

TRIENNIAL REVIEW
SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY & SECURITY STUDIES

Approved: 04/28/2021

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

Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

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

Instructors

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

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

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

Overview

As approved by the Faculty Senate, in Years 1 and 2 of the cycle, each faculty member will be evaluated by the school director. In year 3, faculty will be evaluated by the personnel committee and the school director in independent reviews. Each faculty member's performance will be evaluated for each assigned component (teaching, scholarship, and service) annually. The individual categories will be designated *Meets Expectations* or *Does Not Meet Expectations*.

Annual Data Entry

Each faculty member shall place into the Faculty Activities Database (FAD) evidence of their teaching, scholarship, and service activities by September 20 each year for the previous August 1 to July 31 period. Evidence of teaching effectiveness must include, at a minimum, syllabi and the University-wide student course evaluations for any courses taught during the review period. Faculty may include evidence providing support of effectiveness in other domains, but only the domains in which the faculty member has an assignment shall be considered relevant.

Process for Years 1 and 2 School Director Review

Each year, after September 20, the school director shall review the faculty member's materials for the review period in the FAD and evaluate the faculty member's performance in each assigned area. The review of the materials in the FAD annually is conducted for the purpose of verifying that the faculty members are meeting departmental expectations for performance in assigned domains. This evaluation will include a rationale for a determination of not meeting expectations in any of the three faculty domains (teaching, scholarship, and service). The faculty member will be notified of the results of this evaluation by October 20.

Process for Year 3 Personnel Committee and School Director Review

In every year 3, the personnel committee *and* the school director will independently read and evaluate the submitted materials for each faculty member. The school director will be evaluated by the personnel committee. The personnel committee will complete the review process for each eligible faculty member and notify them of the results by October 31. In every year 3, the personnel committee and the school director¹ will review each faculty members in three domains (Teaching, Scholarship, and Service) using the criteria outlined below:

¹ Evaluators (personnel committee members and the school director) should focus on the quality of the work in each domain in order to determine whether the faculty member is meeting or not meeting expectations.

1. Teaching:

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

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

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

2. Scholarship:

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

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

3. Service:

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

profession, discipline-specific service outside of the department and the university, or is involved in community service.

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

Evaluations of Instructors:

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

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

Failure to Upload Materials to FAD

Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who do not submit materials for evaluation in years 1 and 2, will on advice from the personnel committee be subject to being designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in each domain of their responsibility. Absent exigent circumstances, faculty who do not submit materials for evaluation in year 3, will on advice from the school director be subject to being designated as *Does Not Meet Expectations* in each domain of their responsibility.

Does Not Meet Expectations

Faculty who receive domain-specific performance evaluations of *Does Not Meet Expectations* will have a professional development plan constructed for them (with the input by the personnel committee) within two weeks of the completed review. Failure to agree to submit a professional development plan or failure to show improvement by the end of the designated improvement period may lead to additional consequence specified on the *Faculty Performance Evaluation* approved by the Faculty Senate.

Professional Development Plans

The faculty member and the school director will meet to develop the professional development plan. The plan may include (but is not limited to) identifying professional development goals, mentoring, and/or a partial or temporary reassignment of responsibilities. The plan, developed with the input of the faculty member, shall then be recorded in a letter and returned for review to the personnel committee. The committee may accept the plan or return it to the school director with further recommendations.

Appeal Process

As specified by the Faculty Senate, a faculty member may appeal a domain-specific assessment of *Does Not Meet Expectations* to the appropriate college appeals/grievance committee. Appeals may be made on the basis of a) inadequate consideration of the submitted materials; or b) inadequate consideration of the department's recommendation. Within 5 days of notification of their evaluation at the department level, a faculty member may forward to the college a one-page objection to any portion, representation, or conclusions of the evaluation. For more information on the appeal process, see *Faculty Performance Evaluation* guidelines approved by the Faculty Senate on 04/16/2020.

Faculty who are not required to submit triennial reviews:²

- Pre-tenured faculty (Assistant Professors) who are reviewed yearly.
- Instructors who are subject to annual review
- Faculty who were promoted effective August of year 3 of the review cycle

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