for admission to the Doctoral Criminology Programs and make decisions regarding admissions.
- b. Review graduate curriculum and recommend revisions of the curriculum to the faculty.
- c. Receive, review, and present to the faculty all graduate course proposals and changes.
- d. Review applications for and recommend appointments to graduate assistantships; make recommendations for university and college fellowships, scholarships, and awards.
- e. Review and make recommendations to the faculty regarding any other matters relevant to the graduate programs.
- f. Serve as the department representative for reviews of grade and comprehensive examination appeals. In the event that the grade appeal is filed by a student against the Graduate Director, the Associate Chair shall serve instead.

H. Development/Scholarships and Community Affairs Committee

1. Selection:

The Development/Scholarships Committee is comprised of three (3) faculty members elected by a majority of the faculty to serve three-year staggered terms. In addition, the committee shall identify and select any number of additional members from among our more distinguished alumni within the local community. The Department Chair shall also serve on this committee in a non-voting and administrative capacity.

2. Purpose:

The duties of the Development/Scholarships Committee are two-fold: (1) to identify and nominate eligible students to receive scholarships and oversee the distribution of these awards and the acknowledgement of them, and (2) to identify, recommend, and oversee the department's efforts toward development and fundraising. The Committee shall meet regularly as needed.

I. Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Committee

1. Selection:

The Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Committee is comprised of three to five faculty members chosen by the Graduate Director. The Graduate Director serves the ex-officio Chair of the committee and does not grade comprehensive exams. The three grading members the committee shall be nominated by the Graduate Director and approved, on an individual basis, by majority vote of the faculty for a term of three years or the remainder of the Director's term, whichever is less. Committee member replacements may be named by the Graduate Director, subject to majority vote of the faculty.

2. Responsibilities:

- a. Construct the doctoral comprehensive exam with the assistance of the full faculty.
- b. Recommend revisions to the doctoral comprehensive exam process including revisions to the grading rubric.
- c. Grade each doctoral comprehensive exam in accordance with the grading rubric.
- d. Offer constructive criticism to the student on each exam.

J. MA Comp Exam Committee

1. Selection:

The MA Comprehensive Exam Committee is comprised of three faculty members chosen by the Graduate Director in consultation with the Department Chair. The Graduate Director serves the ex-officio Chair of the committee and does not grade comprehensive exams. Committee members serve two-year terms.

2. Responsibilities:

- a. The Committee constructs the exam as guided by the Graduate Director and grades the exam on a pass/fail basis.
- b. The Graduate Director is responsible for distributing and collecting the exam and receiving and tabulating the grade results from each member of the committee.

VI. Faculty Workloads and Annual Assignments

The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the University of South Florida (USF) and the United Faculties of Florida (UFF) requires that faculty receive a timely, fair, and appropriate assignment of professional duties around the general areas of teaching, research, and service. The CBA further requires that the annual evaluation of faculty performance and productivity in these areas of assignment reflect the percentage of effort assigned. Given the fundamental importance of these faculty assignments to the effective functioning of the university and its colleges, departments, and schools as well as to the career progression of the faculty involved, the faculty in the Department of Criminology in the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences at the University of South Florida have developed the following departmental policy regarding faculty workloads and the annual assignment of duties to faculty:

Faculty workloads in the areas of teaching, research, service, etc. are understood as “percentages of effort” within each category and their sub-categories. For the purpose of this policy, these percentages of effort are reported under two data systems at the University of South Florida; these include:

(1) **AFD/FAR**, Assigned Faculty Duties/Faculty Activity Reports housed in FAIR. These reports are compiled each academic semester and reflect (a) the percentage of effort assigned to each faculty member by the department chair across a number of categories and sub-categories of faculty assignment types in the areas of teaching, research, service, etc. – the AFD and (b) the percentage of effort undertaken by each faculty member across these same categories and sub-categories of teaching, research, service, etc. – the FAR. The AFD/FAR data are compiled each semester and are then aggregated into calendar-year data for use in the annual evaluation of faculty and for tenure and promotion applications.

(2) **FIS**, the Faculty Information System in Archivum in which academic-term percentages of effort assignments are made across the categories and subcategories of teaching, research, service, etc. The FIS borrows from and builds upon the logic of workload assignments in the AFD/FAR.

Under the AFD/FAR in FAIR and the FIS in Archivum, faculty workloads/assignments are made and reported across the categories (and sub-categories within) of teaching, research, service, administrative (for the department chair only), and other and are made to be compliant with the 12-hour rule and the UFF-USF Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Teaching workloads/assignments may be distributed across the following sub-categories: (1) undergraduate courses taught, (2) undergraduate students supervised/directed, (3) graduate courses taught, (4) graduate students supervised/directed, and (5) “other instructional effort” -- advising, new course development, new course preparation/revision, efforts to improve instruction, textbook publishing, publications/presentations in pedagogy, learning outcomes planning, assessment, and/or reporting, etc.

Research workloads/assignments may be distributed across the following categories: (1) departmental research and (2) organized research – research and scholarship supported by grants or contracts. Percentages of effort for organized research may only be reported when the faculty receive a portion of their salary from the grant/contract and the amount of effort reported must equal the exact proportion of salary earned.

Service workloads/assignments may be distributed across the following categories: (1) Professional and Public Service and (2) University Governance. Public service refers to discipline-related engagement within the community that may include agency, organizational and governmental boards and commissions that are beneficial to such groups and individuals.

Administrative workloads/assignments may only be made and reported for those contracted to engage in administrative activities, starting at the level of department chair or higher; branch campus chairs, the Associate Chair, and program directors/coordinators workloads/assignments are to be reported as departmental service.

Workloads/assignments made and reported in the “Other” category are for recording sabbaticals, professional development leave, sick leave, annual leave, parental leave, etc.

Again, under both AFD/FAR and FIS faculty workloads and assignments are made to be in compliance with the 12-hour rule and the CBS and are reported according to two metrics: (1) Contact Hours/Contact Hour Equivalencies (CHE) which for full-time faculty must sum to 12, and (2) Percent of Effort which must sum to 100% for full-time faculty. Finally, the department recognizes that 1 CHE is equal to a maximum of 8.33% effort; as such, a 3 credit-hour course is equal to 3 CHE and a maximum of 25% effort for the semester in which it is taught. Under this relationship between CHEs and percent of effort, teaching assignments can be easily converted into percentages of effort and percentages of effort assigned to other areas of teaching, research, and service, etc. can be easily converted into CHEs. For example, a 35% of effort assigned to departmental research during a particular semester is equal to 4.2 CHE.

A. FIS Default Workloads: 3 credit hour course = 25% effort per semester or 12.5% per year; 4 credit hour course = 33.3% effort per semester or 16.65% per year; 1 credit hour course = 8.33% effort per semester or 4.165% per year.

These do not apply to any sections of independent study, directed readings, directed research, advanced research, honor's thesis, MA thesis, or dissertation hours.

In addition, these are maximum percent of effort values; the chair is authorized to assign lesser values according to USF workload protocols.

1. All tenure-line faculty will be assigned a minimum as 5% effort to a maximum of 10% effort for the supervision/direction of student research efforts to be determined by both the number of students supervised/directed and the nature of that supervision/direction.
2. Percent of effort assigned to "organized research" (i.e., grants/contracts etc.) must be assigned exactly equal to the percent of faculty effort paid by the grant/contract.
3. Typically, faculty will be assigned 5% effort to Professional and Public Service and another 5% effort to University Governance. Faculty serving the department in non-Chair administrative roles, will have the percent effort assigned to those roles (typically 25%) added to their University Governance workload. Variation in these percentages of effort assigned to service activities may be indicated where justified and agreed to in advance between the Chair and the faculty member.
4. Ideally, the overall/total percent of effort assigned to research (a combination of both organized research and departmental research) should approximate 35% -- exceptions due to administrative/University Governance assignments, course releases, and other causes may reduce this value downward.
5. The standard workload assignment per fulltime, 9-mo., tenure-line faculty per semester will typically be 55% TEACHING, 35% RESEARCH, and 10% SERVICE. However, given course releases, administrative/service assignments, grants/contracts, leave, etc., these "typical" workloads may vary across faculty.

B. Faculty Workload Assignment Process:

STEP 1: At the start of the spring term, each faculty member will receive notification via email that they may enter into the FIS Assignments section in Archivum and complete the optional Pre-Assignment Narrative (P.A.N.) – a mechanism by which they may inform the Chair of the course preferences for the next academic year and provide other information useful to the Chair for completing their faculty workloads/annual assignments.

STEP 2. The Chair will review the P.A.N.s and will organized a one-on-one meeting (in-person or via TEAMS) to discuss details of each individual faculty member’s workload/annual assignment of duties for the next academic year.

STEP 3. The Department Chair and Liaison will enter assigned percentages of effort across the various categories of faculty assigned duties. These percentages of effort, unless circumstances should dictate otherwise, are expected to be identical to those discussed during the one-on-one meetings in STEP 2.

Step 4. Once the Chair/liaison have entered and submitted these faculty workloads into FIS, Archivum will notify the faculty via email to enter into Archivum and “Acknowledge Receipt” of their workload assignment.

When acknowledging receipt of assignment, the faculty have the option to “request consultation.” This is an opportunity for the Chair and the faculty member to discuss possible revisions to the assignment and, ideally, reach an agreement.

If the Chair elects to revise the workloads, these changes will be entered into FIS and the faculty member will, once again, be asked to “acknowledge receipt.” Whether or not revisions are made to the assignment, the Chair has the final authority for making assignments.

Step 5. Because not all faculty activities can be accurately predicted months ahead of the next academic year, faculty workloads may be updated in FIS to reflected needed changes. When such a need occurs, STEPS 2 through 4 will be repeated.

C. Annual Faculty Evaluation

RESEARCH

The Department of Criminology is a doctoral-granting program at a research-extensive R1 university. Therefore, scholarship in the form of empirical and theoretical research is a vital activity for each

faculty member. The Department strives to excel in its research mission by publishing in high-quality peer-reviewed journals, obtaining state, federal and private funding, and disseminating research through various scholastic outlets. By excelling in these endeavors, the Department attains prestige among its peers within the university and across the discipline. This effort, in turn, attracts outstanding students and new faculty; it also facilitates higher impact research and scholarship.

The annual research evaluation assesses how well a faculty member has contributed to attaining the Department's research goals in a given calendar year. While the annual review is not the same as tenure and promotion, both are tied to the same goals and therefore share some of the same evaluative criteria and benchmarks. The annual evaluation is not alone sufficient for tenure and promotion decisions.

Department Goals for Research

- *Increase the visibility of the department through research,*
- *Publish research in high-quality peer-reviewed outlets,*
- *Obtain resources for conducting research (i.e., grants, partnerships),*
- *Disseminate research at conferences, colloquia, symposiums, or other public venues,*
- *Evaluate and inform evidence-based policies of public and private organizations.*

The Rubric

There are many ways to help the department attain its goals. The standard expectation for tenured and tenure-track faculty is two peer-reviewed publications per year and other research activities, such as presenting at conferences, writing book chapters, and submitting agency reports. Publishing in high-quality journals or receiving a federal grant are examples of work that exceeds the Department's expectations because they increase the program's visibility. The Department should acknowledge those contributions as Outstanding.

The amount of effort assigned to each faculty member is varied based on consultation with the Department Chair. A standard research assignment is approximately 30% toward research with the expectation to publish at least two articles and contribute through other research productivity. Faculty with less than a 30% assignment should adjust expectations in their ability to help the department reach its goals. For example, a faculty member with a 20% research assignment would only be expected to contribute one peer-reviewed article and fewer other research activities. Tenure-track faculty, however, will always be expected to have on average two peer-reviewed publications per year. **N.B.** Tenure-track faculty are expected to be excellent in research throughout their probationary period; therefore, they must be rated outstanding for a significant portion of their tenure track period.

To evaluate a faculty member's contribution to the Department's goals, the Annual Evaluation committee will use the following to appraise a faculty member's contribution to the Department's goals. This evaluation is limited to work done in the previous calendar year (e.g., spring 2020 through fall 2020). Research output includes peer-reviewed publications, external funding, internal funding, research presentations, monographs, book chapters, and books that include research, and evaluative technical reports. It is up to faculty members under review to make a case for their rating, citing various factors to justify their proposed Annual review outcome assessment.

The following rubric applies to a faculty member with a 30% or more annual assignment in research. Faculty members with less than 30% assignment should be expected to have fewer factors that elevate them to a higher rating.

Unsatisfactory 1	Weak 2	Satisfactory 3	Strong 4	Outstanding 5
Expected research output not evident regarding promoting Departmental goals	Expected research output was minimal regarding Departmental goals.	Research output contributed to departmental goals.	Research output was in highly rated outlets, or sufficiently large, or otherwise significant with respect to the potential for impact the discipline or practitioners.	A score of outstanding indicates research output has excelled at promoting Department goals and the scholar's work.
Factors that elevate the evaluation*				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer-reviewed publications • Book chapter • Monograph in mid-tier press • Internal grant 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-impact journal publication (not first author) • Federal or foundation grant application (not funded) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtaining a federal or foundation grant • Invited presentation at a prestigious institution • A monograph is a top-tier press

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation at an academic conference • Write an evaluation report for a local agency • Works in progress (article under submission to a high-impact journal) • Evidence of a major data collection effort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invited presentation at another university or organization • Book chapter in top-tier press • Monograph in a mainstream press • Write an evaluation report for a state or local agency • Include students as authors on a paper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead-authored publication in a high-impact journal • Write an evaluation report for a prestigious agency (e.g., NIJ, Presidential Commission)
--	---	--

*These factors are not a checklist; instead, they should be used by the faculty member to make their case for impact and be used by the evaluation committee to appraise the case. The list of factors is not exhaustive.

For faculty that have a less than 30% annual research assignment, the evidence for impact remains the same, but the expectation for the quantity of output should be considered. Individuals with less than 30% are advised to make a strong case for productivity. For example, a 20% annual assignment faculty might be considered satisfactory with one peer-reviewed journal article and a conference presentation. Should that person attain one top-tier publication as the second author and have only one presentation, the committee might elevate them to Outstanding, given less time assigned to research.

TEACHING

Teaching is the other essential activity that faculty engage in for the Department. Teaching comprises both in-class and online instruction and mentoring students through various activities, including, but not limited to, serving on thesis and dissertation committees, honors thesis committees, lab activities, directing independent studies, or publishing with students. As in research, there are many ways that faculty may help the department reach its teaching goals. The rubric below provides factors that the evaluation committee may use to assess how well the faculty member has helped the department achieve its teaching goals.

Department Goals for Teaching

- Uphold the mission and values of the College and University.
- Create a classroom and learning environment that promotes inclusivity, equity, and belonging.

- Encourage the real-world application of knowledge and community-engaged learning.
- Develop mentorship relationships with students.
- Promote critical thinking and problem-solving strategies.

Very Unsatisfactory 1	Unsatisfactory 2	Satisfactory 3	Strong 4	Outstanding 5
Teaching effort did not contribute to the Department's goals.	Teaching effort did not elevate the Department's teaching goals	The faculty member contributed to the department goals as expected given their teaching assignment.	The faculty member has contributed to the Department's teaching goals by elevating pedagogy, improving teaching, or contributing to pedagogy.	A score of outstanding indicates teaching has excelled at promoting Department's teaching goals.
Factors that elevate the evaluation*				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teaching evaluations that show evidence of valued instruction • Mentoring students outside of the classroom • Creating new course content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New preparations • Modifications to an existing course in content or course delivery • Working with graduate students • Teaching complex material (e.g., quantitative analysis or graduate methods) • Improvement in teaching evaluations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive modifications to existing courses • Major professor for doctoral student • Shows major improvement in teaching evaluations from the previous year • Received a teaching or mentorship award 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Variety of courses assigned • Incorporate innovative teaching pedagogy • Published textbook or teaching monograph 	
--	---	--

*These factors are not a checklist; instead, they should be used by the faculty member to make their case for impact and used by the evaluation committee to appraise the case. The list of factors is not exhaustive. The evaluation committee should consider the teacher’s workload assignment and access to graduate students (i.e., instructors do not work with graduate students).

SERVICE

The Department’s goals regarding Service are that faculty contribute time, energy, and expertise to the department, college, university, community, and profession. Strong or outstanding Service demonstrates a faculty member's effort to elevate the Department’s goals. Service will vary depending upon each faculty member's skills, talents, and interests and the general and specific needs of the various contexts in which their Service is requested. Consideration should go beyond a simple enumeration of service activities to include an evaluation of the extent and quality of the services rendered. When necessary, faculty should provide more detail on the extent and quality of their service activities in the narrative portion of the annual activities report. Credit for Service is limited only to those activities in which the individual faculty members become involved because of their status as members of the university faculty or profession. Service that is financially compensated outside of one’s employment should not be counted.

The Evaluation Committee should consider that tenure-track faculty are protected from heavy service obligations regardless of their annual service assignment of duties. Therefore, they should be able to make an outstanding contribution to Service with fewer factors in evidence.

Very Unsatisfactory 1	Unsatisfactory 2	Satisfactory 3	Strong 4	Outstanding 5
The service effort was not evident in promoting the	The service effort was minimal to elevate the	The faculty member contributed to the department goals as	The Service improved the operations of the department, college, and/or	Made a major contribution to the operation of the department, college, and/or

Department's goals	Department's service goals.	expected given their service assignment.	university, the profession, and/or the community.	university, the profession, and/or the community.
Factors that elevate the evaluation*				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Served on assigned committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaged in community-related activities related to the profession • Review articles for journals • Service to the discipline (e.g., serve as program chairs) • Provide expertise on issues to local media • Guest editor for journal special issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive Service to a regional or national organization (e.g., division chair) • Provide expertise on issues to state, federal, and international media. • Longform discussions regarding expertise (podcasts or involved media interviews) • Journal editor or associate editor • Receive service award 		

*These factors are not a checklist; instead, they should be used by the faculty member to make their case for impact and used by the evaluation committee to appraise the case. The list of factors is not exhaustive. The factors should be considered regarding the faculty member's service workload assignment.

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

A. Philosophy and Principles of the Department of Criminology

In developing appropriate criteria for tenure and promotion decisions the Department has considered the goals it desires to attain in building our department as well as the college and university guidelines, policies, and strategic priorities. These goals are as follows:

1. To create a community of scholars whose members are, and are recognized to be, among the leaders in their chosen areas of research. We expect our colleagues to make significant, excellent scholarly contributions that transform and shape the areas of scholarship in which they work.
2. Building a department with a reputation for excellent and stimulating teaching at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.
3. Creating a stimulating environment for faculty, staff, and students necessary for professional growth.
4. Serving professional, university, and community needs that criminologists are uniquely qualified to meet.

Keeping these goals in mind, the sections that follow examine the department's criteria for (II) Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor; (III) Promotion from Associate to Full Professor; and (IV) Tenure and Promotion Checklist.

B. Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor*

The granting of tenure is not solely a reward for past achievement; it is also a prediction of future performance. Tenure will be recommended by the department if, and only if, in the judgment of the department, the candidate will continue to be one of the leading scholars in Criminology, a first-rate teacher, and a good citizen of the department, college, and university.

Each individual tenure decision is made independently from prior tenure decisions, and should not be impacted by the outcome of prior tenure cases. Candidates are evaluated entirely on the merits of their own professional achievements, and tenure is awarded whenever we are confident we can predict that an individual's career in future decades will be consistent with the

department's goals. In addition to meeting the standards listed below related to criterion areas (scholarship, teaching, and service), a candidate must be judged to be contributing to the mission and goals of the department and to be able and willing to work cooperatively with colleagues in our unit. Careful consideration must be given both to the equitability of the candidate's assignment and opportunities in relation to others in the department/school.

1. Criterion Areas

When a faculty member is considered for tenure and promotion in this department, we review his or her contributions in three major areas:

- a. Scholarship in the candidate's area(s) of specialization, including community-engaged scholarship
- b. Teaching or comparable activity (including advising, mentoring, and community engaged instruction)
- c. Service to the University, the profession, and the community.

Integral to the mission and vision of USF is commitment to engagement with its communities. As defined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, "community engagement describes collaboration between institutions of higher education and their larger communities (local, regional/state, national, [international,] global) for the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources in a context of partnership and reciprocity." While some faculty engagement may come in the form of public service as such, any of the three categories of faculty activity could entail community engagement, and any could in some way "address critical societal issues and contribute to the public good." Community engagement that is undertaken by faculty to "enhance curriculum, teaching and learning and prepare educated, engaged citizens" may be included and evaluated as part of teaching, and community engagement undertaken to "enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity" may be included and evaluated as part of a research/creative/scholarly faculty assignment.

Tenure and promotion will be recommended only for candidates who demonstrate **excellence** in both teaching and research and at least a **substantive contribution** to service. A favorable decision requires clear and compelling evidence of the candidate's contributions, impact, and recognition in each of these areas. The content of materials that bear on determining if there is "clear and compelling" evidence for tenure is described in the sections that follow. Among the various forms of evidence a candidate for tenure must present, scholarship is weighted most heavily in an effort to promote the department's desire to be ranked among the most productive criminology and criminal justice Ph.D. programs.

2. Scholarship

For a person to be recommended for tenure and promoted from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor in this department, the candidate's published work will provide evidence that he or she is already becoming a leading scholar in their area(s) of specialization, with the expectation that he or she will indeed become a leading scholar in the field in future years.

The candidate's published work represents the first order of evidence about his or her scholarly contributions. Excellence in research is manifested by the quality and coherence of a sustained commitment to a line of research, its scientific soundness and significance, its creativity, and the impact of the work on the field. The quantity of scholarship reported must be interpreted in the context of the nature and scope of the work and the average annual workload percentage assigned to research.

Quality and Impact of Research. We consider a number of sources of information regarding the overall quality and impact of the candidate's scholarly work. Chief among these are: (1) letters from external scholars regarding the applicant's impact and recognition in the field; (2) publication quantity and quality; (3) grants and contract applications and awards; (4) conference presentations at prestigious meetings and invited presentations; (5) appointments to study panels and task forces; (6) election to offices in and other service to professional societies; (7) scholarly awards and honors; (8) citations in major systematic reviews and books; (9) published work by other investigators that explicitly traces itself to the applicant's publications and ideas; and (10) citation counts, impact factors, and other objective indicators of scholarly impact.

3. Teaching

The second area of contribution which is to be assessed is teaching. We will assess the documented quality and impact of graduate and undergraduate, both in and outside of the classroom in various formats to include traditional, online, and hybrid courses. In evaluating the candidate's teaching, we consider evidence regarding: (1) the quality of teaching (including syllabi, student ratings, and other evidence such as peer observations); (2) use of emerging technologies and media; (3) the degree to which students are attracted to work with the candidate; (4) thesis (both graduate and undergraduate) and dissertation direction and committee activity; (5) contributions to the educational programs of the department (e.g., new or revised courses or course materials); (6) efforts to improve teaching; (7) supervision of graduate and teaching assistants; (8) teaching-related publications; (9) teaching workshops³⁸

given; (10) instructional grants awarded; and (11) teaching awards and honors. We are also concerned with the extent to which the applicant has demonstrated a sustained commitment to teaching and fulfills teaching obligations cooperatively and collegially.

Indices of teaching impact may also include: directed students accepted into graduate programs; students gaining employment in the field; students winning awards and honors; student publications; and other successes of current or former students. Various measures of student learning and life change is acceptable (e.g., demonstrable student learning outcomes, acceptance into graduate programs, employment, publications with students, etc.).

4. Service

Service includes positive contributions to the department and programs within it, to the college, to the university and the campus, to the profession, and to the community. We expect routine participation in service to the profession and to the department.

The following will be assessed in evaluating service: (1) participation in department, college, and university committees; (2) editorships and/or editorial board membership; (3) reviewing for publications and granting agencies; (4) holding offices in professional organizations; (5) external review of tenure and promotion applications for other institutions; and (6) activities related to criminology in the community such as consulting with community agencies, media interviews, and public lectures relevant to the discipline. Evidence of service impact should address involvement in important policy decisions, administrative responsibility, and particularly effective outcomes.

C. Criteria for Promotion from Associate to Full Professor*

To be promoted from Associate Professor to Full Professor in this department, it is expected that a faculty member is already a leading scholar in their area(s) of specialization at the national or international level, that he or she has established a record of **excellence** in both teaching and scholarly research, and that he or she has a record of **substantial contributions** in service to the profession, university, and community, where appropriate. The indicators of excellence used to assess the viability of tenure applications are used for promotion to Full Professor, but with higher levels of expectations.

APPROVED: Dec. 5, 2014

D. Tenure & Promotion Criteria Checklist

Based on the criteria noted above and in related documents cited above, this section presents an outline of evidence required and preferred for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Full Professor.

1. Research

A. Required Evidence:

	<u>Tenure/Associate</u>	<u>Full</u>
1. Articles (or equivalent)/year	2	2
2. Continuous record of scholarship	√	√
3. Clear program(s) of research	√	√
4. High impact publications	√	√
5. Sole/lead/senior authorships	√	√
6. Conference Participation	√	√
7. External manuscript referee	√	√
8. Editorial Board Membership/Editor	x	√
9. Grant/Contract Applications	√	√
10. Citation Count	√	√
11. External References	√	√
12. Publications with students	x	√
13. Presentations with students	x	√

B. Preferred/Additional Evidence that may be submitted and considered:

14. Invited Presentations/Speeches
15. Community-Engaged Scholarship
16. Global/Comparative Research
17. Interdisciplinary Research
18. Research Awards/Honors
19. Grant Reviews
20. Book Reviews published
21. Encyclopedia Entries
22. Forwards/afterwards in Monographs
23. Study Panels/Task Forces
24. Work Cited in Systematic Reviews
25. Work as the basis for other researchers' work
26. Other evidence of impact of one's work

C. Indicator Explanation

- 1. Articles/equivalent.** According to data from the 2019 Annual Report of the Association for Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice (ADPCCJ), the average faculty member at a Ph.D. program produces approximately 2.09 articles per year. Because it is the objective of the department to be among the top programs, the annual average number of publications should be equivalent to or higher than the national mean. We expect that during their pre-tenure period, faculty produce an average of 2 articles or their equivalent annually. For candidates applying for promotion to Full Professor, we expect these faculty members to produce, on average, 2 articles or their equivalent annually for at least the preceding five years at the rank of Associate Professor. Consideration for workload allocation will be given, but the general expectations are based on an approximate 40% average workload allocation to research.

There is some need to address general expectations concerning *article equivalents*. An edited book of reprints is equivalent to an article; an edited book of original work is equivalent to 1.5 articles; a scholarly book or monograph is equivalent to 4 articles; a final grant report is equivalent to an article; a grant proposal is equivalent to an article; an accepted federal/state grant is equivalent to 2 articles; book chapters are the equivalent of 0.75 articles. Book reviews and encyclopedia entries are given minor credit, but do not in and of themselves indicate evidence of scholarly publication. Applications for promotion or tenure should consist primarily of peer-reviewed publications, with a preference for peer-reviewed publications that are sole or lead/senior authored and published in high-rank or high-impact outlets.

The USF Publications Council relies on Cabell's Blacklist to identify "predatory publishers," which are deceptive and exploitive quasi-academic, non-academic, or fraudulent publishers that often publish without review for article quality, accuracy, or legitimacy. The criteria for inclusion on the Cabell's Blacklist are available on [Cabell's website](#). Publications in outlets listed on Cabell's Blacklist of predatory publishers will generally not be given credit. The onus is on the applicant to verify that their publication outlets are credible. Access to Cabell's list is available through the USF library website.

- 2. Continuous Record of Scholarship.** Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor are expected to be continuously productive scholars. This requires demonstrable evidence of research productivity in one form or another each year.
- 3. Clear Program(s) of Research.** Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor are expected to demonstrate clear evidence of at least one *developing* programmatic area of research; candidate for promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate clear evidence of at least one *established* programmatic area of research. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence and make a case that their research agenda is developing (promotion to

Associate) or established (promotion to Full).

4. **High Impact Publications.** A significant proportion of the body of published research produced by a candidate for promotion to Associate Professor should appear in high- impact publications; an even greater proportion of the body of published research produced by a candidate for promotion to Full Professor should appear in high impact publications. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence and make a case that their research outlets are high impact publications. Evidence for high impact publications may include impact factors, journal respect within the discipline, citation counts, the Social Science Citation Index (SSCI), and/or any other documentation that may be indicative of a high impact publication.
5. **Sole/Lead Authorships.** A candidate for promotion to Associate Professor should be the sole or lead/senior author on a significant proportion of their body of published research; a candidate for promotion to Full Professor should be the sole or lead/senior author on an even greater proportion of their body of published research. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence and make a case that their record exemplifies a significant proportion" of sole or lead/senior author publications.
6. **Conference Participation.** Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor and Full Professor are expected to have authored/coauthored at least 1 conference paper/poster per year. Candidates for Full Professor should demonstrate additional conference participation above and beyond poster/panel presentations, such as membership on conference organizational team, program coordinator, invited or keynote speaker, etc.
7. **External manuscript referee.** Professors at all levels are expected to make relevant contribution to their scholarly reputation by being asked to serve as external reviewers.
8. **Editorial Boards.** Given their standing in the field, candidates for Full Professor are expected to show evidence that they have either served on a journal or book series editorial board, or as an editor of a journal (this does not include guest editorships).
9. **Grant/Contract Applications.** Consistent with University expectations, candidates for tenure and promotion, regardless of rank, are expected to show evidence of efforts to apply for grants or contracts. For non-tenured faculty, this may include, but should not be limited to, evidence of participating in grant writing workshops. Preference is given for grant/contract applications that are external to USF and/or with federal agencies.
10. **Citation Counts.** Candidates for tenure and promotion to all ranks should provide evidence of their citation counts, and any other "bibliometric" indicators of the impact of their scholarly works.
11. **External References.** For tenure/promotion to Associate Professor, external letters should show evidence that the candidate has contributed to knowledge in their specialty area(s) and, in the opinion of the reviewers, has the potential to continue to contribute to the production of knowledge. For Full professors, additional evidence of national or international recognition in an area of research is required.
12. **Publications with students.** Because it is an objective of the department to be among the top doctoral programs in the discipline, it is imperative that our students be actively involved in the entire research process, including the publication process. As such, it is *preferred* that candidates for promotion in rank of Associate and *required* for candidates for promotion to Full Professor demonstrate their ability to involve their students in this process, which may include evidence of continued mentorship of student graduates on publications. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of student involvement in the research and publication process.
13. **Presentations with students.** As with the above, it is also imperative that our students be actively involved at one or more of our national or regional professional associations by

presenting their research at annual meetings of these professional associations. As such, it is *preferred* that candidates for promotion in rank of Associate and *required* for candidates for promotion to Full Professor demonstrate their ability to involve their students in this process. It is the candidate's responsibility to provide evidence of student involvement in the research presentation process.

- 14. Invited Presentations/Speeches.** A sign of one's visibility and impact within the discipline is the extent to which she/he is invited to give speeches/presentations before selected local, regional, state, national, or international audiences. Candidates for promotion to either Associate or Full Professor are encouraged to accept such offers when they can.
- 15. Community-Engaged Scholarship.** A strategic priority for the University of South Florida is to retain its national prominence as a "Community Engaged" institution. As such, faculty at all ranks are strongly encouraged to participate with local, regional, state, national, or international community partners in their research and scholarship.
- 16. Global/Comparative Research.** Another strategic priority for the University of South Florida is to participate in research and scholarship at an international or global-level or in ways that have a demonstrable international/global impact. As such, faculty at every rank are strongly encouraged to participate in international/global research.
- 17. Interdisciplinary Research.** While criminology is an inherently interdisciplinary endeavor, faculty at every rank are encouraged to partner with colleagues from other units in their research and scholarship.
- 18. Research Awards/Honors.** Powerful indicators of the impact of one's research and scholarship are any honorific awards, citations, or distinctions it has garnered from lay or professional audiences either for the body of work as a whole or for individual pieces of it (e.g., outstanding/best paper, article, book awards).
- 19. Grant Reviews.** Another powerful indicator of the impact of one's research and scholarship are opportunities to serve on grant proposal review boards for various funding organizations. Faculty of every rank are strongly encouraged to accept opportunities to participate in such an activity whenever they can.
- 20. Book Reviews published.** Published book reviews provide an important service to the discipline and may provide opportunities for faculty to work with students. However, published book reviews are not, in and of themselves, indicators of research scholarly productivity for applications for promotion at either rank
- 21. Encyclopedia Entries.** Published encyclopedia entries provide another important service to the discipline and may provide opportunities for faculty to work with students. However, encyclopedia entries are not, in and of themselves, indicators of research scholarly productivity for applications for promotion at either rank
- 22. Forwards/afterwards in Monographs.** Published forwards and afterwards also provide an important service to the discipline. Candidates for promotion in rank are requested to provide evidence of any of these they have written.
- 23. Appointments to Study Panels/Task Forces.** A significant indicator of one's impact on their discipline is the opportunity to participate on select study panels and/or task forces. Faculty of all ranks are strongly encouraged to accept such invitations if they can.
- 24. Work Cited in Systematic Reviews.** When other scholars in the discipline publish a major systematic review of the research literature in an area of study that cites the work of a candidate for promotion, it is a strong indicator of the impact of the candidate's scholarly work.
- 25. Work as the basis for other researchers' work.** Another indicator of the impact of a promotion candidate's scholarly work is evident when the work of other scholar(s) explicitly traces itself to the applicant's research.

26. Other evidence of impact of one's work. Applicants for promotion in rank to either Associate Professor or Full Professor are encouraged to submit any other evidence of their scholarly productivity and/or its impact.

2. Teaching

A. Required

	<u>Tenure/Associate</u>	<u>Full</u>
27. Required/graduate courses Taught	x	√
28. Student Evaluations of Teaching	√	√
29. Peer Evaluation of Teaching	√	x
30. Graduate Student Committee Memberships		
31. Directing/co-directing M.A. Thesis	x	√
32. Directing/co-directing Ph.D. Diss.	x	√
33. Successfully direct student research	√	√
34. Publications with Students	x	√
35. Presentations with Students	x	√

B. Preferred/Additional Evidence that may be submitted and considered:

- 36. Number and Variety of Sections Taught
- 37. Course Preparation
- 38. Teaching Awards/Honors
- 39. Directing Honors Thesis
- 40. Grade Distributions
- 41. Publications on teaching
- 42. Community-engaged teaching
- 43. Textbooks
- 44. Participation in Teaching Enhancement Programs/Courses/Workshops
- 45. Developed New Course
- 46. Appointment to Teaching Committees at University, State, or National Levels
- 47. Supervision Instructional GAs
- 48. Innovative Teaching Methods
- 49. New Technologies Employed
- 50. Other Evidence of Contributions/Effectiveness in Teaching

C. Indicator Explanation

- 27. Courses Taught.** Candidates for promotion in rank to Associate Professor should provide evidence that they have made a meaningful contribution to the core undergraduate curriculum, such as teaching required courses. Candidates for promotion in rank to Full Professor should provide evidence of their teaching graduate courses.
- 28. Student Evaluation of Teaching.** Candidates for promotion in rank to either Associate Professor or Full Professor are expected to be effective classroom teachers. One measure of teaching effectiveness is average student rating for each section taught. On average, student evaluations of the candidate's teaching should be approximately at or above the college average for equivalent courses. Student comments should parallel these quantitative ratings.
- 29. Peer Evaluation of Teaching.** Candidates for promotion in rank to Associate Professor are required to have the department Chair, Associate Chair, or branch campus Chair visit their classroom at least once prior to their Mid-tenure Review and at least once again after the Mid-tenure Review but prior to their application for tenure. These peer observers, in turn, are required to provide the candidate with a written peer evaluation identifying various strengths and weaknesses and offering suggestions for improvement. These written peer evaluations constitute additional evidence of teaching effectiveness. Tenured faculty members are encouraged to make similar invitations for peer evaluation of their teaching, although such peer evaluations are not required.
- 30. Graduate Student Committee Memberships.** All tenure-line faculty members are expected to be actively involved in M.A. thesis/project and Ph. D. dissertation committee membership.
- 31. Direct/co-direct M.A. thesis/project.** Candidates seeking promotion in rank to Full Professor must demonstrate that they have directed/chaired at least one M.A. thesis through a successful defense, unless waived by the Department Chair. While not required of those candidates seeking promotion in rank to Associate Professor, the successful direction of an M.A. thesis is very desirable.
- 32. Direct/co-direct Ph.D. dissertation** Candidates seeking promotion in rank to full Professor must demonstrate that they have directed/chaired at least one doctoral dissertation through a successful defense, unless waived by the Department Chair. Tenure-earning Assistant Professors are discouraged from pursuing this activity.
- 33. Successfully direct student research.** Tenure-line faculty members at all ranks are expected to provide evidence of successful direction of student research (undergraduate, Masters, or doctoral) to completion. This may be in the form of a successfully defended Honor's thesis, M.A. thesis, Ph. D dissertation, or publishable manuscript.
- 34. Publications with Students.** It is highly desired that faculty members at all ranks actively include and participate with students, especially graduate students, in some research activities that lead to the development of publishable manuscripts. Evidence of successful publishing with students is *required* for those seeking to apply for promotion in rank to full Professor.
- 35. Presentations with Students.** It is highly desired that faculty members at all ranks actively include and participate with students, especially graduate students, in some research activities that lead to the development of manuscripts/posters presented at the annual meetings of professional associations. Evidence of presenting manuscripts/posters with students at the annual meeting of professional organizations is *required* for those seeking to apply for promotion in rank to Full Professor.

- 36. Number and Variety of Sections Taught.** It is especially desirable for candidates seeking promotion in rank to either Associate or Full Professor to demonstrate that she/he has taught a variety of courses across the curriculum (the number and variety of sections taught should be consistent with their assignment of duties and appropriate for their rank). This diversity of teaching could include undergraduate, Masters, and doctoral levels; large and small enrollments; required and elective courses; classroom, web-based, and/or hybrid formats, etc.
- 37. Course Preparation.** Candidates for promotion in rank to Associate Professor or Full Professor should provide direct evidence of the extent to which they have actively prepared new courses or revised/updated courses they have previously taught. This would include courses converted from classroom delivery to web-based or hybrid formats.
- 38. Directing Honors Thesis.** Candidates for promotion in rank to Full Professor are encouraged to be actively involved in the direction of undergraduate Honors thesis research.
- 39. Teaching Awards/Honors.** A highly desirable indicator of the impact of one's teaching are any honorific awards, citations, or distinctions garnered from lay or professional audiences.
- 40. Grade Distributions.** The Department of Criminology in no way seeks to interfere with the academic freedom of its faculty members. However, consistent evidence of especially lenient or harsh grade distributions is a cause for concern.
- 41. Publications on teaching.** An important contribution to the discipline and a strong indicator of one's impact on teaching is any publication on pedagogy. Such publications would include peer-reviewed articles on teaching.
- 42. Community-engaged teaching.** Community engagement is an important strategic priority at the University of South Florida. Demonstrable evidence of service learning activities in which students enrolled in a course are actively involved in a project with a community partner is highly valued.
- 43. Textbooks.** An important contribution to the discipline and another strong indicator of one's impact on teaching is the publication of a textbook or edited reader (i.e., collections of previously published works). Of lesser significance, though still valued, is the production/publication of test banks, study guides, and/or other pedagogic materials made available to the discipline.
- 44. Participation in Teaching Enhancement Programs/Courses/Workshops.** Candidates seeking promotion in rank to either Associate Professor or full Professor are encouraged to demonstrate efforts to either enhance their own teaching effectiveness or the teaching effectiveness of others through their participation in teaching enhancement workshop, etc.
- 45. Developed New Course.** A particularly valuable contribution to the instructional enterprise of the department, college, and university is the development of new courses.
- 46. Appointment to Teaching Committees at University, State, or National Levels.** Another indicator of one's contribution to teaching is an appointment to a departmental, college, university, statewide, or national-level committee/panel on teaching.
- 47. Supervision Instructional GAs.** One of the required elements of graduate education is the preparation of graduate students for their role as an instructor of record. A primary component to this process is the supervision of instructional G.A.s/T.A.s. Candidates for promotion in rank should demonstrate the extent to which they have contributed to this effort.
- 48. Innovative Teaching Methods.** Truly innovate teaching methodologies can help improve teaching effectiveness, not just for the section in which the innovation was employed, but also as examples to other faculty for their consideration. Candidates for promotion in rank

should provide evidence of any innovations they may have adopted as well as any evidence that established their effectiveness.

49. New Technologies Employed. A form of innovative teaching methodologies includes efforts to employ new technologies in the classroom. These are given special recognition here due to the resource and other institutional commitments provided to encourage faculty to adopt them. Candidates for promotion in rank should provide evidence of any new technologies they may have adopted as well as any evidence that established their teaching effectiveness.

50. Other Evidence of Contributions/Effectiveness in Teaching. Applicants for promotion in rank to either Associate Professor or full Professor are encouraged to submit any other evidence of their teaching performance/productivity and/or its impact.

3. Service

A. Required

	<u>Associate/Tenure</u>	<u>Full</u>
54. Department Committee Membership	√	√
55. Department Committee, Chair	x	√
56. College/University Committee Member	x	√
57. External Manuscript Referee	√	√
58. Conference Program Service	x	√
59. Editorial Board Membership/Editor	X	√
60. Community-engaged service	√	√

B. Preferred/Additional Evidence that may be submitted and considered:

- 59. Community-engaged service
- 60. Officer and Other Service to Professional Organizations
- 61. Service to Government Agency
- 62. Service to Grant Agency
- 63. Administrative Position, Academic
- 64. Service to Student Organizations
- 65. Media Contributions
- 66. Participation in Graduation Ceremonies
- 67. College/University Committee Chair
- 68. Departmental Written Reports
- 69. Graduate Director
- 70. Associate Chair
- 71. Guest Editor
- 72. Talks given to community or professional groups
- 73. Other Evidence of Service

C. Indicator Explanation

- 54. Department Committee Membership.** Shared faculty governance is an ideal to which the University of South Florida is dedicated to and faculty participation is required for faculty governance to be realized. Candidates for promotion in rank are expected to demonstrate the extent to which they have served on at least one departmental committee (standing or ad hoc) each academic year of their appointment.
- 55. Department Committee, Chair.** Candidates for promotion in rank to Full Professor are also expected to demonstrate that they have served as the Chair of at least one departmental committee.
- 56. College/University Committee Member.** Faculty governance includes service activities to the college and/or university as well. Candidates for promotion in rank to Full Professor are expected to demonstrate the extent to which they have served on at least one college- or university-level committee.
- 57. External Manuscript Referee.** Service to the discipline is also expected of all faculty members. Candidates for promotion in rank are expected to demonstrate the extent to which they have served the discipline through their activities as an ad hoc peer reviewer of manuscripts/monographs submitted for publication in scholarly journals/presses.
- 58. Conference Program Service.** Another form of professional service expected of tenured faculty takes the form of conference service (e.g., program manager, session organizer, session moderator, discussant, etc.). Candidates for promotion in rank to Full Professor are expected to document the extent of such service.
- 59. Editorial Board Membership/Editor.** A particularly important professional service includes serving as an editor or member on the editorial board for a scholarly press or journal; likewise, service as an editor or member of the editorial board for a professional association newsletter is also laudable. Candidates for promotion in rank to full Professor must demonstrate the extent to which they have served in any of these capacities.
- 60. Officer & Other Service to Professional Organizations.** A particularly important professional service includes serving as an officer for a professional organization. Other service to a professional organization (e.g., committee service) is also highly valued. Candidates for promotion in rank should provide any evidence of such professional service.
- 61. Community-Engaged Service.** Community-engaged service at the local, regional, state, national, or international levels is an integral component of the mission of the University and College. Candidates for promotion at either rank must document such contributions in line with the College's definition of community-engagement.
- 62. Service to Government Agency.** Public service can also extend to faculty members' contribution to and participation in the activities of local, state, and national governmental agencies.
- 63. Service to Grant Agency.** Particularly honorific forms of professional service are those invitations to serve on proposal review panels for various funding agencies. Candidates for promotion in rank should provide evidence of any such activity.

- 64. Administrative Position, Academic.** Administrative appointments at the university, college, or departmental level constitute an exceptionally heavy service commitment. Those candidates for promotion in rank who have held such posts should document this service.
- 65. Service to Student Organizations.** Candidates for promotion in rank who have helped with various student organizations are encouraged to document this activity.
- 66. Media Contributions.** An important component of public service and are an effective way to enhance the department's visibility is through our contributions to the media. Candidates for promotion in rank are strongly encouraged to document such contributions.
- 67. Participation in Graduation Ceremonies.** Faculty participation in graduate ceremonies is very important to our students, their families, and to our administration. Candidates for promotion in rank are encouraged to document their participation in these important events.
- 68. College/University Committee Chair.** Faculty governance includes service activities to the college and/or university. Candidates for promotion in rank who have chaired any college- or university-level committees should document such service.
- 69. Departmental Written Reports.** Authorship on reports to the university or college administration provides an important contribution to faculty governance. Candidates for promotion in rank who have contributed to any such reports are encouraged to document this activity.
- 70. Graduate Director.** Serving as the department's Graduate Director is a very important governance function. Candidates for promotion who have held such an appointment should document it.
- 71. Associate Chair.** Serving as the department's Associate Chair is a very important governance function. Candidates for promotion who have held such an appointment should document it.
- 72. Guest Editor.** An especially meaningful professional service activity is an invitation to serve as a guest editor for a special issue of a scholarly journal. This service work is also very time and labor intensive. Candidates for promotion in rank are requested to provide evidence of any of these invitations they have accepted.
- 73. Talks given to community or professional groups.** Talks and speeches given to community or professional groups provide another form of service important to the public. Candidates for promotion in rank are requested to provide evidence of any of these they have given.
- 74. Other Evidence of Service.** Applicants for promotion in rank to either Associate Professor or full Professor are encouraged to submit any other evidence of their public, professional, administrative, or university service.

VIII. INSTRUCTOR PROMOTION GUIDELINES

1. Departmental Instructor Promotion Committee

This committee is referred to as the Departmental/School Instructor Promotion Committee (DS-IPC) in the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path, and that acronym will be used below. The term instructor will be used to refer to both faculty who hold titles of Professors of Instruction and faculty who hold titles of Instructor. The Department will make decisions about promotion for Instructors in accordance with the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path CBCS Instructor Promotion Guidelines. As needed, the Department Chair will appoint a DS-IPC to review applications and enter the vote. Refer to the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path for further information.

2. Duties:

- a. The Department Chair will appoint the DS-IPC Committee when an instructor or professor of instruction at any level requires an evaluation for promotion.
- b. The committee will consist of four eligible tenure-track faculty at the rank of associate or full professor. If possible, three of the four members should hold a position as instructors. Branch campus tenure-track faculty and instructors are eligible to serve on the committee, but if the candidate is from a branch campus, a higher-ranking instructor or tenure-track faculty member from that campus should serve on the committee.
- c. Per the CBCS Promotion Guidelines for Instructor Career Path, “the DS-IPC committee **shall select the DS-IPC Chair** who shall be responsible for writing the evaluation of the majority opinion of the DS-IPC committee, entering the vote of the committee into the promotion application, noting the evaluations made by the DS-IPC Committee (e.g., Excellent, etc.) and signing the application on behalf of the DS-IPC”.

Approved by Department: March 20,

2015 Approved by Dean Serovich,

April 16, 2015

Approved by Vice Provost Glover, July 14, 2015; Effective July 14, 2016

IX. ADJUNCT SCREENING PROCESS

- A. The Adjunct Screening Process will be the responsibility of the Associate Chair/Campus Chairs of the campus for which the adjunct is to be appointed. The Associate/Campus Chair will request the assistance of the faculty member who has the most appropriate background to evaluate any adjunct applicant who wishes to teach the same or a similar course as that taught by the full-time faculty member.
- B. The Associate/Campus Chair will be responsible for obtaining all the documents necessary to assess the suitability of the applicant. This includes a current c.v., teaching evaluations from other institutions (if they are available), letters of recommendation, and a certified college transcript. In general, applicants must have at least a master's or J.D. degree. Exceptions to this educational standard will be made by majority vote of the faculty on a case-by-case basis. In addition to normal University application procedures, each applicant will be required to complete a notarized affidavit indicating that they have not had any difficulties with licensing/certification should this apply to any given adjunct. If there are any exceptional circumstances, the Department Chair will discuss this matter with the faculty.
- C. After each applicant's packet has been reviewed, the Associate/Campus Chair will make a recommendation in writing to the Department Chair indicating that the individual is acceptable or is not acceptable, and which courses, if any, the individual is qualified to teach.
- D. New adjuncts may be assigned by the Associate/Campus Chair to a tenured Criminology faculty member or Lecturer II who will serve as a mentor. The mentor will also review the adjunct's course syllabus and other related instructional material to be certain they meet departmental standards.
- E. The Associate/Campus Chair will review all adjunct teaching evaluations at the end of each semester and advise the Department Chair if, in his/her judgment, the adjunct is performing adequately. If it is determined that problems exist, these will be brought to the

attention of the Department Chair along with recommendations for dealing with the problem.

X. SUMMER APPOINTMENT POLICIES

- A. **Introduction.** The Department Chair with the assistance of the Associate Chair and Campus Chairs and in consultation with the Dean is responsible for making summer teaching assignments. The Chair makes his/her recommendations for summer teaching to the Dean. Recognizing that summer appointments are often limited by available funding, and that the final decision rests with the Chair and Dean, the Department encourages the Chair and Dean to employ an equitable summer appointment decision which the Department members have agreed constitutes a solution to this problem and is outlined below.
- B. **General Policy.** Every effort will be made to ensure that every faculty member who so desires has the opportunity to teach at least one summer course except as follows.
- C. **Availability of and limited funds.** If funding is limited and courses are not available for all who indicate an interest in teaching during the summer, priority will be given to untenured faculty on tenure track lines. Following the distribution of courses as described above, a lottery procedure will be utilized to determine the priority order in which classes will be distributed to remaining faculty with an interest in summer teaching. The lottery procedure is as follows. At a faculty meeting, slips of paper with the names of faculty who wish to teach a summer course will be placed in a container from which the names will be drawn. The order in which names are drawn constitutes the order in which faculty will be allowed to pick from available courses. Alternatively, if more than one course is available, the lottery system will be utilized to determine the distribution of second courses among interested faculty. In the event that budgetary restrictions prevent the appointment of any individual on the lottery list, but sufficient funds exist to appoint a lower salaried member of the faculty to teach, the existing lottery order shall be employed to select the alternative candidate. If there are no appropriate alternative candidates on the lottery list, the Chair may use other methods to fill courses the department needs to offer during summer sessions.
- D. Faculty assignment must take into account departmental needs in course scheduling. While faculty preference will be taken into account, faculty must ultimately select from courses that best fit the needs of the department.

- E. If it is necessary to offer a course that requires a specific faculty member as instructor, that faculty member may be assigned the course without being subject to the lottery procedure.
- F. Courses taught on other USF campuses, if available, will be included in the list of courses from which faculty may be assigned.
- G. Faculty who negotiate USF Criminology summer course assignments separate from the department are not eligible for assignments determined by the first round of the lottery procedure.
- H. Faculty who are unable to obtain a course are, in lottery pick order, automatically eligible for course assignment during the next (or subsequent) summer that a course is available, and will be assigned a course prior to utilization of the lottery system.
- I. The foregoing policies pertain to summer courses that are funded through allotments from the College of Behavioral & Community Sciences Dean's Office and from other USF campus sources. Should other options for teaching summer courses become available, allotment procedures will be specified in a freestanding document until such time that it is formally incorporated into this Governance Document.

XI. ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AND BEHAVIORAL MISCONDUCT BY STUDENTS

A. Academic Dishonesty

When an instructor or other departmental employee (such as the undergraduate advisor or departmental support staff) has reason to believe a student has engaged in academic misconduct in class or on an assignment, he/she should follow the procedures outlined “Academic Integrity of Students,” (USF Regulation 3.027). Instructors should inform the Associate Chair/Undergraduate Program Coordinator (and Graduate Director if a graduate student) of the alleged incident, and may seek guidance on a course of action.

B. Behavioral Misconduct

When an instructor or other departmental employee encounters instances of student behavioral misconduct that justify an official response, that person should first discuss the issue with the Associate/Campus Chair, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, or, if the alleged offender is a graduate student, the relevant Graduate Director/Coordinator. Considerable discretion should be utilized in determining the severity of the misconduct in each case and the responses that are appropriate to it. If the infraction is deemed to be minor, but in the opinion of the Associate/Campus Chair, Undergraduate Program Coordinator, or Graduate Director/Coordinator rises to a level of unacceptability that justifies an official response, the Department will send a letter to the student that expresses concern about the incident. If the student is a Criminology major, a copy of the letter will be placed in his/her file so as to be available for future reference.

If the student’s misconduct is considered to merit a higher level of sanction, procedures specified in the appropriate codes of student conduct will be followed, e.g. USF Academic Disruption regulation 3.025.

C. Disenrollment from the Criminology Major as a Sanction (pending approval of the Undergraduate Council and publication in the University Catalog).

The Department of Criminology has a vested interest in graduating majors who possess high standards of ethical and behavioral conduct in their employment settings. Therefore,

as Departmental policy, disenrollment from the Criminology major should be considered as a sanction included in any negotiated settlement regarding instances of academic cheating and/or behavioral misconduct. If the case proceeds to the College/University level, disenrollment from the major may be among the sanctions requested. The decision to pursue disenrollment must be made in consultation with the Associate/Campus Chair or Undergraduate Program Coordinator/Graduate Director/Graduate Coordinator or other appropriate departmental representatives.

XII. DEPARTMENTAL LINES OF COMMUNICATION

With consolidation, our departmental structure and organization has become much more complex and appropriate lines of communication have become less clear. In order for the department to function efficiently and effectively, and in an effort to minimize misunderstandings, miscommunications, and conflict, it is important that we establish and maintain clear guidelines regarding proper channels of communication and authority. Faculty circumventing the departmental organizational structure by reporting to whomever they want is counterproductive and weakens the department. Such actions disrespect the immediate supervisor and overtaxes the higher-ranked supervisors who likely do not have the time to address issues/matters that could and should have been handled at a lower tier. The result is chaos, the risk of supervisors being undermined, and ineffective communication and decision-making since the appropriate parties have been cut out of the process. As such, I feel that it is now necessary to more clearly define the appropriate lines of communication to be followed should issues/matters arise among or between departmental students, faculty, staff, or administrators. Importantly, these lines of communication and the departmental organizational structure from which they derive are not designed to discourage or impede collaboration between or among faculty, students, staff, and/or administrators.

“Issues/matters” do not involve just disputes or disagreements, etc., but also agreements, suggestions, comments, counsel, advice, etc. In short, “issues/matters” include all sorts of everyday program/campus management interactions for which clear lines of communication should be developed. However, this policy is restricted to interpersonal and/or intra-departmental issues/matters that are not otherwise addressed by University policies.

Nothing in this document is intended, nor should it be interpreted, to conflict with or supersede existing University Policies, Regulations, and procedures for reporting employee concerns, including but not limited to reporting concerns of discrimination or retaliation under USF Policy 0-007: Diversity and Equal Opportunity – Discrimination and Harassment or USF Policy 0-004: Sexual Misconduct/Sexual Harassment (including Sexual Violence), or the processing of student complaints as detailed in USF Policy 30-053: Student Concern Process. This document is also not intended to abridge academic freedom, as addressed in Article 5 of the faculty Collective Bargaining Agreement, or otherwise infringe on any employee’s freedom of speech or expression. Rather, this document is intended as a guide for faculty in the escalation of issues/matters that

require resolution and are not otherwise addressed by University Policies, Regulations, and procedures.

First, make every effort to avoid escalating any issues to a formal level of resolution. Work directly and informally with the involved parties to resolve any issue.

Second, for branch campus-specific issues that could not be resolved informally among the parties involved, the Campus Chair should be brought in to attempt to resolve the matter informally.

Should the issue remain unresolved, the Campus Chair should forward the matter to the Department Chair and/or to the appropriate branch campus administrator for resolution.

Should branch campus issues be advanced to the Department Chair, the Chair may either work to resolve the issue or delegate it to another departmental administrator, as appropriate, for resolution.

Should the matter remain unresolved, it may be advanced by the Chair to the appropriate college or university administrator for resolution.

Third, for issues that arise on the Tampa campus, or arise between campuses, and for which efforts to resolve the matter informally have failed, the matter should be addressed by the Department Chair. The chair may delegate the matter to other departmental administrators, as appropriate, for resolution.

Should the matter remain unresolved, the Chair may forward the issued to the appropriate college or university administrator for resolution.

Fourth, issues regarding other departmental administrators, regardless of campus, should be advanced to the Chair for resolution. Should the matter remain unresolved, it may be advanced by the Chair to the appropriate college or university administrator for resolution.

Fifth, issues regarding the Chair, should be advanced to either the Associate Chair or to the department's Executive Committee for resolution. Should the matter remain unresolved, it should

be advanced by the Associate Chair or Chair of the Executive Committee to the appropriate college or university administrator for resolution.

Sixth, issues taken out of sequence shall be remanded back to the proper level for resolution.

XIII. PROCEDURE TO AMEND THE GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT

Any member of the Criminology faculty may propose amendments of this Governance Document by submitting the proposed change in writing to the Chair of the Department. The proposal will be considered at the next scheduled faculty meeting. However, additions or deletions to, or revision of, the Governance Document must be disseminated to all faculty members at least five business days before the proposed amendment is to be voted upon. Changes to the Governance Document require a 2/3 vote of the eligible faculty.