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# Background

The Bylaws of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice (SCCJ) require the Executive Committee to “coordinate Annual Performance Reviews of all tenured and tenure-track faculty and confidentially inform the School Director of the Committee’s evaluation and recommendations with regard to the three areas of Scholarship and Research, Teaching, and Service.”

The process for conducting these Annual Performance Reviews has historically been ad hoc, influenced heavily by the composition of the committee and the individual serving as Chair in any given year. Certain aspects of the review process have varied from year-to-year, such as whether to use student evaluations of teaching and the manner in which workload assignments are incorporated into the scores.

This ad hoc process is inconsistent with Arizona State University’s policy on annual evaluations of faculty. In ACD506-10, Arizona State University’s Academic Affairs Manual states that each academic unit must have a written policy specifying how faculty will be evaluated.[[1]](#footnote-1) Moreover, this policy “must be approved by the voting members of the unit’s academic assembly as specified by unit policies, and then submitted for review and action by the dean, and the provost of the university.”

This year, the Executive Committee seeks to adopt a policy for conducting Annual Performance Reviews so that the process is more transparent and consistent. The proposed policy is intended to bring the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice into compliance with ACD506-10.

# Proposed Policy

# Introduction

The School of Criminology and Criminal Justice (hereafter referred to as the School) has developed a strong professional curriculum, advanced a broad and rigorous research agenda, and arranged effective partnerships with local and regional community organizations. The School advances the social, economic, environmental and cultural well-being of our local and global communities through instruction, research, and service, which should be reflected in Annual Performance Reviews of faculty, staff and administrators.

Recommended Policy #1: Faculty APRs

# Annual Performance Reviews for Tenure Track Faculty

## Purpose of Annual Performance Review

The purpose of this document is to specify the processes, criteria, and measures used in the School to achieve the goals of the Annual Performance Review. Each year, faculty are required to undergo Annual Performance Review (APR) to assess faculty performance, provide feedback to faculty on their performance, and to form a basis for decisions on the allocation of merit increases to faculty salaries.

## Philosophy of Evaluation

In general, tenure-track faculty members in the School are expected to assume a workload distribution consisting of teaching (40%), research (40%), and service (20%). Exceptions to this typical workload may be negotiated in special cases to reflect faculty interests and talents while enabling the School to meet its collective goals of teaching, research, and service. An exception to the typical workload should be negotiated in advance with the School’s Director. Faculty must contribute in all three areas; the lowest percentage allowable in each category is 10%.

## Coordination of Annual Performance Reviews

In accordance with CCJ bylaws, the Executive Committee will coordinate Annual Performance Reviews of all tenured and tenure-track faculty and inform the School Director of the Committee’s evaluation recommendations with regard to research, teaching, and service. Furthermore, in accordance with CCJ bylaws, each faculty member will receive a copy of the Committee’s evaluation recommendations for that faculty member.

Following the Committee’s review and recommendations to the Director, each faculty member will receive the Director’s evaluation of their performance in writing.

In addition to providing each faculty member with a written assessment of their performance, the Director is also available to discuss the performance assessment with faculty on request. A written statement recording the sense of this discussion will be provided to the faculty member by the Director if such a conversation does take place.

## Evaluation materials for annual review

Tenure-track faculty members are responsible for preparing materials for the annual review process covering the previous three-year period. All faculty members shall file complete evaluation materials (at present through Interfolio ASU Vita) to be considered for merit or equity adjustments. At a minimum, the faculty are required to provide their vitae to the Executive Committee. Teaching evaluations and the faculty member’s three-year workload will be provided to the Committee by staff or the Director. Faculty members have the option to provide a two-page statement contextualizing their achievements in research, teaching, and service over the evaluation period. Other materials requested by the Executive Committee or Director should be provided by the faculty member to the Committee on the timeline provided by the School and/or College.

## Period of Evaluation

The time period for the Annual Performance Review for tenure track faculty will include the previous three calendar years. Greater weight should be given to the most recent calendar year. Evaluation criteria in this document assume a 40/40/20 distribution. If the relative weightings for teaching, research, and service are different for the three-year evaluation period, the faculty member will develop with approval of the Director an overall workload estimate that reflects the relative weightings for the three areas of evaluation for the three-year evaluation period. Expectations for faculty with different workload distributions will be adjusted commensurately.

## Performance pay (merit) evaluation criteria

Performance pay is based on the premise that all faculty members who continue to make solid contributions to the scholarly, teaching, and service programs of the school should receive some level of meritorious consideration. As such, it is recommended that performance adjustments be distributed based on the percentage of the pool available, not on the basis of the percent of faculty salary.

## Evaluation Process

Tenure track faculty will first be assessed by the Executive Committee. This stage of the review process will be facilitated by the Chair of the Executive Committee. The Committee will rate all tenure-track faculty in the School on a 5-point scale as clarified in the section below (entitled Evaluation Ratings). The faculty reviews will be forwarded to the Director. The Director will then consider these evaluations in formulating the final performance assessment for each faculty member.

## Evaluation Ratings

Faculty will be evaluated for their contributions in research, teaching, and service. The ultimate responsibility for the annual review process and outcomes lies with the School Director with input from the faculty.

Within each area, faculty members will be evaluated as specified in the below section on Evaluation Criteria. For each area, faculty performance will be evaluated as: Extraordinary Performance (5), Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Partially Meets Expectations (2), and Unacceptable Performance (1). Any faculty member receiving a score of “1” or “2” will receive written feedback from the Committee explaining the reason(s) for the score. The written feedback will be provided to the Director, who in turn will provide it to the faculty member.

Overall evaluations of Extraordinary Performance (5), Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Partially Meets Expectations (2), and Unacceptable performance (1) should be determined by combining the evaluations for teaching, research, and service in accord with the FTE assigned to each.

## Evaluation Criteria

### Assessment of Research and Scholarship

Because productivity in research and scholarship takes many different forms, meeting expectations in research and scholarship can take on many different forms. In general, faculty must demonstrate consistent productivity assessed across one or more of the three primary indicators, consistent with the assessment criteria stated in the School’s bylaws: publishing books at scholarly presses, publishing peer-reviewed journal articles, and applications and awards for external funding to support research and scholarship. Given the presence of faculty who specialize in law, accommodations will be made for publishing in law journals (which are not typically peer reviewed) since these represent an appropriate outlet for legal scholars to publish their work. Textbooks are *not* included under this heading. Instead, they are included in the evaluation of teaching.

Secondary indicators of research and scholarship productivity include edited books, book chapters, applying for funding, technical reports, and non-peer-reviewed articles. Faculty members are encouraged to include all activities they believe should be considered as secondary indicators for all parts of the evaluation rubric. Secondary indicators are purposefully left open-ended because it is not possible to anticipate the varied ways in which faculty may contribute to the mission of the school and we want to allow room for unanticipated valuable activities to be rewarded.

Research and scholarship that is solo-authored and/or first-authored will be weighted more heavily, unless otherwise noted by the faculty member. Publications with a student as the first author are also weighted more heavily. Co-authored work will be weighted based on the order of authorship unless otherwise noted by the faculty member. Journal impact factor will be taken into consideration as an indicator of excellence.

### Assessment of Teaching / Instruction

The evaluation of teaching will focus on three primary dimensions: performance in teaching classes (whether in person or online), mentoring students outside the classroom, and pedagogical activities.

The School will assess quality of teaching in classes holistically by relying on at least one of the following three potential sources of information: student evaluations, peer evaluations (if available), and brief teaching statements submitted by faculty. Student evaluations of teaching are known to have certain biases and therefore should not be used in isolation to evaluate teaching performance.[[2]](#endnote-1) Peer evaluations of teaching are a useful source of feedback that can provide information about teaching performance. Self-evaluations provide a third form of feedback that enables the assessment committee to form a well-rounded impression about teaching performance. To facilitate this third component, faculty may provide a brief, bullet- pointed statement (not to exceed one page) that summarizes experiences, accomplishments, challenges, and goals with regard to teaching performance during the assessment period.

A second dimension of teaching performance is mentoring students via dissertations, theses, publications, including students in funded and unfunded research projects, independent studies, and other types of teaching that occur outside the classroom. The School encourages active involvement on dissertation and thesis committees, joint research projects that provide students with research opportunities, publishing with students, and mentoring students in other ways. This information can be summarized in the faculty member’s teaching statement or listed on their CV.

A third dimension of teaching performance includes pedagogical or teaching-related publications, authoring or editing textbooks or other books that are primarily intended for use in teaching (as opposed to books that make a substantive research contribution), creating new courses, new course preparations, refreshing courses, participating in student workshops, and other activities that support the School’s teaching mission. This information can also be summarized in the faculty member’s teaching statement or listed on their CV.

### Assessment of Service

Service activities are a vital part of a faculty member’s responsibilities. Faculty members are expected to perform service activities that benefit the institution (the school, college, and university), the profession, and the community. All faculty members must provide evidence helpful for evaluating their service activities. Expectations regarding service will necessarily be lower for non-tenured faculty.

Institutional service includes (but is not limited to):

Participating on school, college, and university committees.

Holding administrative or leadership positions within the school or college, where not otherwise accounted for in administrative workload.

Engaging in other activities that benefit the governance or administration of the school, college, or university.

Professional service includes (but is not limited to):

Organizing or participating in the organization or execution of professional meetings or conferences (academic conference presentations count under research, not professional service).

Founding, holding office in, or otherwise serving the needs of professional associations.

Providing pro bono advising, technical assistance, or other services to agencies or professional associations including presentations and trainings.

Editing and refereeing manuscripts or proposals for journals, publishers, or grant-making organizations.

Community service includes (but is not limited to):

Providing public lectures or pro bono consultation for community groups.

Providing interviews for media outlets, including television, radio, newspapers, and other media genres such as op-eds and blog posts.

## Appeals

Appeals of the performance evaluation are submitted to the director for discussion. If a faculty member is not satisfied with the recommendation of the Director, the evaluation may be appealed to the Dean or their designee.

Faculty members may appeal a performance evaluation according to the following procedure:

1. Within 30 days of receipt of their annual review, a faculty member must prepare a formal letter of appeal to the Dean, including a statement of the reason(s) for requesting the review and provide all necessary documentation and data. The Dean will consider these materials and reach a decision.
2. If a faculty member is not satisfied with the decision of the Dean, they shall file a formal letter of appeal to the Provost within 30 days of receipt of the Dean’s decision. The Dean or their designee shall provide information on the appeals process.
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