

**Ad Hoc Committee Report of  
The Third-Year Review of Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_,  
Department of Criminology & Criminal Justice  
College of Liberal Arts  
Southern Illinois University Carbondale**

**Month Day, Year**

**1. Summary of Evaluation**

At the written request (Month Day, Year) of Dr. Kimberly Kempf-Leonard, Chair of the CCJ, the Committee conducted “a critical review of Assistant Professor \_\_\_\_\_’s prospects for tenure...in the third year of service in that rank.” The Committee consisted of Drs. \_\_\_\_\_(Chair and rank), \_\_\_\_\_ (rank), \_\_\_\_\_ (rank), and \_\_\_\_\_ (rank) in the CCJ. Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ is an Assistant Professor of \_\_\_\_\_. S/he was awarded the doctoral degree in \_\_\_\_\_ from the \_\_\_\_\_ and began her/his appointment in August, 200x. Her/his research areas are \_\_\_\_\_ within the more general fields of \_\_\_\_\_ in \_\_\_\_\_. S/he teaches an introductory course in \_\_\_\_\_, as well as other undergraduate and graduate courses in specific areas of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, and \_\_\_\_\_.

The evidence of Dr. \_\_\_\_\_’s research, teaching, and service consisted of materials presented in the candidate’s review file as well as information requested by the Chair from CCJ faculty members. On the basis of its review of the evidence of research, teaching and service, the Committee reports that “the performance of the faculty member demonstrates (does not demonstrate) a potential for tenure at a subsequent point of tenure review.” The following three sections of the report describe and evaluate Dr. \_\_\_\_\_’s research, teaching and service performance as well as “desired future achievements.”

**2. Qualifications: Research**

[Here, note number of peer-reviewed articles, book chapters, and books published, if any, prior to beginning the tenure-track appointment and receiving the doctoral degree – Note number of papers presented at professional meetings, and name of associations involved, if any, prior to being appointment and receiving degree – Note same subsequent to beginning tenure-track appointment and receiving degree – Note additional papers being prepared for review by professional journals and which ones.]

The Committee evaluated this research in terms of (co)authorship, coherence, pace, quality, and external research support. The evaluation follows.

- The **(co)authorship** is (in) appropriate to date – [Here, note extent to which published research is (co)authored – Assess whether practice is understandable at the early stage of a professional career, and brings the benefits of sharper analysis and presentation that accrue from interaction with people in similar areas – Note extent to which planned submissions to peer-reviewed journals are co-authored – State Committee’s advice, as appropriate, that assistant professor should establish her/himself as the principal author of published works that are part of a research agenda that displays both independence and originality of thought.]
- The **coherence** is (not) strong – [Here, note extent to which published and proposed work focuses on topics of long-standing interest and importance, as well as newer concerns, and in which fields – Give specific description of research thematic interest and evaluation of degree of integration among various parts in research program.]
- The **pace** is (in)consistent – [Here, state whether research production occurs just at the beginning or just towards the end of initial appointment, or whether it occurs throughout the period – State Committee’s advice, as appropriate, that assistant professor should focus

efforts on publishing papers that are genuine advances on previous research and at a more accelerated pace.]

- The **quality** is (not) high – [Here, characterize importance of subject matter, the analysis, interpretation and design of the research, and the organization, clarity and style of its presentation – Describe and evaluate research outlets in terms of both general professional and field specialty journals (cite professional rankings of journals as available); list journals published in with impact and evaluation rankings; list journals planned for submission with impact and evaluation rankings – State Committee encouragement of assistant professor’s continuing to target high levels of press and journal quality, and to present work at the meetings of the major professional associations; in particular, give examples of top-tier general journals, top-tier field journals, and top-tier subfield journals and comment that mix of top-tiers is highly desirable – Comment that putting research at high publication and presentation levels enables individual to take the steps that are necessary to ensure that work benefits from the additional insight and rigor that such outlets provide, and that it enjoys greater visibility – Comment further that presentations at professional meetings also can provide an effective means for increasing the profile of a junior scholar as well as that of the CCJ and SIUC in the profession and at large.]
- **External research support** is not a criterion for third-year review, but it is an activity that an assistant professor should think about undertaking when building record for, and beyond, the six-year review – [Here, note that Committee recognizes that proper preparation of a research proposal can be a very time-consuming activity – Note also that it may not be appropriate for an assistant professor in a three-year phase of probationary review – Note further that the Committee encourages assistant professor to seek external support for work, particularly in areas of \_\_\_\_\_ that attract the attention of academicians, policy practitioners, and/or government officials – Comment, as appropriate, that such support helps to advance research program and, in turn, professional salience as well as that of the CCJ.]

Overall, the Committee reports that the research performance of Professor \_\_\_\_\_ demonstrates (does not demonstrate) the potential for a successful six-year promotion and tenure review.

### 3. Qualifications: Teaching

Since the first year of appointment, Dr. \_\_\_\_\_ has taught undergraduate and graduate courses. The Committee reviewed instruction in terms of contributions to undergraduate and graduate education, syllabi quality, and student evaluations.

- The **contribution to undergraduate education** is (in)significant – [here, state whether assistant professor has undertaken teaching of large sections and whether his/her teaching has enabled program and University to meet growing demand for this requirement – State also whether candidate teaches other required upper-division courses and their average enrollments per semester.]
- The **contribution to graduate education** is (in)significant – [Here, note contributions in terms of courses and their importance to program delivery, and their degree of course preparation and individual student tutoring time – Note also their average enrollment per semester – Note further contributions to master’s thesis-- skill development and, as appropriate, completion – Note assistance provided to students in presenting papers at professional meetings, becoming aware of employment opportunities, etc., as appropriate. If contributions are made to doctoral education in other departments, please note that too.]
- **Syllabi quality** is (not) high – [Here, assess extent of rigor and quality of syllabus, note theoretical significance and contemporary relevance of coverage – State why rigor important in terms of challenging students to develop their thinking, and of deepening understanding –

Comment whether syllabi clearly express requirements for, and expectations of, student performance, including student conduct in class.]

- **Student evaluations** are (not) good – [Here, note review file’s reports of student rankings on the course in general, the course content, and the instructor’s contribution – For course in general, rankings range from low for the (required) name of course to high for name of course – For instructor’s contribution and for course overall, provide ranges and course names – Note student comments of assistant professor’s teaching qualities – Committee statement, as appropriate, that particular attention needs to be paid to improving (e.g, clarity of expression, organization, etc.) ]

Overall, the Committee reports that the teaching performance of Professor \_\_\_\_\_ demonstrates (does not demonstrate) the potential for a successful six-year promotion and tenure review.

#### 4. Qualifications: Service

The review file lists several service activities. They include committee participation and faculty and student involvement in activities of the CCJ, CoLA, SIUC, professional associations, and the community. Generally, the expectation is that assistant professors will not become too involved in service activities beyond minimal committee assignments in the CCJ and perhaps some professional service.

- **Committee participation** is (in)adequate. It includes both School and University committees. [Here, Give examples of the former – Note degree of committee attendance and whether constructive contributions made to committee deliberations, if possible – Note also willingness to undertake other services, including recruitment of new faculty , and why these services are important.]
- **Faculty and student involvement** is (not) significant – [Here, state whether Assistant Professor contributed knowledge and time and thereby facilitated the development of other faculty research projects – State whether Assistant Professor participated in other scholarly activities that have engaged both undergraduate and graduate students.]
- **Professional service** is good/poor – [Here, state whether articles reviewed for professional journals and, if so, then which – State whether proposals reviewed for funding agencies and foundations and, if so, then which – State, if appropriate, professional associational committees, advisory committees, and editorial boards, and, if so, then which.]

Overall, the Committee reports that the service performance of \_\_\_\_ demonstrates (does not demonstrate) the potential for a successful six-year promotion and tenure review. The Committee also strongly encourages focus of efforts on the research and teaching activities as discussed in this report.

Submitted By:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Committee Chair, \_\_\_\_\_

Alphabetic Listing and Signatures of Committee Faculty: