

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

**DEPARTMENTAL REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE, AND PROMOTIONS POLICY:
PRINCIPLES FOR EXEMPLARY SERVICE AS A TEACHER-SCHOLAR**

California State University, Long Beach ("CSULB") aspires to be a national exemplar in public higher education. Towards this end, CSULB takes pride in its faculty of teacher-scholars. The Department of Criminal Justice is committed to fostering the development of teacher-scholars so that they may, in turn, provide an instructional program of high quality that is responsive to the needs of its students, the community, and the justice professions. Accordingly, this document sets forth expectations for faculty in the Department of Criminal Justice within the teacher-scholar model, focusing on excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. In doing so, it is intended to: (1) guide new faculty in their quest for reappointment, tenure, and promotion within the framework of being a true teacher-scholar; (2) guide development of tenured faculty as teacher-scholars; (3) guide the Departmental Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Committee ("RTP") in evaluating candidates for mini-reviews, reappointment, tenure, promotion, and periodic post-tenure review; and (4) help create an environment that supports faculty working to achieve the missions of the Department, the College of Health and Human Services ("CHHS"), and the University. These evaluative policies and procedures are intended to take into consideration the diversity of expertise within a department that is interdisciplinary and, when possible, transdisciplinary, thereby enabling the department to grow in strength and stature.

To provide candidates with a single, comprehensive document that sets forth the RTP requirements of the university, the CHHS, and our own academic unit, the Department of Criminal Justice has elected to integrate its disciplinary standards within the framework of the RTP policies of both the university and the college. Thus, language used in the RTP policies of the university and the college that are critical for clarity and emphasis have been inserted throughout this document. All University and CHHS RTP Policy insertions in this document are presented in italics to distinguish clearly between the language of the university and college policies, on one hand, and the language that is unique to the Department of Criminal Justice. Portions of the university and/or college RTP policies that have not been included in this document are referenced by the section number used in the original university and/or college policies.

1.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1.1 Mission and Vision

California State University, Long Beach is a diverse, student-centered, globally-engaged public university committed to providing highly valued undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching; research, scholarly and creative activities (RSCA); and service for the people of California and the world. CSULB envisions changing lives by expanding educational opportunities, championing creativity, and preparing leaders for a changing world. In service to the university's mission, the CHHS seeks to be nationally and internationally recognized as an innovator and leader

46 *in community connections, the discovery of knowledge, and for educating diverse*
47 *students in the health and human services professions.*

48
49 The Department of Criminal Justice evaluates, researches, and serves the justice
50 professions through the interdisciplinary and comparative study of crime and criminal
51 behavior, as well as the policies and systems designed to control criminality. The
52 Department promotes life-long learning among students who develop into justice
53 professionals prepared to lead ethically public and private efforts that make communities
54 safer and that promote the equitable application of the law across all boundaries, both
55 perceived and real. The Department's curricular offerings provide both a substantive and
56 practical knowledge base that links multidisciplinary social-scientific theories and
57 methods with effective and responsible public policy and the ethical practice of the
58 justice professions within a free, multicultural, constitutional democracy.

60 **1.2 Guiding Principles of Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP)**

61
62 **1.2.1** *A faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarship, creativity, and service is*
63 *essential to accomplishing the mission and vision of the university, the CHHS, and*
64 *the Department of Criminal Justice. Faculty members integrate the results of their*
65 *RSCA into their teaching, thereby invigorating and enhancing student learning.*
66 *Faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions to the*
67 *Department of Criminal Justice, the CHHS, the university, the community, and the*
68 *profession.*

69
70 **1.2.2** *Decisions regarding RTP are among the most important made by our university*
71 *community. RTP decisions must be clear, fair, and unbiased at all levels of review.*
72 *Faculty achievements may differ from those of colleagues yet still meet the*
73 *standards for reappointment, tenure, or promotion. The RTP process must ensure*
74 *that excellence will be rewarded and that faculty members who meet academic unit,*
75 *college, and university standards and expectations will have an opportunity for*
76 *advancement.*

77
78 **1.2.3** *Faculty members shall be evaluated on the quality of their achievements and the*
79 *impact of their contributions over the period of review in: 1) instruction and*
80 *instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; 3) service and engagement at the*
81 *university, in the community, and in the profession. All faculty members will be*
82 *evaluated on the basis of all three areas.*

83
84 **1.2.4** *This policy should not be construed as preventing innovation or adjustment in*
85 *workload (with respect to teaching, RSCA, or service) based upon faculty expertise*
86 *and accomplishment; academic unit and college needs; and university mission.*

87

88 **1.2.5** *All faculty members are expected to demonstrate positive qualities that reflect*
89 *favorably on the individual, the Department of Criminal Justice, the college, and*
90 *the university. These qualities include high standards of professional, collegial, and*
91 *ethical behavior.*

92
93 **1.2.6** The process of evaluating faculty members is holistic. All faculty members in the
94 Department of Criminal Justice are expected to be familiar with the provisions of
95 this policy and comport their professional development in accordance with its letter
96 and spirit. While the provisions of this policy set forth in great detail the
97 Department's RTP requirements, candidates are encouraged to consult the
98 appendices for a shorter, user-friendly guide to assembling the materials they must
99 submit for mini-reviews. It should be noted, however, that the appendices appears
100 only for the sake of convenience. Nothing in the appendices shall be construed at
101 superseding the contents or requirements of the body of this RTP Policy.

102 **1.3 Governing Documents**

103 **1.3.1 Adoption**

104
105 The Department adopts this document pursuant to the mandates of the Section 3.5
106 of both the university RTP Policy (Policy Statement 09-10) and the CHHS RTP
107 Policy, and in accordance with the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement
108 (CBA). *If any provision of this document conflicts with any provision within the*
109 *CBA, the university RTP policy, or the CHHS RTP policy, the conflicting provision*
110 *shall be severed from the rest of this document, deemed void, and thereby rendered*
111 *inoperable.*

112 **1.3.2 Specific Role of this Departmental Policy**

113
114 This departmental-level document serves to interpret, synthesize, and apply the
115 policies and procedures set forth in these other RTP policies specified in Section
116 1.3.1 in a manner that provides concrete guidance to faculty in the Department of
117 Criminal Justice within the Department's discipline-specific framework. As such, it
118 is intended to be the primary document upon which faculty members in the
119 Department of Criminal Justice rely both as candidates and in their role assigning
120 candidates' files.

121 **1.4 Obligations**

122
123 *All participants in the RTP process are expected to comply with the policies set forth in*
124 *the university, college, and department RTP policies.*

125 **1.4.1 Obligation of the Candidate to Start Process**

126
127 *In order to be considered for any RTP personnel action, candidates must submit an*
128 *RTP file.*

131 **1.4.2 Completeness of Candidate's File**

132 Candidates must furnish all necessary and relevant documentation for evaluation
133 (e.g., for teaching, student evaluations, course syllabi, peer evaluations, and grade
134 distributions; for RSCA, copies of manuscripts under review and/or presented at
135 conferences; preprints or reprints of articles; letters accepting manuscripts for
136 publication; etc.; for service, letters documenting the candidate's service which
137 assess the quality of the service contributions).

138
139 **1.4.3 Obligations of the Department RTP Committee**

140 The reputation, success, and future credibility of the Department of Criminal Justice
141 are directly related to the quality of the candidates and the diligence with which
142 Department RTP Committee discharges its responsibilities in evaluating the
143 evidence to support its recommendations.

144
145 **1.5 Standards**

146 *Recommendations from the RTP committees of academic units and the chairs or directors*
147 *of academic units (if submitted) shall evaluate evidence of a candidate's strengths and*
148 *weaknesses associated with each of the established standards, not just merely restate or*
149 *summarize the candidate's narrative. Evaluation(s) shall include an analysis of the*
150 *candidate's role, performance, and achievement within the academic unit. Evaluation(s)*
151 *of a candidate's record must be guided by the principle that the higher the academic*
152 *rank, the greater the expectation for demonstrated excellence in teaching, scholarship,*
153 *and service. Evaluation must also be guided by the following expectations that apply to*
154 *all Department faculty members at all ranks:*

155
156 **1.5.1 Staying Current**

157 Faculty members must keep abreast of scholarly and applied discourse in the
158 relevant sub-fields of criminal justice, criminology, and justice-related studies
159 applicable to the faculty member's areas of teaching and research interest(s) through
160 appropriate means.

161
162 **1.5.2 Involvement in the Profession**

163 Faculty members are expected to attend and participate in the annual meetings of
164 professional organizations such as the American Society of Criminology, the
165 Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the American Sociological Association, the
166 American Psychological Association, the American Political Science Association,
167 the Society for the Study of Law and Society; the American Academy of Forensic
168 Science; the American Bar Association; and other similar national and regional
169 organizations (such as the Western Society of Criminology and the Association for
170 Criminal Justice Research of California).

171
172 **1.5.3 Scholarly Research and Publishing**

173 Faculty members must actively pursue a research and publishing agenda relevant to
174 one or more of the following types of scholarship, all of which are equally valued
175 regardless of reliance on quantitative, qualitative, or other discipline-appropriate
176 methodologies (such as legal analysis or policy analysis):

- 177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
- A. Scholarship of Discovery – the traditional research model in which new content knowledge is acquired and disseminated;
 - B. Scholarship of Integration – the creation of new knowledge by synthesizing and making connections across disciplines or sub-disciplines;
 - C. Scholarship of Application – the bridging of the gap between theory and practice through both research and action in ways that promote positive social change and/or promote policy-oriented problem solving; and
 - D. Scholarship of Pedagogy – the discovery of the ways our students learn and the identification and assessment of methods used to foster learning.

1.5.4 High-Quality Instruction

191 Faculty members must involve students in active learning through excellence not
192 only in their "in-classroom" teaching, but also in their mentoring of students in the
193 following ways:

- 194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
- A. by their own examples of service to the Department of Criminal Justice Department; the College of Health and Human Services; the university; professional organizations; and in the community at large;
 - B. through collaborative research that engages students in the processes of critical inquiry and discovery;
 - C. through engaging students in service learning projects;
 - D. through unique disciplinary interactions with students through directed readings and independent research projects;
 - E. through the ongoing process of socializing students into a culture of intellectual discovery and professional communication via both group and one-on-one interactions in classes, at conferences, in co-curricular activities (especially through Alpha Phi Sigma, the Criminal Justice Students' Association, the Pre-Law Society, the Moot Court and/or mock trial teams, etc.), and through advising/mentoring; and
 - F. through assigning meaningful work in the discipline, and by interacting with students both in and out of class in a manner that fosters the development of broadly-applicable intellectual habits necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship.

219 **1.5.5 Meaningful, Collegial Service**

220 Faculty members are expected to serve the Department of Criminal Justice, the
221 CHHS, the university, the community, and the profession as a meaningfully
222 contributing citizen.

- 223
- 224 A. CSULB depends on faculty contributions to ensure that it achieves its
225 educational mission through effective and efficient operations. The university's
226 commitment to participatory governance and the needs of academic programs
227 and units necessitate a spirit of collegial service and citizenship. Thus, all
228 faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice are required to
229 participate collegially, constructively, and respectfully in the process of faculty
230 governance, discipline-appropriate community service activities, and in
231 professional organizations.
- 232
- 233 B. Faculty service contributions are expected to increase concomitantly with the
234 institution's commitment to the individual. This means that faculty members are
235 expected to accept more significant service responsibilities over time during the
236 probationary period, and then even more at each higher rank.
- 237

238 **1.6 Profiles of Academic Ranks**

239 The Department of Criminal Justice is comprised of a community of teacher-scholars and
240 learners who are dedicated to free inquiry and open exchange. In accordance with the
241 CSULB Mission, the Department's faculty is dedicated "to providing highly-valued
242 undergraduate and graduate educational opportunities through superior teaching,
243 research, creative activity and service for the people of California and the world."
244 *Sections 5.0-5.5.2 of both the university and college RTP policies profile the standards*
245 *applicable to each academic rank.* The Department's expectations for achieving
246 CSULB's mission and the standards contained in Sections 1.5.0 through 1.5.5 vary by
247 rank. The specific criteria applicable to each academic rank are integrated throughout
248 Section 2.0 of this Policy and its subsections.

249

250 **1.7 Candidate's Narrative**

251 *In order to present their achievements in the most coherent intellectual and professional*
252 *context, candidates are required to present a written narrative describing their work in*
253 *each of the categories to be evaluated. The narrative is intended to serve as a guide to*
254 *reviewers in understanding the faculty member's professional achievements. As*
255 *explained in sections 3.1 of this policy (which mirrors the language used in the RTP*
256 *Policy of the CHHS), the narrative should range from between 8 and 25 double-spaced,*
257 *single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch margins.*

258

259 **2.0 RTP AREAS OF EVALUATION**

260

261 As Section 2.0 the university and CHHS RTP policies both make clear, *academic units are*
262 *responsible for defining the standards of excellence and accompanying criteria for*
263 *reappointment, tenure, and promotion in their various disciplines, consistent with the mission*
264 *and needs of the university, the college, and the particular academic unit.* The subsections of

265 Section 2.0 in this Policy were crafted in fulfillment of that obligation. Accordingly, the
266 provisions in Section 2.0 and its subsections articulate the standards for faculty accomplishments
267 and the criteria for evaluation of those accomplishments in three areas of evaluation: 1)
268 instruction and instructionally-related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) collegial service and
269 engagement.
270

271 **2.1 Instruction and Instructionally-Related Activities**

272 While all of expectations set forth above in Sections 1.5.0 through 1.55 are heavily
273 valued, Criminal Justice faculty members are expected, above all, to serve the missions of
274 the department, college, and university through high-quality teaching that successfully
275 integrates both discipline-specific and broad learning goals and objectives. The goal of
276 higher education is to help develop educated, ethical, and productive citizens, as well as
277 capable criminal justice professionals in a variety of disciplines and fields. In a rapidly
278 changing world, a university education must provide students with more than the
279 knowledge needed for success in a specific profession. It also must provide them with
280 skills and attitudes that facilitate adaptation and constructive response to societal needs
281 and changes. Accordingly, faculty at all ranks should aspire to be teachers of the first
282 order.
283

284 **2.1.1 Instructional Philosophy and Practice**

285 *Effective teaching requires that faculty members reflect on their teaching practices*
286 *and assess their impact on student learning. Thoughtful, deliberate efforts to*
287 *improve instructional effectiveness that may result in adopting new teaching*
288 *methodologies are expected of all faculty members. Effective teaching also*
289 *requires that faculty members engage in professional development activities*
290 *associated with classroom and non-classroom assignments. Teaching methods*
291 *shall be consistent with course/curriculum goals and shall accommodate student*
292 *differences.*
293

294 To help evaluate candidate's instructional philosophy and practice/teaching
295 effectiveness, candidates for mini-review, reappointment, tenure, and promotion
296 must submit four types of indicators of teaching effectiveness: student evaluations,
297 peer evaluations, course syllabi, and grade distributions. All of these materials shall
298 be evaluated by the Department RTP Committee for evidence of teaching
299 effectiveness using the criteria specified in this Policy. Additionally, candidates
300 may (but are not required to) submit any additional documentation that evidences
301 high-quality teaching and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher.
302

303 A. Indicia of High-Quality Teaching – Although “high quality teaching” is to be
304 assesses holistically, hallmarks of excellence in instructional philosophy and
305 practice include, but are not limited to:

- 307 1) subject mastery, currency, and ongoing growth in one's discipline;
- 308
- 309 2) timeliness and professionalism in meeting classes and evaluating student
310 work;

- 311
312 3) rigor and transparency in evaluating student work;
313
314 4) enthusiasm that arouses student interest, curiosity, motivation, and
315 participation;
316
317 5) purposeful experimentation with one's pedagogy in ways that foster
318 engaging educational environments that are characterized by academic
319 freedom, creative expressions, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and
320 community engagement;
321
322 6) the creation and/or revision of courses and curricula in ways that foster a
323 vibrant, intellectual community that is built around a shared commitment
324 to scholarly inquiry;
325
326 7) thoughtful mentorship and advising that contribute to students' cultural,
327 social, and intellectual lives; and
328
329 8) incorporation of one's scholarship into teaching, when appropriate,
330 including the effective supervision of student research and the
331 incorporation of students into one's own scholarly research, when
332 appropriate.
333

334 **B. Indicia of Ongoing Professional Development as a Teacher**

- 335
336 1) Keeping abreast of discipline developments through participation in
337 discipline-specific conferences and continuing education activities.
338
339 2) Actively participating in the Department's curricular assessment efforts.
340
341 3) Creating and/or assessing graduate students' comprehensive examination
342 questions.
343
344 4) Mentoring graduate students through active participation on committees
345 that supervise graduate student theses and research.
346
347 5) Actively engaging in the activities summarized in Section 2.1.2 (below) in
348 a manner which evidences continuous efforts to improve student learning
349 outcomes through the constant evolution of one's teaching.
350

351 **2.1.2 Student Learning Outcomes**

352 Effective teaching requires that faculty members provide evidence of student
353 learning *that should be addressed in a candidate's narrative and documented by*
354 *supporting materials, include, but are not limited to:*
355

- 356 A. *Instructional practices and course materials that clearly convey to students—in*
357 *measurable, behavioral terms—expected student learning outcomes.*
358
- 359 B. *Syllabi and course materials that clearly communicate course requirements*
360 *(including the semester schedule; assignments; and grading practices,*
361 *standards, and criteria), as well as the purposes for which a course may be*
362 *meaningful to students (e.g., preparation for further courses, graduate school,*
363 *or employment; the intrinsic interest of the material; development of civic*
364 *responsibilities and/or individual personal growth). For more information on*
365 *syllabi, see Section 2.1.5 in this Policy and CSULB Policy # 04-05 and/or its*
366 *successor policies.*
367
- 368 C. Careful preparation and clear organization of lessons and pedagogical materials
369 that enhance student learning, especially by meaningful incorporation of
370 feedback from previous evaluations of one's teaching by students and peers.
371
- 372 D. Thoughtful, deliberate effort to produce continuous improvement in teaching
373 effectiveness is expected of all candidates, including but not limited to:
374
- 375 1) Regular and ongoing interactions with colleagues regarding pedagogy,
376 such as discussions of pedagogical issues, classroom visits, and
377 consultation on course development; or
378
- 379 2) A sustained record of involvement in programs of the CSULB Faculty
380 Center for Faculty Development; or
381
- 382 3) A sustained record of participation in teaching development seminars or
383 conferences sponsored by the Department, College, University or
384 professional organizations; or
385
- 386 4) A sustained record of giving or receiving formal or informal pedagogical
387 coaching and/or other activities which contribute to professional
388 development of teaching effectiveness.
389

390 **2.1.3 Student Response to Instruction**

391 Student course evaluations shall be used to evaluate student response to instruction.
392

- 393 A. Required Documentation – In order to allow for complete consideration of
394 student evaluations, candidates must submit all copies of student evaluations—
395 both quantitative and qualitative—in accordance with the following
396 requirements:
397
- 398 1) Although candidates for mini-review and/or initial reappointment are
399 strongly encouraged to submit all student evaluations from all sections of
400 all courses they have taught, they are required to submit copies of all

401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433

student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses¹ taught each semester.²

- 2) In the years following initial reappointment, candidates for mini-review, any subsequent reappointment, tenure, or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are encouraged to submit of all student evaluations from all sections of all substantive courses taught; however, they are required to submit copies of all student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses¹ taught each semester.²
- 3) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are encouraged to submit copies of all student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught in the five (5) years since their last promotion review; however, candidates are required to submit copies of all student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses¹ taught each semester² during the five-year period prior to the submission of the application.³

B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – *Ratings by students must reflect a positive student perception of the instructor's conveyance of knowledge, effort, availability, organization, and attention to individual needs.*

- 1) *While, on rare occasions, student evaluations might fall below the usual standards of the Department and/or the CHHS for reasons that should be explained in the candidate's narrative (e.g., when teaching a new course for the first time, especially if offered at the graduate-level; when teaching under-enrolled courses which could easily result in skewed evaluations), overall, student ratings of instruction are expected to be consistently favorable when compared to academic unit and college averages.*
- 2) Student ratings of instruction are “consistently favorable” when both of following criteria are met:

¹ Because supervision-based classes (e.g., internships, directed research projects, independent studies, theses, etc.) are not evaluated, no student ratings need be submitted for any such courses.

² Under unusual circumstances (such as when teaching a new graduate-level course in which low enrollment could easily result in skewed evaluations or taking medical or maternity leave which results in many weeks of the instructor's absence from classes), a faculty may request that a particular course (or set of courses) not be evaluated. If this request is granted either by the Department Chair or by a majority vote of the Departmental RTP Committee, then, understandably, a faculty member may not have the requisite number of course evaluations to submit from a particular semester.

³ The number of years of documentation may be adjusted when teaching has been interrupted due to sabbatical leaves, fellowship leaves, extraordinary service, or in cases where service-credit for prior years of experience serves to accelerate the time-clock for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

- 434 a) the mean for students' responses to questions on standardized
435 teaching evaluation forms are no lower than one standard deviation
436 below the departmental mean; and
437
438 b) student evaluations submitted by candidates provide evidence of the
439 following trends:
440
441 (1) For reappointment, student evaluations of teaching must
442 evidence either continued improvement in teaching or a
443 sustained level of high-quality teaching.
444
445 (2) For tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor,
446 student evaluations of teaching submitted by candidates must
447 evidence of a sustained level of high-quality teaching.
448
449 (3) For promotion to the rank of Professor, student evaluations
450 submitted by candidates must evidence that the candidate has
451 reached a consistent level of teaching excellence.
452

453 C. Caveat on the Use of Student Ratings – *Student course evaluations alone do not*
454 *provide sufficient evidence of teaching effectiveness. Utilization of the university*
455 *standard evaluation form is only one method of presenting student response to*
456 *learning and teaching effectiveness. Importantly, any single item on this form—*
457 *or the entire form, by itself and in isolation from other information—does not*
458 *provide sufficient evidence of effective instructional philosophy and practices.*
459 *For this reason, candidates must present other information, such as their*
460 *syllabi, grade distributions, and peer evaluations of instruction. These*
461 *additional materials serve to help the Department RTP Committee contextualize*
462 *student ratings.*
463

464 **2.1.4 Peer-Evaluations of Teaching**

465

- 466 A. Required Documentation –Candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion
467 must submit *at least* three (3) peer evaluations conducted within the three years
468 prior to the application. Ideally, a candidate will ask for peer evaluations for
469 each course topic they teach and such evaluations will be conducted by different
470 tenured colleagues (unless there is a lack of sufficient tenured personnel to
471 achieve this goal). Moreover, to show growth in response to feedback from
472 peers, candidates are encouraged to seek a second peer evaluation from the
473 same tenured colleague in a subsequent semester.
474
475 B. Evaluation by RTP Committee – Peer evaluations must be based on
476 observations of teaching in which pedagogical approaches and methods are
477 described and evaluated for quality. Peer evaluations must document whether:
478 instructional methods are appropriate to the course(s) being taught; content is
479 up-to-date and appropriate to the topic; and overall effectiveness of ways in

480 which information is communicated to students in the classroom. To the
481 maximum extent possible, peer evaluators should endeavor to learn as much as
482 possible in order to be able to comment from an informed perspective about as
483 many of the indicia of excellence in teaching listed in Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2
484 of this Policy. Peer evaluators should also inspect and comment upon the
485 clarity, rigor, and currency of syllabi, assignments, and other course materials.
486 To assist tenured colleagues in conducting these types of evaluations, peer
487 evaluators must use the form contained in Appendix A.
488

489 **2.1.5 Syllabi**

490 At minimum, all course syllabi comply with the requirements of CSULB's official
491 syllabi policy (see Policy # 04-05 and/or its successors). Pursuant to that policy, all
492 syllabi must set forth course meetings times and location; the instructor's office
493 location, office hours, and contact information; required books and other resources;
494 an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy; an explanation of how the
495 instructor will apply the University's course withdrawal policy; a summary of
496 course requirements that form the basis of the faculty member's assessment of
497 student performance; a statement on academic integrity; and a course outline or
498 schedule. Excellent syllabi, however, also contain other types of information, such
499 as:

- 500
- 501 A. the measurable learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to
- 502 the major;
- 503
- 504 B. clearly articulated grading practices, standards, and criteria;
- 505
- 506 C. instructional methods that are appropriate to the courses taught; and
- 507
- 508 D. readings and assignments that are up-to-date, appropriate to the topic, and
- 509 enhance student learning. In keeping with the mission of the Department of
- 510 Criminal Justice, assigned readings from primary sources that enhance the
- 511 interdisciplinarity and/or comparative nature of a course are particularly valued.
- 512

513 The absence of the content specified above in any course syllabus constitutes
514 evidence that the course and, therefore, the instructor, may fail to meet the
515 standards of excellence this Policy is designed to facilitate.
516

517 **2.1.6 Grade Distributions**

518 Although there is no such thing as an "ideal" grade distribution, grade distributions
519 can help to contextualize a candidate's student evaluations and assist in the
520 evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The RTP Committee should evaluate a
521 candidate's grade distributions within the context of how the candidate himself or
522 herself commented upon them. For example, while a bell-shaped curve might be
523 expected in larger undergraduate classes, the use of mastery-learning techniques
524 might justifying a grading distribution of all "A"s and "B"s in small, upper-level or

graduate seminars. Thus, grade distributions must be understood within the context of a professor's teaching philosophy, pedagogies, and practices.

2.1.7 Additional Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness

Candidates are encouraged (but are not required) to submit any additional documentation that evidences high-quality teaching as set forth above in Section 2.1.1(A) and/or ongoing professional development as a teacher as set forth in Section 2.1.1(B). If submitted by the candidate, the RTP Committee shall review such documentation and incorporate their assessment of it as part of their review of the candidate's teaching effectiveness.

2.2 Research, Scholarly, and Creative Activities

Research and scholarly/creative activities (RSCA) represent efforts and evidence whereby the candidates establish professional status and contribute to the profession. RSCA are considered critical and beneficial components of the professorial role for several reasons. First, advances in the discipline are dependent on generating new information. Expanding one's knowledge has the potential for improving the quality education by keeping students abreast of current research findings specific to the discipline. Second, RSCA bring prestige and visibility to the University and the Department. The most respected and successful universities support and encourage the acquisition of knowledge. This increases not only the likelihood that the Department will attract high quality students and faculty, but also the likelihood of obtaining grants, equipment, and other financial support from the community, industry, and government agencies. Third, RSCA enhance teaching effectiveness and enrich the education of students. Fourth, RSCA, especially when funded, bring equipment, technology, and professional development opportunities to the Department and its students. This, in turn, increases the likelihood that students will be well-trained and competitive when seeking employment. Fifth, professional survival requires that members generate a large portion of the knowledge upon which their profession is based. Scholarly activities enable professions to shape their own destiny, rather than allowing others to dominate the course of events. For these reasons, *faculty members are expected to make significant and ongoing contributions of substance in RSCA throughout their careers.* Accordingly, faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice must be engaged in an ongoing program of scholarly research which demonstrates intellectual and professional growth in the discipline over time and that contributes to the advancement, application, or pedagogy of the disciplines of criminology, criminal justice, and/or related fields.

2.2.1 Variability within Criminology and Criminal Justice

- A. Variability in the Nature of Relevant RSCA – Criminology and criminal justice are interdisciplinary fields. Scholarship includes basic, applied, and pedagogical research, as well as outreach initiatives. Qualified faculty members may be trained in the social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, political science, and anthropology), the humanities (e.g., history and philosophy), the natural sciences (e.g., chemistry, biology, physics, engineering, computer science, neuroscience), the professions (e.g., law, medicine, accountancy,

571 nursing, education), and/or in interdisciplinary programs (e.g., criminology,
572 criminal justice, justice studies, law and society). These varied disciplines use a
573 diverse array of research methodologies that are all equally valued. Thus, any
574 application of standards needs to respect individual differences in scholarly
575 programs and goals.
576

- 577 B. Variations Due to Intense Service Roles – There may be some years when the
578 level of scholarly activity is reduced due to a significant increase in teaching or
579 service, such as serving as the department chair, associate chair, graduate
580 advisor, undergraduate advisor, or in a position of leadership with college-wide
581 and/or university-wide significance. In such cases the reduction in scholarship
582 should not be counted against the candidate, but there should be evidence that
583 the candidate's scholarly activity has been maintained to some degree and has
584 promise for full resumption when the other activities return to normal levels.
585

586 **2.2.2 Standards for the Production of Scholarly Research and Creative Activities**

587

- 588 A. Standards – The following provide the foundation for delineating our discipline-
589 specific standards for teacher-scholar excellence and, therefore, shall be used
590 for evaluating candidates' RSCA:
591

- 592 1) high-quality work as judged by one's peers;
- 593
- 594 2) scope of recognition at the national, regional, or local level;
- 595
- 596 3) sustained effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment; and
- 597
- 598 4) the impact of one's research and scholarly activities.
599

- 600 B. Types of RSCA – All faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice
601 are *required to engage in a sustained program of quantitative, qualitative,*
602 *theoretical, and/or other discipline-appropriate scholarly research (such as*
603 *policy analysis or legal analysis), as well as other scholarly and creative*
604 *activities consistent with the provisions of this Policy.* Copies of all such
605 scholarly work must be submitted so that the Department RTP Committee may
606 review the quality of the research.
607

- 608 1) Required Types of RSCA
609
- 610 a) Publication of scholarly research in peer-reviewed journals is
611 required of all candidates at all levels of review. Specific
612 publication requirements are set forth below in subsections C(2),
613 D(1), and D(2).
614

- 615 (1) *“Research” involves scientific, clinical, social scientific, or*
616 *other discipline-appropriate investigative methods (such as*
617 *policy analysis or legal analysis) that rely on or are derived*
618 *from data that were obtained by means of observation or*
619 *experiment. This type of data-based research is the most*
620 *highly valued type of scholarly activity for the purposes of*
621 *reappointment, tenure, and promotion in the Department of*
622 *Criminal Justice.*
- 623
- 624 (2) Under appropriate circumstances, such as publication of
625 articles or original (i.e., non-edited) books that meaningfully
626 advance criminological theory, theoretically-based scholarly
627 writing may also constitute “research,” depending on the
628 candidate’s area of expertise, even if it does not include the
629 quantitative or qualitative examination of empirical data.
630 Articles published in journals like *Theoretical Criminology*, for
631 example, would clearly satisfy the departmental requirement
632 for scholarly research. Under no circumstances, however, shall
633 this provision be interpreted as allowing literature reviews,
634 book reviews, scholarly article reviews, or encyclopedia entries
635 to satisfy the departmental requirement for “scholarly
636 research.”
- 637
- 638 b) All RTP candidates are expected to present their research at relevant
639 academic conferences (see subsection 2.2.2 D(6), below).
640 Conference proceedings and presentations, however, strengthen a
641 candidate’s scholarly portfolio for reappointment, tenure, and
642 promotion to any rank. Conference proceedings and presentations
643 do not, however, substitute for the requirement that candidates
644 publish scholarly research in peer reviewed journals as set forth in
645 specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
646
- 647 2) Enhancing Types of RSCA
- 648
- 649 a) *Although other forms of scholarly and creative activity (e.g.,*
650 *literature reviews, book reviews, article reviews, encyclopedia*
651 *entries, op-ed pieces, etc.) are valued (and therefore are detailed*
652 *below in subsection D) these types of scholarly and creative*
653 *activities alone are insufficient to meet the department or CHHS*
654 *RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and*
655 *promotion decisions in the absence of other research conducted by*
656 *the candidate. In other words, these other forms of scholarly activity*
657 *strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do*
658 *not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly*
659 *journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and*
660 *D(2).*

661 b) *Candidates may strengthen their required program of RSCA with*
662 *editorial or reviewer assignments in recognized professional*
663 *publications, including journals, newsletters, or electronic media;*
664 *appointments to review panels for grants, fellowships, contracts,*
665 *awards; assignments as a referee; creation of software and/or*
666 *electronic documents, especially if these receive favorable notice or*
667 *reviews from professional peers. These forms of scholarly activity*
668 *strengthen and enhance the candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do*
669 *not supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly*
670 *journals as specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and*
671 *D(2).*

672
673 c) Candidates may also strengthen their required program of RSCA by
674 writing or editing books. Books strengthen and enhance the
675 candidate’s RSCA portfolio, but they do not supplant the need for
676 peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified in
677 subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
678

679 C. Evolution of RSCA – Although scholarly activities take many forms, faculty
680 members must develop a scholarly research agenda and a record of scholarly
681 publication that flows from the pursuit of that research agenda.
682

683 1) Scholarly Research Agenda – Teacher-scholars in the Department of
684 Criminal Justice are expected to establish and maintain an ongoing
685 program of scholarship that is marked by continued scholarly research
686 activity and dissemination. Teacher-scholars may concentrate on one type
687 of research specified in Section 1.5.3, or may distribute their scholarship
688 across the different types. Rates of dissemination may vary with specific
689 scholarly goals.

690
691 An important element of all RTP reviews is the teacher-scholar's future
692 plans and goals. While the primary focus is clearly on accomplished
693 contributions during the probationary years, it is important to respect and
694 support the continued vibrancy of scholarly activity after the award of
695 tenure and promotion. While the focus of scholarly activity can be
696 expected to change with the seasons of an academic career, continuity,
697 reflection, and growth are expected to persist. We recognize that
698 sometimes staying involved and remaining vibrant means taking risks to
699 change focus, adopt a new methodological approach, or develop a new
700 application. As a community of vibrant teacher-scholars, we are
701 committed to recognizing, valuing, and supporting each others' unique
702 paths of professional growth. Toward these ends:

703
704 a) In the first two years of appointment, probationary faculty members
705 are expected to formulate and pursue a scholarly research agenda.
706

- 707 b) Reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate
708 Professor require evidence that the candidate's scholarly research has
709 been productive as evidenced by publications in suitable, scholarly
710 venues (see subsection 2 below). Moreover, candidates for
711 reappointment, tenure, and promotion should be able to demonstrate
712 how their research agenda is both continuing and evolving.
713
- 714 c) Promotion to the rank of Professor requires a sustained pattern of
715 achievement since attaining the rank of Associate Professor, with
716 evidence indicating the maturation of the scholarly record.
717
- 718 2) Scholarly Publications – The quality of work is defined by its significance
719 in one's field of inquiry and necessarily requires such peer review to
720 validate the work's significance. Normally, this means that the finished
721 works will be published and/or presented in a respected venue consistent
722 with accepted disciplinary standards (discussed in more detail below in
723 subsection D of Section 2.2.2). This level of accomplishment is required
724 and is the most important evidence for reappointment, tenure and/or
725 promotion within the RSCA area.
726
- 727 a) RTP Committee members doing mini-reviews must be mindful of the
728 fact in the early probationary years, faculty are likely to just be starting
729 to advance a research agenda. Thus, in the first year, new faculty
730 might be more likely to publish book reviews, encyclopedia entries,
731 invited essays, monographs, grant proposals, etc., than to be publishing
732 article in peer-reviewed journals. New faculty, however, are expected
733 to be working on writing and submitting manuscripts to refereed
734 journals for editorial consideration in their first two years. New
735 faculty members are especially encouraged to try transforming their
736 dissertations into at least one or two peer-reviewed journal articles.
737 Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the
738 expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as
739 constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
740
- 741 b) By the time a candidate applies for initial reappointment, it is expected
742 that the candidate will have at least two peer-reviewed journal articles
743 either in-print or formally accepted for publication; three or more peer-
744 reviewed journal articles are preferred. Quality, however, is more
745 important than quantity. Exceeding these baseline expectations by
746 publishing more than three pieces of quality scholarship shall be
747 evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
748

- 749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
- c) After initial reappointment, in the latter half of the probationary period (typically years four through six), faculty should be publishing in refereed journals of recognized quality and stature. Candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor should have published at least five scholarly articles in refereed venues (an average of roughly one publication per year). Quality, however, is more important than quantity. Thus, for example, a dozen publications of questionable significance (e.g., publications in lower-tier journals that do not advance the knowledge base in the field in a meaningful manner) are unlikely to be sufficient to support a favorable tenure and/or promotion decision. Conversely, publishing three or four articles in high-quality peer-reviewed journals that advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful way may warrant granting tenure and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
 - d) Candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor are expected to have maintained their scholarly activity consistently, and to have demonstrated the ability to bring significant projects to fruition by having published them in high-quality, peer-reviewed journals. Associate Professors seeking promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to have produced, on average, at least one scholarly publication in a refereed journal each year since the last promotion. As with promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, however, quality is more important than quantity. Thus, multiple publications that do not advance disciplinary knowledge in a meaningful manner are not likely to result in a favorable recommendation for promotion. Conversely, three or four publications in high-quality journals, or a book or two with a well-respected scholarly press or leading commercial publishing house may warrant granting promotion to the rank of Professor. Exceeding these baseline expectations by publishing more than the expected quantity of quality scholarship shall be evaluated as constituting strong evidence of scholarly achievement.
- 3) Significance of Scholarly Engagement of Students and/or Community – In keeping with the mission of the university and the CHHS, the Department of Criminal Justice values research that involves students in a scholarly manner and/or research that is connected to our role in serving the communities in which we work and live. Scholarly activities that achieve these ends shall be considered enhancing evidence of excellence in scholarly achievement.
- 4) Sponsored Research – *Securing external funds to support scholarly research is an important and highly valued contribution to the scholarly process. External funding benefits the University, the College, academic*

795 *units, faculty members, and students. Accordingly, faculty members are*
796 *encouraged to apply for external funds that support research and*
797 *scholarly activity (e.g., grants, fellowships, contracts, awards, stipends).*
798 *However, neither application for nor receipt of sponsored research funds*
799 *shall be viewed as a prerequisite for reappointment, tenure, or promotion*
800 *to any rank. Securing such sponsored research opportunities, though,*
801 *shall constitute a significantly enhancing criterion that is given extremely*
802 *positive weight during the evaluation of an applicant's scholarly activities.*
803

804 a) The award of sponsored research funding is highly competitive.
805 Preparing applications is a time-consuming process that can detract
806 from the applicant's ability to otherwise be pursuing scholarly
807 activities that do not require funding. Thus, during the entirety of the
808 probationary period, merely applying for sponsored research
809 opportunities is to be commended and supported. Candidates should
810 not be penalized if their proposals are not funded, but rather should be
811 encouraged to continue developing their grant-writing skills. However,
812 applying for sponsored research opportunities does not supplant the
813 need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as specified
814 in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
815

816 b) During the time that faculty members are conducting grant-related
817 scholarly activities, allowances should be made in the expectations for
818 publishing scholarly journal articles. Such allowances must
819 recognizing that managing large-scale grant work is time-consuming
820 and, therefore, publication of the results of such research may be
821 delayed until after an extensive data-collection and analysis process.
822

823 **D. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of Specific Forms of RSCA**

824 The following tangible indicators of disciplinary scholarship quality can be used
825 to guide choices of scholarship dissemination outlets. The most important of
826 these criteria are contained in subsections (1) and (2), as such publications are a
827 requirement for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as stated above in
828 subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a) and C(2); all other forms for RSCA listed below
829 strengthen and enhance the candidate's RSCA portfolio, but they do not
830 supplant the need for peer-reviewed publications in scholarly journals as
831 specified in subsections 2.2.2 B(1)(a), C(2), D(1), and D(2).
832

833 1) Authorship – Sole-authored and first-authored works, as well as works
834 published with student collaborators, are evaluated most positively. For
835 multiple-authored works, the amount or nature of author contributions
836 should be specified. Absent unusual circumstances (such as using a
837 unique methodology or participating in long-term grant research with
838 other scholars, etc.), all RTP candidates who contribute to multiple-
839 authored works are expected to balance such collaborative research
840 projects with research and publication of their own, independent research.

- 841 2) Refereed Journal Articles – The following criteria should guide the RTP
842 Committee’s assessment of articles: peer-review; acceptance/rejection
843 rates for the journal; professional sponsorship or other affiliation status of
844 the journal; status of the journal within the subfield; status of the members
845 of the journal editorial board within the subfield; inclusion of journal
846 abstracts in relevant disciplinary abstracting services; and/or citations to
847 the article.
848
- 849 a) Venues – Refereed articles that are accepted and published in criminal
850 justice/criminology journals, journals from related social sciences
851 and/or cognate disciplines, justice-related professional journals and
852 newsletters, law reviews, and relevant electronic media are all valued
853 as scholarly contributions for the purposes of reappointment, tenure,
854 and promotion. The degree of value, however, depends on the quality
855 of the journal, the quality of the research published, the degree of the
856 candidate’s contribution to the publication, and the impact of the
857 publication on the discipline must always be taken into account when
858 assessing the significance of any publication.
859
- 860 b) Exceptional Scholarship
861
- 862 (1) Top-Tier Journals – Publishing exceptionally high-quality
863 scholarship in top-tier journal constitutes the strongest evidence
864 of scholarly achievement that contributes to the meaningful
865 advancement of the discipline. RTP Committee members,
866 therefore, usually give significant, positive weight to such
867 publications in their evaluation of a candidate’s RSCA
868 contributions for reappointment, tenure, and promotions decision
869 purposes. Although the rankings of any particular journal may
870 vary from year to year, those journals referenced in Appendix C
871 are generally considered to be “top tier.”⁴
872
- 873 (2) High-Quality Journals –The fields of criminology and criminal
874 justice recognize a number of journals for their generally
875 consistent, high quality contributions to our interdisciplinary
876 knowledge base even though they are not generally recognized as
877 “top tier” journals. Examples of such “high quality” journals are
878 contained in Appendix D. Although RTP Committee members
879 must still evaluate the quality of any publication, an article
880 published in one of these high-quality journals usually
881 constitutes evidence of scholarly achievement that contributes to
882 the meaningful advancement of the discipline.⁵
883

⁴ The Department shall periodically revise the listing of journals contained in Appendices C and D to maintain currency and accuracy.

- 884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
- 3) Books – The academic standing of the publisher; published reviews; evidence of readership (e.g. size of the press run, sales, course adoptions); and citation frequency.
 - (a) Both scholarly books and textbooks are valued for RTP purposes.
 - (b) Although edited books are valued for RTP purposes, books written (or co-written) by the candidate are to be given significantly more weight than edited books.
 - 4) Sponsored Research – The application for and securing of external funds to support scholarly research.
 - 5) Invited Publications and/or Presentations – The stature of the editor of the special issue or book; the stature of other contributors to the publication; the academic standing of the publisher; the scope of the professional organization extending the invitation (i.e., international, national, regional, or local); and the number of invited colloquia given at the college/university level.
 - 6) Conference Presentations (e.g., symposia, paper presentations, roundtables, poster sessions) – A peer review process used for the conference; and the scope of the professional organization sponsoring the conference (i.e. international, national, regional, or local). Presentations at the international conferences of the American Society of Criminology, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the Society for the Study of Law and Society, and similar nationally-recognized organizations are paramount. Nothing in this section shall be construed to mean that conference presentations of any type constitute sufficient RSCA to warrant reappointment, tenure, or promotion. Rather, conference presentations represent a form of scholarly activity that enhances, but does not supplant, the requirement that candidate’s produce peer-reviewed publications in discipline-appropriate venues.
 - 7) Editorial Roles – Activities in the capacity of editor-in-chief, associate editor, contributing editor, or assistant editor; guest editor for a special issue of a journal; membership on an editorial board; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer on journal submissions; membership on a grant-review panel; invitations to serve as an ad hoc reviewer for grant applications. Such roles augment faculty members’ required program of RSCA, but are insufficient to meet the Department RSCA standards required for favorable reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions in the absence of other data-based research conducted by the candidate.
 - 8) Professional Consulting Activities – The number and scope of technical reports; and the frequency and range of clients for consulting activities.

- 930 9) Internal Support of Scholarly Activities – The number and scope of
 931 activities supported by SCACs, sabbaticals, and other forms of support for
 932 scholarly research funded by CSULB.
 933
- 934 10) Professional Honors, Awards, and Other Forms of Recognition – Election
 935 as an officer of a professional organization, including consideration of the
 936 scope of the organization (i.e., international, national, regional, or local);
 937 recognition through fellowship status in a professional organization,
 938 including consideration of the scope of the organization; awards, prizes,
 939 and other forms of recognition, including consideration of the scope of the
 940 organization presenting the award.
 941

942 E. Criteria for the Assessment/Evaluation of the Impact of RSCA
 943

- 944 1) Disciplinary Impact (e.g., advancing basic and/or applied knowledge) –
 945 Disciplinary impact includes the importance of information (theory,
 946 empirical data, methodological innovation, application) for disciplinary
 947 progress and typically includes dissemination in peer-reviewed
 948 disciplinary journals. Across successive articles, distinct and progressive
 949 contributions are valued (in contrast to multiple dissemination of similar
 950 work).
 951
- 952 2) Impact on Students – CSULB emphasizes that scholarly work should
 953 positively impact students. The Department of Criminal Justice evaluates
 954 impact accordingly in terms of the significance of scholarly work for
 955 students' development as junior scholars and professionals (e.g., modeling
 956 and mentoring in undergraduate research or field work; co-authoring
 957 scholarly presentations and publications; first-person discussions of the
 958 research process and research findings in courses). Publications and
 959 presentations that include student co-authors are highly valued.
 960
- 961 3) Community Impact – We recognize impact in various types of community
 962 (applied professional, public, organizational, policy), as well as at
 963 different levels of community effort (local, state, national, and
 964 international communities).
 965

966 The impact of scholarship on students and the community is more difficult to
 967 demonstrate tangibly than the impact on the discipline. Nevertheless these are
 968 highly-valued areas of impact. There are no clearly-established criteria for
 969 scholarly contributions in these areas. Documentation of this type of impact is
 970 thus particularly important. Indicators may include student co-authorship on
 971 presentations/publications, undergraduate research mentee pursuit of graduate
 972 training, scholarship used to provide community testimony on use of technical
 973 reports or consultation to address issues of public policy, expert review or letters
 974 about the quality and impact of applied work, and external evaluation of
 975 engaged scholarship.

976 F. Weighting of the Body of Work – The applicant's entire body of scholarly work
977 provides evidence for the pattern of continuing scholarship in support of mini-
978 reviews, reappointment, tenure, and promotion, but works finished since
979 appointment at CSULB carry greater weight for mini-reviews, reappointment,
980 and tenure, while works finished since the last promotion carry greater weight
981 for any subsequent promotion.
982

983 2.3 Service

984 *Quality service contributions and activities are necessary to ensure and enhance the*
985 *quality of programs and activities at the university, in the community, and in the*
986 *profession.*
987

988 2.3.1 Range and Depth of Service Commitments

989 *All faculty members are required to participate collegially, constructively, and*
990 *respectfully in the process of faculty governance through service to their academic*
991 *units, the college, and the university. The expectations regarding the depth of*
992 *service involvement depend upon faculty rank and experience. Candidates for*
993 *reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor are*
994 *required to have made quality service contributions either in the community or to*
995 *the profession as described in this subsection. Candidates for promotion to the rank*
996 *of Professor shall have provided significant service and leadership either in the*
997 *community or to the profession as described in this subsection.*
998

999 A. Service within the University

- 1000
- 1001 1) *During the first three years of probationary appointment, faculty members*
1002 *are not required to participate in university or college service; however,*
1003 *they are expected to perform quality service within the Department of*
1004 *Criminal Justice as demonstrated by:*
1005
- 1006 (a) advising student organizations, clubs, and/or honor societies;
1007
 - 1008 (b) participating actively and meaningfully in departmental committees,
1009 (especially by chairing a department committee such as the Awards,
1010 Scholarship, and Banquet Committee or the Assessment Committee);
1011
 - 1012 (c) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the
1013 department;
1014
 - 1015 (d) attending and meaningfully participating in departmental faculty
1016 meetings;
1017
 - 1018 (e) attending and meaningfully participating in professional development
1019 opportunities sponsored by the department, the college, the university,
1020 and professional organizations; and
1021

- 1022 (f) actively participating in student programs.
1023
1024 2) *For tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, faculty*
1025 *members are required to make quality service contributions to both the*
1026 *Department of Criminal Justice (as discussed above) and to service*
1027 *contributions to the effective operation and growth of the CHHS, such as*
1028 *serving on college-wide committees and/or authoring documents, reports,*
1029 *and other materials pertinent to the college. University-level service is*
1030 *desirable, but not required.*
1031
1032 3) *For promotion to the rank of full Professor, faculty members are required to*
1033 *demonstrate a sustained pattern of consistent service and leadership at the*
1034 *department, college, and university levels. In doing so, they must contribute*
1035 *significantly to the effective operation and growth of the institution,*
1036 *including, but not limited to:*
1037
1038 (a) chairing the department,⁵ serving as the Graduate Advisor,
1039 Undergraduate Advisor, or Associate Chair; directing the
1040 Department's certificate or distance-learning degree programs, etc.;
1041
1042 (b) chairing major departmental committees;
1043
1044 (c) holding elected or appointed office in or chairing college-wide and/or
1045 university-wide committees, organizations, or task forces;
1046
1047 (d) authoring documents, reports, and other materials pertinent to the
1048 university, college, or department;
1049
1050 (e) creating or significantly revising entire department/program curricula.
1051
1052 B. Service to the Community and/or the Profession – *All faculty members are*
1053 *expected to provide quality service and leadership in the community and/or to*
1054 *the profession.*
1055
1056 1) Community Service – *If a faculty member engages in service to the*
1057 *community, this service must directly involve the academic expertise of the*
1058 *faculty member such that he or she applies academic skills and experience to*
1059 *the solution of local, regional, national, or international problems.*
1060
1061 (a) For reappointment, tenure, and promotion to the rank of Associate
1062 Professor, such community service may include:
1063

⁵ This provision shall not be construed as inviting or authorizing a review of the candidate's performance as department chair. Rather, RTP committee members must be mindful of the fact that the duties and responsibilities of a department chair may impact a candidate's ability to engage in a full range of instructionally-related activities and/or RSCA.

- 1064 (1) *consulting with schools; health and human services agencies and*
1065 *organizations; local, state, federal, or foreign governments;*
1066 *and/or community organizations.*
1067
- 1068 (2) helping to organize or facilitate events for charities, civic
1069 organizations, cultural organizations, and/or agencies related to
1070 the candidate's professional expertise; and/or
1071
- 1072 (3) acting as a resource person (including performing evaluations)
1073 for educational organizations, government, business, or industry.
1074
- 1075 (b) For promotion to the rank of full Professor, such community service is
1076 expected to include a record of meaningful service in the community
1077 (applying academic skills and experience to the solution of campus,
1078 local, national, or international problems), such as:
1079
- 1080 (1) taking leadership roles in community-oriented programs or
1081 workshops;
1082
- 1083 (2) holding office in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations
1084 related to the candidate's professional expertise;
1085
- 1086 (3) consulting in a leadership role for educational organizations,
1087 government, business, industry, or community service
1088 organizations;
1089
- 1090 (4) serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, etc.; and/or
1091
- 1092 (5) engaging in activities such as giving speeches related to criminal
1093 justice; serving as a media consultant (by giving interviews or
1094 otherwise) for justice-related events or news stories; assisting
1095 civic or non-profit organizations with justice-related missions;
1096 writing justice-relevant editorials in newspapers, magazines, or
1097 newsletters; and/or by holding professional or civil office.
1098
- 1099 2) Professional Service – *Service to the profession may include leadership*
1100 *positions, workshops, speeches, media interviews, articles, and/or*
1101 *editorials; performances and/or displays; and/or elected offices in a*
1102 *criminal-justice related professional organization. Such professional service*
1103 *is most highly valued when it is performed for the American Society of*
1104 *Criminology, the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, the American*
1105 *Academy of Forensic Sciences, the Western Society of Criminology, and*
1106 *the criminal justice divisions of law societies and/or bar associations.*
1107

1108 **2.3.2 Quality of Service Commitments and Participation**

1109 *The quality of service contributions is fundamental to meeting the requirements*
1110 *specified above in section 2.3.1. Accordingly, the RTP Committee must not merely*
1111 *summarize the breadth and/or quantity of a candidate’s service contributions, but*
1112 *rather must evaluate the depth, quality, and significance of service activities. In*
1113 *doing so, the Committee should consider:*

- 1114
- 1115 A. *the nature of the service commitment in terms of the time, energy, and*
1116 *dedication it takes to participate meaningfully in the particular service*
1117 *activities;*
- 1118
- 1119 B. *the degree to which the activity contributes to the mission of the university, the*
1120 *college, and/or to the Department of Criminal Justice;*
- 1121
- 1122 C. *the significance of contributions to the organizational, academic, intellectual,*
1123 *and social life of the university, college, and/or department, including*
1124 *participation on committees and/or with student organizations;*
- 1125
- 1126 D. *the depth and quality of activities that enhance the University's ability to serve*
1127 *the needs of a diverse student body, especially multi-ethnic, non-traditional,*
1128 *and prospective students;*
- 1129
- 1130 E. *the depth and quality of activities that enhance the department’s ability to*
1131 *retain and graduate students, including mentorship and advising;*
- 1132
- 1133 F. *the depth and quality of activities that enhance the mission of the community*
1134 *and/or professional organization(s) to which the candidate volunteers his/her*
1135 *services; and*
- 1136
- 1137 G. *most importantly, the degree of leadership exhibited by the candidate. In*
1138 *evaluating this criterion, the RTP Committee must be mindful of the fact that*
1139 *leadership is not exclusively defined by one’s position in a hierarchical*
1140 *structure, but rather is something that can be demonstrated at all levels by*
1141 *influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the*
1142 *effectiveness and success of the group in which they serve. Effective leaders*
1143 *create results, attain goals, realize vision, and guide others by modeling more*
1144 *quickly and at a higher level of quality than do ineffective leaders.*
- 1145

1146 **2.3.3 Evaluation of Service**

1147 *The candidate must provide a documented narrative of his or her service*
1148 *contributions. It is incumbent on the candidate to describe the above evaluative*
1149 *criteria in his/her narrative.*

- 1150
- 1151 A. *Candidates shall summarize their contributions to committee and council*
1152 *work and to other processes of faculty governance.*
- 1153

1154 B. Candidates shall provide official correspondence from community
1155 organizations and/or professional societies or associations attesting to the
1156 candidates' participation and/or any leadership roles in such organizations.
1157

1158 **3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE RTP PROCESS**

1159
1160 *Participants in the RTP process include the candidate, the academic unit, Department of*
1161 *Criminal Justice RTP committee, the chair of the Department of Criminal Justice, the college*
1162 *RTP committee, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. In addition, there may be external*
1163 *reviewers participating in the RTP process. For details on conducting external evaluations, see*
1164 *the Academic Senate policy on external evaluations.*
1165

1166 *The Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) allows faculty, students, academic administrators,*
1167 *and the President to provide information concerning the candidate during the open period.*
1168

1169 *Deliberations on reappointment, tenure, and promotion shall be confidential. Access to materials*
1170 *and recommendations pertaining to the candidate shall be limited to the RTP candidate, the RTP*
1171 *committee of the academic unit, the chair or director of the academic unit, the college RTP*
1172 *committee, the Dean, the Provost, Associate Vice President for Faculty Affairs (as an*
1173 *appropriate administrator), and the President (see CBA). In addition, external reviewers, if any,*
1174 *shall have access to appropriate materials for evaluation.*
1175

1176 **3.1 Candidate**

1177 *A candidate for RTP shall make every effort to seek advice and guidance from the*
1178 *Department Chair, particularly regarding the RTP process and procedures and how*
1179 *criteria and standards are applied. The candidate has the primary responsibility for*
1180 *collecting and presenting the evidence of his or her accomplishments. The candidate's*
1181 *documentation must include all information and supporting materials specified in all*
1182 *applicable RTP policies. The candidate must clearly reference and explain all supporting*
1183 *materials.*
1184

1185 The candidate shall submit a narrative that describes his or her goals and
1186 accomplishments during the period of review, including a clear description of the quality
1187 and significance of contributions to the three areas of review: 1) instruction and
1188 instructionally related activities; 2) RSCA; and 3) service. The narrative should range
1189 from between 8 and 25 double-spaced, single-sided pages in 12-point font with one-inch
1190 margins. The candidate shall provide all required supplemental documentation, including
1191 summary sheets from student evaluations and an index of all supplementary materials.
1192 The candidate shall provide all prior RTP reviews and periodic evaluations over the full
1193 review period, including candidate's responses or rebuttals, if any.
1194

1195 **3.2 The Department RTP Policy**

1196 The content of this RTP policy, belonging to the Department of Criminal Justice,
1197 specifies in-writing the standards and criteria to be applied in evaluating teaching
1198 performance, RSCA, and service. As administered by the Department, the standards are
1199 equal to or in excess of both university and CHHS standards. These standards are derived
1200 from and support the mission of the university, the college, and the department. *This*
1201 *RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and probationary*
1202 *faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice and to approval by the college*
1203 *Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost. Additionally, this Policy shall be subject to*
1204 *regular review by the Department’s tenured and probationary faculty.*
1205

1206 **3.3 The Department RTP Committee**

1207 The Department of Criminal Justice RTP Committee *has the primary responsibility for*
1208 *evaluating the candidate’s work and makes the initial recommendation to the college*
1209 *RTP committee regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Academic unit RTP*
1210 *committee members are responsible for critically analyzing the candidate’s performance*
1211 *by applying the criteria of the academic unit. The committee shall forward its evaluation*
1212 *and recommendation with supporting materials to the college RTP committee.*
1213

1214 **3.3.1 Election of Committee**

1215 The RTP Committee of the Department of Criminal Justice is composed of at least
1216 three (3) tenured members elected by majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track
1217 faculty members of the department.
1218

1219 A. Election –Membership on the RTP Committee reflects, at a minimum, all
1220 requirements specified in the university and college RTP policies. To wit:
1221

1222 1) *The Committee must be comprised of at least three (3) tenured, full-time*
1223 *faculty members. Committees reviewing applications for reappointment,*
1224 *tenure, and/or promotion to the rank of Associate Professor may be*
1225 *comprised of tenured Associate and full Professors. Committees reviewing*
1226 *applications for promotion to the rank of Professor must be comprised of*
1227 *tenured full Professors.*
1228

1229 2) *Persons on difference-in-pay leave or sabbatical for any part of the*
1230 *academic year may serve on the RTP Committee.*
1231

1232 3) *Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) may*
1233 *serve on the RTP Committee if requested by the majority vote of tenured and*
1234 *probationary faculty members of the academic units and approved by the*
1235 *President. However, the RTP Committee may not be made up solely of*
1236 *faculty participating in the FERP.*
1237

1238 4) *The Department Chair may serve as a member of the RTP Committee, if*
1239 *elected, subject to the provisions of section 3.3.2(B).*
1240

1241 B. Single vs. Multiple Committees – Subject to the exception provided in
1242 subsection 3.3.6 governing joint appointments, all recommendations for
1243 advancement (promotion) to a given rank, for tenure, or for reappointment shall
1244 be considered by the same committee. However, there may be different
1245 committees for different kinds of RTP matters. For example, one committee
1246 comprised of three faculty members at the rank of Associate Professor might
1247 consider all candidates within the Department who are eligible for
1248 reappointment, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor. A second
1249 committee comprised of three faculty members with the rank of Professor might
1250 consider only candidates eligible for promotion to the rank of Professor.
1251

1252 **3.3.2 Committee Composition**

1253 The following provisions shall govern the composition of the Department RTP
1254 Committee.
1255

1256 A. Membership Rank – *Members of the Department of Criminal Justice RTP*
1257 *Committee who participate in promotion recommendations must be tenured and*
1258 *must have a higher rank than the candidate(s) being considered. They must not*
1259 *themselves be candidates for promotion.*
1260

1261 B. Department Chair – The Chair of the Department of Criminal Justice generally
1262 does not serve as a member of the Department RTP Committee so that he or she
1263 may write an independent evaluation of the candidate pursuant to the provisions
1264 of Section 3.4.2 of this document. However, in the event that there are an
1265 insufficient number of faculty member qualified to serve on the Department
1266 RTP Committee (or other unusual circumstances that so warrant), the
1267 Department Chair may serve as a member of the Department RTP Committee, if
1268 elected. If elected to such service, though, the Chair *may not make a separate*
1269 *recommendation pursuant to Section 3.4 of this policy. Moreover, to avoid*
1270 *conflicts of interest, the Department Chair may not sit with the Department RTP*
1271 *Committee during the time that the Committee is considering his or her own*
1272 *materials for reappointment, tenure, or promotion.*
1273

1274 C. Vacancies – In the event that one or more vacancies occur in unexpired terms of
1275 the Department RTP Committee, either a meeting of the department faculty
1276 shall be called for the purpose of securing nominations, or nominations shall by
1277 solicited via a nominating ballot executed by the Chair of the Department of
1278 Criminal Justice. If there are unexpired terms of differing lengths, the
1279 nominee(s) who receive(s) the most votes shall serve the longest term(s).
1280

1281 D. Chair of the Department RTP Committee – The Department of Criminal Justice
1282 RTP Committee shall elect a chair from among its own members.
1283

1284 **3.3.3 Responsibility and Accountability**

1285
1286 A. Candidates

- 1287
1288 1) *The initial responsibility to ensure compliance with RTP policies and*
1289 *deadlines rests with the candidate. Candidates are expected to furnish*
1290 *necessary and relevant evidence to support their applications, and to*
1291 *provide this information in accordance with established deadlines.*
1292
1293 2) *Candidates may request a meeting to review recommendations with both the*
1294 *academic unit RTP committee and the chair or director of their academic*
1295 *unit. Candidates have the contractual right to respond in writing to these*
1296 *recommendations.*

1297
1298 B. Department of Criminal Justice RTP Committee

- 1299
1300 1) Mini-Reviews – The Department RTP shall conduct an assessment of all
1301 probationary faculty members at least once per year during probationary
1302 years in which the candidate is not scheduled for a formal RTP review.
1303 While such mini-reviews do not result in any job actions (e.g.,
1304 reappointment, tenure, or promotion), they must be provide guidance for
1305 professional development. Thus, mini-reviews shall commend
1306 probationary faculty member for meeting or exceeding expectations for
1307 instruction and instructionally-related activities, RSCA, and service, while
1308 providing written guidance for making improvements in areas which need
1309 strengthening. See Appendix B for the streamlined procedures to be used
1310 for mini-reviews.
1311
1312 2) Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Reviews – RTP reviews shall be
1313 conducted by the Department of Criminal Justice RTP Committee on the
1314 schedule set by the University. The Department of Criminal Justice RTP
1315 Committee is accountable for its recommendations by (a) supplying the
1316 College RTP Committee with a substantive evaluation to support its
1317 recommendations; and (b) submitting candidates’ RTP portfolios and
1318 supporting documents on-time in accordance with established deadlines.
1319

1320 **3.3.4 Prohibition on Multiple Levels of RTP Review**

1321 *No one individual may participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more*
1322 *than one level of review.*
1323

1324 **3.3.5 Ad Hoc Committees**

1325 If fewer than the required number of members of the Department, as specified in
1326 this policy, are eligible to serve on the Department RTP Committee, *then additional*
1327 *members from outside the academic unit shall be selected in accordance with the*
1328 *following procedure:*

- 1329 A. *Nominees may be from any school or college within the university provided that*
1330 *they have some familiarity with the RTP candidate's discipline or area of*
1331 *expertise.*
- 1332
- 1333 B. *After prospective nominees have granted their permission to stand for election*
1334 *to an ad-hoc RTP Committee, the academic unit shall submit the names of all*
1335 *candidates for election to the unit's RTP committee and then conduct an*
1336 *election.*

1337 **3.3.6 Joint Appointments**

1339 *Joint appointments shall be evaluated by a committee composed of members of*
1340 *each academic unit served by the person being evaluated. The joint-appointment*
1341 *RTP committee shall be composed of members currently elected to each academic*
1342 *unit's RTP committee. This committee shall use the existing criteria of each*
1343 *academic unit to evaluate the individual holding joint appointment pursuant to item*
1344 *VI, Academic Senate Policy Statement 94-11 (or any successor policy).*

1345 **3.4 Department Chair/Director**

1347 *The Chair of the Department of Criminal Justice is responsible for communicating the*
1348 *department, college, and university policies to candidates. The Chair also provides*
1349 *ongoing guidance to candidates as to whether their performance is consistent with*
1350 *department expectations. The Chair, in collaboration with mentors from department*
1351 *and/or the college, is responsible for talking with candidates about their overall career*
1352 *development and providing professional mentoring.*

1353 **3.4.1 Meeting with Committee**

1354 *The Chair shall meet with the Department RTP Committee prior to the beginning of*
1355 *the department evaluation process to review the department, college, and university*
1356 *processes and procedures.*

1357 **3.4.2 Optional Independent Evaluation by the Chair**

1359 *The Department Chair may write independent evaluations of all RTP candidates*
1360 *unless the Chair is elected to the Department of Criminal Justice RTP Committee.*
1361 *In promotion considerations, however, the Department Chair must have a higher*
1362 *rank than the candidate being considered for promotion in order to contribute*
1363 *a review or participate on a review committee. In no case may the Department*
1364 *Chair participate in the evaluation of any single candidate in more than one level of*
1365 *review.*

1366 **3.4.3 Candidate's Rights**

1367 *At all levels of review, before recommendations are forwarded to a subsequent*
1368 *review level, candidates shall be given a copy of the recommendation. The*
1369 *candidate may submit a rebuttal statement or response in writing and/or request a*
1370 *meeting be held to discuss the recommendation within ten (10) days following*
1371 *receipt of the recommendation. A copy of the response or rebuttal statement shall*
1372 *be provided to the candidate.*

1374 accompany the candidate's file and also be sent to all previous levels of review.
1375 This section shall not require that evaluation timelines be extended.
1376

1377 **4.0 TIMELINES FOR THE RTP PROCESS** 1378

1379 *All tenured and probationary tenure-track faculty members undergo performance review and*
1380 *evaluation. Probationary faculty members are evaluated each year. During years when the*
1381 *candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, the candidate will*
1382 *undergo periodic review. Tenured faculty members are evaluated every five (5) years.*
1383

1384 *The following timelines apply to candidates who are appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor*
1385 *with no service credit; actual timelines may vary according to level of appointment and service*
1386 *credit.*
1387

1388 **4.1 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Reappointment** 1389

1390 **4.1.1 Periodic Review (“Mini-Review”)**

1391 *In the first year and second years of service, as well as in successive probationary*
1392 *years during which a candidate is not being reviewed for reappointment, tenure, or*
1393 *promotion, the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic review (“mini-*
1394 *review”). The periodic review is conducted by the academic unit RTP committee,*
1395 *the chair or director of the academic unit, and the college Dean. The periodic*
1396 *review provides guidance for professional development, especially with regard to*
1397 *the candidate's progress toward reappointment and, later, tenure. Thus, periodic*
1398 *reviews shall commend probationary faculty member for meeting or exceeding*
1399 *expectations in the relevant areas of review, while providing written guidance for*
1400 *making improvements in areas which need strengthening. See Appendix B for the*
1401 *streamlined procedures to be used for mini-reviews.*
1402

1403 **4.1.2 Reappointment Review**

1404 *In the third year of service, the annual evaluation takes the form of a reappointment*
1405 *review. Successful candidates are reappointed for one, two, or three years. If*
1406 *reappointed for three years, probationary faculty shall continue to be evaluated*
1407 *annually using the periodic review process. If, however, candidates are reappointed*
1408 *for a shorter period of time, then they are to be evaluated annually using the*
1409 *periodic review process until such time as they undergo another formal*
1410 *reappointment review.*
1411

1412 **4.2 Evaluation of Probationary Faculty for Tenure and Promotion**

1413 *In the first and second years of reappointment (or fourth and fifth years of continuous*
1414 *service), the annual evaluation takes the form of a periodic or reappointment review, as*
1415 *appropriate. In the third year of reappointment (or the sixth year of continuous service)*
1416 *the annual evaluation takes the form of a tenure review, which may also be a review for*
1417 *promotion. A probationary faculty member may request consideration for early tenure*
1418 *and promotion prior to the scheduled sixth year review. This process is discussed under*
1419 *Section 5.5 of the College of Health and Human Services RTP Policy.*

1420 **4.3 Evaluation of Tenured Faculty for Promotion**

1421 *An Associate Professor becomes eligible for promotion review to the rank of Professor in*
1422 *the fifth year at the rank of Associate Professor. A tenured Associate Professor, however,*
1423 *may opt to seek early promotion to the rank of Professor prior to the fifth year in rank in*
1424 *accordance with the provisions of Section 5.5 of the College of Health and Human*
1425 *Services RTP Policy.*

1426
1427 *A tenured faculty member may choose not to be evaluated for promotion in a given year;*
1428 *however, the faculty member will still be required to undergo the five-year periodic*
1429 *evaluation of tenured faculty as outlined in relevant Academic Senate policy documents.*

1430

1431 **5.0 APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONAL LEVEL CRITERIA**

1432

1433 Section 5 of the university and CHHS RTP policies outline the general standards for
1434 reappointment, tenure, and promotion. This RTP Policy elaborates on those policies by
1435 providing the specific criteria under which RTP candidates from the Department of Criminal
1436 Justice will be reviewed. Candidates are referred to the CHHS policy for specific information on
1437 early tenure and promotion.

1438

1439 **6.0 STEPS IN THE RTP PROCESS**

1440

1441 **6.1 Academic Affairs Sets Dates**

1442 *The Division of Academic Affairs determines the timelines for the RTP process, including*
1443 *deadlines for the submission of the candidate's materials, dates for the open period,*
1444 *completion of all RTP reviews by all review levels, and final decision notification to the*
1445 *candidate. The deadlines for notification of final actions shall be consistent with the*
1446 *requirements of the CSU-CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).*

1447

1448 **6.2 Academic Affairs Notifies Candidates of Eligibility**

1449 *The Division of Academic Affairs notifies all faculty members of their eligibility for*
1450 *review and specifies items required to be provided by all candidates.*

1451

1452 **6.3 Posting of Notice of Open Period**

1453 *Academic units shall post in their offices a list of candidates being considered for*
1454 *reappointment, tenure, or promotion, following timelines and guidelines for the open*
1455 *period provided by the Office of Academic Affairs and consistent with the requirements of*
1456 *the CBA. A copy of all information submitted shall be provided to the candidate. The*
1457 *chairperson of the academic unit RTP committee prepares an index of the materials*
1458 *submitted during the open period to be included in the candidate's file.*

1459

1460 **6.4 Preparation and Submission of RTP File**

1461 *Candidates prepare materials for review and deliver them to the academic unit RTP*
1462 *committee by the deadline.*

1463

1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504

6.5 Review by Department RTP Committee

The RTP Committee of the Department of Criminal Justice reviews the candidate’s materials and, using the standard university form, provides a written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.6 Review by Department Chair

The chair or director of the academic unit, if eligible and if not an elected member of the academic unit RTP committee, may review the candidate’s materials and may provide an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.7 Review College RTP Committee

The college RTP committee reviews the candidate’s materials and provides an independent written evaluation and recommendation to the next level of review by the deadline.

6.8 Review by Dean

The Dean reviews the candidate’s materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the Provost by the deadline.

6.9 Review by Provost

The Provost reviews the candidate’s materials and provides an independent written review and recommendation to the President. The President has the authority to make final decisions for the university with respect to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. The President (or Provost as designee) notifies the candidate of the final decision regarding reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion by the deadline.

7.0 ADDITIONAL PROCESSES

7.1 Withdrawal

Prior to the final decision, candidates for promotion may withdraw without prejudice from consideration at any level of review (see CBA). This provision also applies to candidates for early tenure.

7.2 Missing Documentation

If, at any time during the review process, the absence of required evaluation documents is discovered, the RTP package shall be returned to the level at which the requisite documentation should have been provided. Such materials shall be provided in a timely manner.

1505 **7.3 Rebuttal**
1506 At each level of review, the candidate shall be given a copy of the recommendation,
1507 which shall state in writing the reasons for the recommendation, before the
1508 recommendation is forwarded to the next review level. The candidate shall have the right
1509 to provide a rebuttal/response in writing no later than ten (10) calendar days following
1510 receipt of the recommendation. A copy of all of the candidate’s rebuttal/responses shall
1511 be forwarded to the next level of review, as well as to any previous review levels.
1512

1513 **7.4 External Review**
1514 The candidate or evaluators at each level of review may request an external evaluation,
1515 consistent with Academic Senate policy on external evaluations (see Policy 86-07 or its
1516 successor).
1517

1518 **8.0 APPROVAL OF AND CHANGES TO THIS RTP POLICY**
1519

1520 **8.1 Ratification**
1521 This RTP policy is subject to ratification by a majority of voting tenured and
1522 probationary faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice and to approval by
1523 the CHHS Faculty Council, the Dean, and the Provost.
1524

1525 **8.2 Amendments**
1526 Amendments to this Policy may be initiated by a petition signed by fifteen percent (15%)
1527 of the entire full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the Department of Criminal
1528 Justice. Upon receiving a petition so initiated, the Dean of the College (either directly or
1529 through the Department Chair as the Dean’s designee) shall communicate the proposed
1530 amendment(s) to the faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice at least two
1531 weeks (i.e., 14 calendar days) prior to voting.
1532

1533 **8.2.1 Voting on Amendments**
1534 *Voting on amendments shall be by ballot prior to the close of the preceding*
1535 *academic year of adoption, and shall comply with the policy as identified in the*
1536 *CSU/CFA Collective Bargaining Agreement.*
1537

1538 **8.2.2 Majority Needed to Adopt**
1539 *To become effective, all proposed amendments shall require a majority of the*
1540 *ballots cast by eligible voters and the approval of the CHHS Faculty Council, the*
1541 *CHHS Dean, and the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs.*
1542

1543 **8.2.3 Voting Rights**
1544 *All tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department of Criminal Justice*
1545 *– including those on leave, sabbatical, and FERP – are eligible to vote on RTP*
1546 *policy matters.*
1547
1548

APPENDIX A: PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM



**COLLEGE OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

**EVALUATION REPORT FROM
PEER-OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHING**

INSTRUCTOR'S NAME			
INSTRUCTOR'S RANK			
COURSE OBSERVED			
OBSERVATION DATE			
NUMBER OF STUDENTS PRESENT			
TIMEBASE	<input type="checkbox"/> PART-TIME	<input type="checkbox"/> FULL-TIME	Number of WTUs

A. Summary of Key Teaching Performance Indicators

The class session began with an overview of the lesson's objectives and then proceeded to meet those objectives through the delivery of instruction.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The lesson was well-organized.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The methods used to deliver the lesson during the observed class session were appropriate for meeting the learning objectives.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The instructor was well-prepared for class.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson
The instructor integrated content from sufficiently varied sources to add both breadth and depth to the lesson.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

Information communicated by the instructor was accurate and up-to-date (i.e., the instructor's subject mastery and currency were evident).				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor was effective in presenting subject content and materials in the class session.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor was enthusiastic and/or was able to arouse student interest, curiosity, motivation, and/or participation.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

The instructor fostered an effective educational environment that facilitated creative expression, critical thinking, intellectual inquiry, and/or student engagement.				
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable or insufficient opportunity to observe in the particular lesson

B. Course Syllabus Construction

1. Consistent with CSULB policy, the syllabus adequately sets forth:		
course meeting times and location	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
the instructor's office location and office hours	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
the instructor's contact information	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
required books and resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
an explanation of the instructor's attendance policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
an explanation of how the instructor will enforce the university's withdrawal policy	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
course requirements that form the basis of the assessment of student performance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
a statement on academic integrity	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
a course outline or schedule	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Other syllabus evaluation criteria:		
The learning goals of the course and the relationship of the course to the major and/or to general education are clearly conveyed to students in behavioral terms.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all		
Grading practices, standards, and criteria are clearly articulated.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all		
Instructional methods used in the course are explained and are appropriate to the course taught.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all		
Course assignments are explained and are appropriate to/for the course taught.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all		
Course content appears to be up-to-date, appropriate to the course topic, and enhancing of student learning.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all		
The course appears to integrate materials that are interdisciplinary and/or comparative.		
<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement
<input type="checkbox"/> Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable	

C. Qualitative Feedback on Teaching

1. *Describe the lesson taught, including the subject, objectives, and methods used.*
2. *Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, currency, breadth, and depth.*
3. *How well organized and clear was the presentation?*
4. *How effective were the methods of instruction used for this presentation?*
5. *Describe the level of student interest and participation.*
6. *What were the instructor's major strengths? Weaknesses?*
7. *What specific and constructive recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's teaching in this class?*

D. Overall Rating of Teaching

On the basis of the evidence provided in Sections A, B, and C, I rate the instructor's overall teaching as:

<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Proficient	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory	<input type="checkbox"/> Needs Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory
--	---	---	--	---

SIGNATURE OF PEER-EVALUATOR: _____

NAME OF PEER EVALUATOR	TITLE OF PEER EVALUATOR	DATE

SIGNATURE OF EMPLOYEE	
<i>I have read the above evaluation. My signature indicates neither agreement nor disagreement with it.</i>	
EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE	DATE

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR MINI-EVALUATIONS AND EVALUATIONS OF TENURED FACULTY MEMBERS

Mini-Evaluations of probationary faculty are to be conducted by the Department of Criminal Justice RTP Committee, the Department Chair (optional), and the College Dean. The standard form for evaluation must be used. Pursuant to that form, a candidate's activities are to be evaluated under the categories of: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. The dossier, however, for a mini-evaluation is not a full RTP evaluation file. Accordingly, candidates for mini-reviews are expected to submit only those materials covering the period since the most recent review (i.e., since their last mini-evaluation or since their last formal RTP review for reappointment).¹

To assist the Department RTP Committee in conducting a mini-evaluation of a probationary faculty member, the candidate must submit an updated curriculum vitae which addresses: (1) instruction and instructionally-related activities; (2) research and scholarly and creative activities; and (3) department, college, university, community, and professional service. These updates are to be supported with the following documentation:

1. Narrative – The narrative for a mini-review should be in the form of a short letter (*two to three pages*) that reflects on a candidate's accomplishments in all three areas either since initial appointment (for new probation faculty), since the last mini-review (for candidates in their second or fifth years), or since formal reappointment (for candidates in their fourth year).

In terms of the content of the narrative, two or three paragraphs should be devoted to reflection on one's teaching. Two or three paragraphs should discuss the candidate's scholarly activities; in these paragraphs, in accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy (and its subsections), candidates must identify their program of scholarly research. It is important that specific goals and plans – both current and future – be clearly articulated and documented because mere claims of intent are insufficient. This should include not only a written plan of research activity, but also some indication of how data for empirically-based research may be derived or obtained. Finally, a paragraph or two should explain the candidate's service contributions during the relevant review period.

2. Student Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.3(A)(1) of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review are strongly encouraged to submit all student evaluations, both quantitative and qualitative, from all sections of all courses they have taught; however, candidates for mini-review are only required to submit all quantitative and qualitative copies of student evaluations from a minimum of two sections of all non-supervision based courses taught each semester. In addition, candidates must submit a

¹ New probationary faculty should therefore submit materials from the date of appointment. However, if service credit was given at the time of appointment, candidates should also include materials for the credited years.

summary table of their student evaluations from all sections of all courses taught since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses that are subsequently evaluated by students. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 1: Summary of Quantitative Anonymous Feedback on Teaching

Question	Semester Year		Semester Year		Semester Year		Candidate Average
	CRJU xxx	CRJU xxx	CRJU xxx	CRJU xxx	CRJU xxx	CRJU xxx	
1. The instructor provided clear and accurate information regarding course objectives, requirements, and grading procedures.							Compute Mean of the Means
2. The instructor's grading was consistent with stated criteria and procedures.							
3. The instructor provided assignments/activities that were useful for learning and understanding the subject.							
4. The instructor's expectations concerning work to be done in this course were reasonable.							
5. The instructor was well-prepared for class.							
6. The instructor was effective in presenting subject content and materials in the class.							
7. The instructor was available during posted office hours for conferences about the course.							
8. Overall, I rate this instructor's overall teaching effectiveness in this course as:	Instructor Mean						
	Department Mean						
	College Mean						

3. Peer-Evaluations – In accordance with Section 2.1.4 of the Departmental RTP Policy, candidates for mini-review must submit peer evaluations of teaching that were conducted within the year prior to the application. Candidates should have at least one peer-evaluation each year they teach from tenured faculty. Ideally, candidates should ask for a peer evaluation each semester that he/she teaches a course to show that growth, development, or consistency exists in the candidate's teaching.
4. Syllabi – In accordance with Section 2.1.5 of the Department RTP Policy, syllabi from all courses taught in the relevant review period must be submitted. Only one syllabus per discrete course should be submitted, not multiple copies of syllabi used in different sections or semesters. An exception to this rule, however, is if the candidate has made substantial changes to a syllabus in response to suggestions from students or peers. In such an event, candidates should submit "before" and "after" copies as evidence of efforts to improve courses. Candidates should make sure that their syllabi conform to all

university requirements.

5. Table of Grade Distributions – In accordance with Section 2.1.6 of the Department RTP Policy, candidates must submit their grade distributions *in summary tabular form* from all sections of all courses taught since initial appointment. Thus, this table is created in the year of initial appointment and is updated annually by adding the data from additional courses taught. The table should be presented using the following format:

Table 2: Summary of Grade Distributions

Date	Course	A # (%)	B # (%)	C # (%)	D # (%)	F # (%)	W # (%)	CR # (%)	NC # (%)	I or RP # (%)	Total # (%)	Mean GPA	Mean Dept. GPA
Semester Year	CRJU										(100%)		
Semester Year	CRJU										(100%)		
Semester Year	CRJU										(100%)		
Semester Year	CRJU										(100%)		
Semester Year	CRJU										(100%)		
Semester Year	CRJU										(100%)		
Totals											(100%)		

6. Scholarly Publications – In accordance with Section 2.2.2 of the Department RTP Policy and its subsections, candidates must document their scholarly publication record. During mini-evaluations, candidates should therefore including copies of papers presented at conferences; manuscripts under review; preprints of articles accepted for publication along with the letter of acceptance; reprints of articles that have been published; proposals for funded research; and letters documenting service as an editor or peer-reviewer. *Only those scholarly activities that have occurred since the last review need to be submitted.*
7. Documenting Service – Candidates during mini-reviews need not submit any documentation of service; simply listing such service on their updated curriculum vitae is sufficient. Candidates are well advised, however, to be careful to keep such documentation since it is required to be submitted as part of a candidate's RTP file for formal reappointment, tenure, or promotion.

Finally, because there are no required forms or documentation set in any written policies governing the evaluation of tenured faculty, those faculty members undergoing post-tenure five-year reviews shall submit the same items specified in this Appendix governing min-reviews except that documentation must be provided for the five-year period since the last review.

APPENDIX C: “TOP-TIER” JOURNALS

- A. “Top-tier” journals in criminology and criminal justice include, but may not be limited to (depending on changes in journal rankings and publication from year to year): *Aggression and Violent Behavior*; *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*; *British Journal of Criminology*; *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*; *Crime & Delinquency*; *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*; *Crime, Law, and Social Change*; *Criminology*; *Criminology and Public Policy*; *Criminal Justice and Behavior*; *Criminal Justice Policy Review*; *Criminal Justice Review*; *Deviant Behavior*; *European Journal of Crime, Criminal Law and Criminal Justice*; *European Journal of Criminology*; *Feminist Criminology*; *Homicide Studies*; *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*; *Journal of Criminal Justice*; *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*; *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*; *Journal of Forensic Science*; *Journal of International Criminal Justice*; *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*; *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*; *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*; *Judicature*; *Justice Quarterly*; *Justice Systems Journal*; *Law and Human Behavior*; *Law & Society Review*; *Prison Journal*; *Punishment & Society*; *Sexual Abuse*; and *Theoretical Criminology*.
- B. Top-tier journals in law and society relevant to criminology and criminal justice include (but may not be limited to (depending on changes in journal rankings and publication from year to year): *American Criminal Law Review*; *American Journal of Criminal Law*; *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*; *Berkeley Journal of Criminal Law*; *Boston University Public Interest Law*; *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy*; *Criminal Justice*; *Criminal Law Bulletin*; *Criminal Law Review*; *Federal Courts Law Review*; *Fordham Urban Law Journal*; *Florida Journal of Law and Public Policy*; *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy*; *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*; *Journal of Appellate Practice and Process*; *Journal of Empirical Legal Studies*; *Law and Contemporary Problems*; *Law and Psychology Review*; *Law and Inequality*; *Law & Social Inquiry*; *New Criminal Law Review*; *New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement*; *New York University Review of Law & Social Change*; *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*; *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*; *Stanford Law & Policy Review*; *Social and Legal Studies*; *Supreme Court Review*; *University of Chicago Legal Forum*; *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*; *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law*; *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy*; *Yale Law & Policy Review*.
- C. Top-tier journals in related/cognate fields include (but may not be limited to (depending on changes in journal rankings and publication from year to year): *Addiction*; *Addictive Behaviors*; *Administration & Society*; *American Bar Association Journal*; *American Behavioral Scientist*; *American Journal of Forensic Psychiatry*; *American Journal of Political Science*; *American Journal of Psychology*; *American Journal of Sociology*; *American Philosophical Quarterly*; *American Political Science Review*; *American Politics Research*; *The American Review of Public Administration*; *American Sociological Review*; *Analysis*; *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*; *Annual Review of Psychology*; *Annual Review of Sociology*; *Archives of General Psychiatry*; *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*; *Behavior Genetics*; *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*; *Cognition*; *Cognitive Psychology*; *Criminal Law and Philosophy*; *Critical Inquiry*; *Drug &*

Alcohol Review; Ethical Theory and Moral Practice; Journal of the American Medical Association; Ethics; Feminist Studies; Inquiry; Journal of Abnormal Psychology; Journal of Applied Social Psychology; Journal of Conflict Resolution; Journal of Contemporary Ethnography; Journal of Ethics; Journal of Experimental Psychology; Journal of Family Violence; Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology; Journal of Personality and Social Psychology; Journal of Philosophy; Journal of Policy Analysis and Management; Journal of Political Philosophy; Journal of Politics; Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory; Journal of Psychiatry & Law; Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology; Journal of Social Philosophy; Journal of Social Policy; Journal of Social Psychology; Journal of Sociology; Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment; Law & Economics; Law and Philosophy; Legal Theory; Nature; Philosophy & Public Affairs; Philosophical Quarterly; Philosophical Review; Philosophical Studies; Philosophy and Public Affairs; Philosophy & Social Criticism; Philosophy of the Social Sciences; Political Analysis; Political Research Quarterly; Politics and Society; Public Administration Review; Policy & Politics; Policy Sciences; Policy Studies Journal; Public Opinion Quarterly; Psychology of Addictive Behaviors; Psychological Bulletin; Psychological Review; Psychology, Crime & Law; Psychology, Public Policy, and Law; Psychiatry, Psychology and Law; Review of Public Personnel Administration; Science; Social Forces; Social Problems; Social & Legal Studies; Sociological Methods & Research; Sociological Quarterly; Substance Use & Misuse.

APPENDIX D: “HIGH-QUALITY” JOURNALS

- A. High-quality journals in criminology and criminal justice include but may not be limited to (depending on changes in journal rankings and publication from year to year): *American Journal of Criminal Justice*; *Asian Journal of Criminology*; *Crime and Justice—A Review of Research*; *Crime, Media, Culture*; *Crime Patterns and Analysis*; *Criminology & Criminal Justice*; *Child Abuse & Neglect*; *Criminal Justice: The International Journal of Policy & Practice*; *Criminal Justice Ethics*; *Drug & Alcohol Dependence*; *Drug Court Review*; *Federal Probation*; *Global Crime*; *International Criminal Justice Review*; *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*; *International Journal of Crime, Criminal Justice and Law*; *International Journal of Drug Policy*; *Journal of Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*; *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*; *Journal of Court Innovation*; *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture*; *Journal of Criminal Justice Research*; *Journal of Digital Forensics, Security and Law*; *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice*; *Journal of Forensic Identification*, *Journal of Legal Studies*; *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*; *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*; *Justice Policy Journal*; *Justice Research and Policy*; *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*; *Legal and Criminological Psychology*; *Police Quarterly*; *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*; *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*; *Policing and Society*; *Qualitative Inquiry*; *Qualitative Research*; *Security Journal*; *Victimology*; *Violence Against Women*; *Violence & Victims*; *Youth Justice*; *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *Western Criminology Review*, and *Women and Criminal Justice*.
- B. High-quality general law reviews/law journals are typically those published by institutions ranked as "first-tier" and "second-tier" law schools by *U.S. News and World Report*. High quality specialized law reviews/law journals and typically those ranked by the Washington and Lee University School of Law’s “Law Journals: Submission and Rankings.”
- C. Candidates who publish in the journals of related/cognate disciplines must present documentation of journal rankings (or similar indicia, such as impact factors) to allow the RTP Committee to assess the quality of the venue.