

## **DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND LEGAL STUDIES Annual Faculty Evaluation**

**Annual evaluation of Department Faculty requires a review of both qualitative and quantitative data and information. The multi-disciplinary interests and methodologies represented by the academic disciplines comprising the Department preclude the delineation of specific, precise, or detailed criteria or performance standards. Therefore, performance standards must be flexible and general, and the annual evaluation of faculty will be a matter of individual assessment by the Chair in terms of the general guidelines contained in the Department Standards for Annual Evaluation and specific circumstances pertaining to each person.**

**All faculty are encouraged to actively engage in the Annual Assignment process as outlined in the 2004-2007 BOT-UFF Collective Bargaining Agreement (“BOT-UFF Agreement”) which occurs at the beginning of the calendar year. It is at the time of annual assignment that specific questions concerning expectations for performance should be raised with the Chair. The assignment of specific activities and their value included within the basic categories of performance (teaching, research, service) should be established at the time of the annual assignment. Issues pertaining to those matters, such as the value which will be accorded a proposed research effort or scholarly activity should be negotiated and resolved at that time.**

**The basis of the Annual Evaluation will be information obtained through the Faculty Annual Report, Student Evaluation forms, Annual Work Plans and Assignment forms, and other information outlined in the BOT-UFF Agreement obtained by the Department Chair. All evaluations will be done by the Department Chair.**

### **Performance Categories**

**The performance categories for annual evaluation are outstanding, above satisfactory, satisfactory, conditional, and unsatisfactory. Elaboration of the performance categories is contained in the Department Standards for Annual Evaluation. The particulars of that document should be read in conjunction with the Criteria for Tenure and Promotion for faculty seeking tenure and/or promotion.**

**Annual evaluation of performance must consider the annual assignment of duties.**

## **A. TEACHING**

**Evaluation of teaching will be based on student evaluations, the nature of the course being taught, the portion of FTE assigned to teaching, and other information pertinent to the question of the quality of instruction. Faculty are encouraged to submit any information they consider important to this determination. Activities in this category include classroom instruction; online instruction; direction of independent studies, student research projects, theses, and dissertations; academic advising; involvement and participation in workshops, seminars, and other forums which have curricular interests, teaching, or the learning process as their principal theme or focus; and program or course development. Faculty should consult the Department Standards for Annual Evaluation for guidance on performance levels for various teaching activities.**

**Good teaching (at least “Satisfactory”) is expected of all faculty. Deficiencies or weaknesses in teaching will be noted with a “Conditional” or “Unsatisfactory” rating.**

**The quality of performance in teaching, and all that it includes, is important in the determination of the overall rating of each faculty member.**

## **B. RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES**

**A principal responsibility of tenure earning and tenured faculty is active engagement in research and scholarly activities. Evaluation of research and scholarly activity should take into account the quality of the work, the portion of FTE assigned to research activities, work in progress, and other factors which may contribute to the performance assessment in this category. Research and scholarly activity includes published manuscripts and the acquisition of research grants and contracts. Manuscripts listed for review at time of annual evaluation should represent research and scholarly activity not previously reported for annual review.**

**In research, faculty must provide evidence of research ability. Normally, although not exclusively, the primary evidence will consist of articles published in indexed, refereed journals; law review articles; monographs; books; and other literary forums within the appropriate discipline. Both quality and quantity are required, and the variation in the acceptance rates of journals and reviews may be considered. Faculty must provide evidence of research or scholarly activity in a specific area sufficient to reflect the establishment of his/her expertise in that selected area. Faculty should consult the Department Standards for Annual Evaluation for guidance on performance levels for various scholarly activities.**

**Scholarly activity at the “Satisfactory” level is expected of all tenured and tenure-track faculty. Deficiencies or weaknesses in scholarly activity will be noted with a “Conditional” or “Unsatisfactory” rating.**

#### **C. SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**All faculty are expected to participate in service activities, particularly those in the Department. Additional service activities are at the discretion of the faculty member. Evidence of the quality of performance of these latter activities is the responsibility of the faculty member. Faculty should consult the Department Criteria Standards for Annual Evaluation for guidance on performance levels for various service activities.**

**Service activity at the “Satisfactory” level is expected of all faculty. Deficiencies or weaknesses in service activity will be noted with a with a “Conditional” or “Unsatisfactory” rating.**

#### **D. OTHER UNIVERSITY DUTIES**

**In some instances, other duties may be a significant part of evaluating a faculty member’s performance. The faculty member, in consultation with the Chair, will determine alternate weights and include them on the faculty member’s assignment form for all categories at the beginning of each calendar year. Evaluation of this category will be based on information provided to by the Chair or by the appropriate**

supervisor, if applicable, of the assigned duty and on supplemental data provided to the Chair by each individual.

#### **E. OVERALL RATING**

The overall rating of a Department faculty member will be determined by the Department Chair in a written annual evaluation in accordance with the BOT-UFF Agreement. Normally, performance in the research and teaching categories will be weighted more heavily to determine an overall assessment than performance in the service category. Unassigned activities compensated by sources other than the University (**except academic books or textbooks for which the author may receive royalties**) generally will not be included in the merit evaluation.

Not all individual circumstances pertaining to performance throughout the year can be anticipated in advance. Faculty members whose annual assignments vary from the norm or who require unique interpretation of performance standards are urged to negotiate an acceptable arrangement with the Department Chair as soon as it is apparent that such stipulations are necessary or desirable.

#### **G. GRIEVANCE PROCESS**

Open communication and informal resolutions of evaluation disputes are encouraged under the 2004-2007 BOT-UFF Agreement. For further information on grievances, faculty should consult the terms of the 2004-2007 BOT-UFF Agreement.