I. 1

II. 2

III. 3

A. 3
B. 3
C. 4
1. Eligibility for Voting 4
2. Quorum 4
3. Procedure 5

IV. 6

A. 6
1. Appointment 6
2. Charge 6
3. Evaluation 7
B. 7
1. Appointment 7
2. Charge 8
3. Evaluation 8
C. 8
1. Appointment 8
2. Charge 8
3. Evaluation 9
D. 9
1. Appointment 9
2. Charge 9
3. Evaluation 10
E. ,
10
1. Appointment 10
2. Charge 10
3. Evaluation 10
F. 11
1. Appointment 11
2. Charge 11
3. Evaluation 11
G. 11

3. 10

3. Charge6J 0 Tc 0 Tw [( )-2973.7 ( )-2983 ( )-2983 ( )-2983 ( )-2983 ( )-2983 ( )-2983 ( )]TJ -0.006 Tw 26.08

V. 13

A. 13
B. 13
1. Purpose 13
2. Appointment 14
3. Meeting Schedule 14
C. 14
1. Selection 14
2. Responsibilities 15
D. 16
1. Selection 16
2. Responsibilities 16
E. 17
1. Selection 17
2. Responsibilities 17
F. 18
1. Selection 18
2. Responsibilities 18
G. 19
1. Selection 19
2. Responsibilities 19
H 20
1. Selection 20
2. Purpose 20
I. 21
1. Selection 21
2. Responsibilities 21
J. 21
1. Selection 21
2. Responsibilities 21

VI. 22

A. 24
B. 24
C. 25
1. Research 25
2. Teaching 28
3. Service 30

VII. 32

A. 34
B. 35
1. Criteria Areas 35
2. Scholarship 36
3. Teaching 37
4. Service 37
C. 38

D. 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. 51

IX. 51 5IX

1. . 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

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.

---

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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).

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

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.

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.

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.

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 eu8a2 Tw 1.826 0 Tdv

te122 Tc

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 xTf 9.9bve Commi tttkis o -4.3 (ea)10.Td [6

Committequiq(i)2.6 s5.9 (ed f)-6.6 (o)10.5 (r)11 ( )10.7 (t)A5.9 (ed a

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,

c. Regional Chancellors will provide a formal review in promotion and tenure cases for

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

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.

a.

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 it's 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) 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 culty Dut i,413.5 (t)-6.6sy Dut in t and

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., te

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-N . . 9 9 ( ) - B

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.

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

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.

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.

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 in both teaching and research and at least a 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.

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.

. 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.

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 workshops

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 of 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.).

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,

APPROVED: Dec. 5, 2014

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.

A. _____

	Tenure/Associate	Full
Articles (or equivalent)/year	2	2
Continuous record of scholarship	¥	¥
Clear program(s) of research	¥	¥
High impact publications	¥	¥
Sole/lead/senior authorships	¥	¥
Conference Participation	¥	¥
External manuscript referee	¥	¥
Editorial Board Me (on)]TJ ET Q q /C2_0 1 24 Tm		

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

Associate) or established (promotion to Full).

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.

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.

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.

A strategic priority for the University of South Florida is to retain its national prominence as a "Community Engaged" institution. As such, faculty at o

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.

A. _____

	Tenure/Associate	Full
Required/graduate courses Taught	x	¥
Student Evaluations of Teaching	¥	¥
Peer Evaluation of Teaching	¥	x
Graduate Student Committee Memberships		
Directing/co-directing M.A. Thesis	x	¥
Directing/co-directing Ph.D. Diss.	x	¥
Successfully direct student research	¥	¥
Publications with Students	x	¥
Presentations with Students	x	¥

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.

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.

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.

Candidates for promotion in rank to Full Professor are encouraged to be actively involved in the direction of undergraduate Honors thesis research.

A highly desirable indicator of the impact of one's teaching are any honorific awards, citations, or distinctions garnered from lay or professional audiences.

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.

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.

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.

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.

4 0 0 1 1033.3 (is Tc 0.039 Tw -12.9137 Td d)185(ar)-4.3-2 17 eiln511(l)2.9 1t.6g pr.6g pr

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,

1 0 0 1 84 84 cm /MC0 BDC /TT8 1 Tf -0.01 Tc 0.039 Tw (Lesson) Tj

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

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.

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.

Department Committee Membership	¥	¥
Department Committee, Chair	x	¥
College/University Committee Member	x	¥
External Manuscript Referee	¥	¥
Conference Program Service	x	¥
. Editorial Board Membership/Editor	X	¥
. Community-engaged service	¥	¥

B. _____

Community-engaged service
Officer and Other Service to Professional Organizations
Service to Government Agency
Service to Grant Agency
Administrative Position, Academic
Service to Student Organizations
Media Contributions
Participation in Graduation Ceremonies
College/University Committee Chair
Departmental Written Reports
Graduate Director
Associate Chair
Guest Editor
Talks given to community or professional groups
Other Evidence of Service

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.

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.

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.

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 though their activities as an ad hoc peer reviewer of manuscripts/monographs submitted for publication in scholarly journals/presses.

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.

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

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.

Candidates for promotion in rank who have helped with various student organizations are encouraged to document this activity.

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.

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.

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.

Authorship on reports to the university or college administration provides an important contr060.9 (t)-6.6 (an)10.6 (t)4.2 >>BDC / -0.002 Tc 02u0.002 .

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 who shall be responsible for writing the evaluation of the majority opinion of the DS-IPC committee, entering the vote of the

c. -

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

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

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 [illegible] 8-6 (as)2 (our)-.5 ( )05.9 (s)-2 (es)-.5 (ar)-.6 (r)4.9-e, warn tlot wery

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.

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.

(pending approval of the Undergraduathe

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

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 addresses 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.