

**SIGNATURE SHEET FOR EVALUATIVE CRITERIA**  
**APPROVED CRITERIA SHALL HAVE ALL REQUIRED SIGNATURES**

Department/Office: Law and Justice Studies

Department Chair/Head: Michael Weiss  
 Print

Michael Weiss  
 Signature

Academic Year (circle): 15-16      16-17      17-18      18-19      19-20

Date Sent to Dean/Supervisor: 9/10/15

Signature	Date	Approved
<u>Cindy Vitt</u>	<u>9/15/15</u>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y / P / N
Dean/Supervisor:		

Add'l Admin:		
<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>9/30/15</u>	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Y / P / N
Provost/designee:		

President/designee:		
		Y / P / N

Y = Approved                      P = Approved pending modifications                      N = Not approved

For P or N decisions, the departmental committee should be provided with the reasons for non-approval, as well as suggested changes to the criteria within a reasonable time to ensure timely approval for first year candidates.

**DIRECTIONS:** Sign each line and print or stamp name below the line. This signature page must accompany the evaluative standards throughout the entire approval process, and serves as a record that all levels have contributed to the approval process. After all levels have approved the evaluative standards, this cover page and the criteria shall be duplicated, and a copy sent to the Senate office for archiving. The original criteria packet is returned to the Department/Office.

<b>SUGGESTED TIMETABLE:</b>	<b>DATE</b>
Departmental approval, sent to Dean/Supervisor:	<b>September 25 (earlier if possible)</b>
Dean provides feedback regarding criteria	<b>October 9</b>
Final administrative approval and forwarding to Senate, Department, and Dean	<b>November 1</b>

**Department of Law and Justice Studies**  
**Revised Tenure and Recontracting Criteria**  
(For faculty hired after July 14, 2015)

**Introduction- Law and Justice as an Academic Discipline**

The Department of Law and Justice Studies is committed to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge in the discipline of Criminal Justice. Criminal Justice has been and remains a multidisciplinary field of study, with roots in Law, Humanities, Social Sciences, Public Policy, and other fields. It is concerned with the study of crime and deviance and the reactions of society to crime and deviance. Areas of inquiry include- but are not limited to- the examination of political, economic and cultural factors shaping definitions of crime and influencing social responses to crime, the study of social and individual forces leading to criminal conduct, and the analysis of the organization, composition, interactions and behaviors of the many agencies and actors that comprise criminal justice systems.

**Terminal Degree Requirements:**

The Department of Law and Justice Studies expects Assistant Professors to possess a Ph.D. in Criminal Justice or a closely related field. Instructors are expected to possess any one or more of the following degrees: Ph.D., M.A., M.S., M.Phil., J.D., or Ed.D.

**Tenure and Recontracting Criteria- Broad Considerations**

The Department of Law and Justice Studies will evaluate probationary candidates with the rank of Assistant Professor on the following criteria, with each criteria being weighted as indicated: (1) Teaching Effectiveness (40%); (2) Scholarly and Creative Activity (30%) (3) Contributions to the University Community (20%); (4) Contributions to the Wider Professional Community (10%). Probationary candidates with the rank of Instructor will be judged on the following criteria, with each criteria being weighted as indicated: (1) Teaching Effectiveness (50%); (2) Professional Development (20%) (3) Contributions to the University Community (20%) (4) Contributions to the Wider Professional Community (10%).

The Tenure and Recontracting Criteria in place when a candidate is hired govern the recontracting and tenure decisions for that faculty member unless the faculty member chooses to be judged by a subsequent Tenure and Recontracting agreement. If expectations are increased after a person is hired, they will be judged by the criteria in place when they started at Rowan University.

**(1) Teaching Effectiveness**

**Assessing Teaching Effectiveness**

The Department of Law and Justice Studies recognizes the importance of striving for excellence in teaching and as such, *teaching effectiveness* shall be the most important factor in evaluating candidates. In general, faculty should demonstrate skillful teaching, a commitment to student learning, and engagement with constructive pedagogical practices. Candidates will be evaluated

on their academic instruction, development of learning activities, development as a teacher, and student mentoring activities.

The Department of Law and Justice Studies regards the following as indicative of teaching effectiveness:

- A. Demonstrating a command of the current state of the discipline
- B. Developing courses beyond a mere exposition of the textbook
- C. Fluency in major pedagogical approaches
- D. Motivation to experiment and incorporate innovative teaching techniques
- E. Engaging students in the learning process
- F. Creating a challenging class environment for students
- G. Demonstrating a positive attitude toward teaching and learning.
- H. Taking an interest student success

#### Use of Student Evaluations

Methods of Student Evaluation: Teaching effectiveness will be demonstrated primarily through the use of standard Student Instructional Reports II (SIRs), although we will recognize other methods of evaluation when SIRs may not be appropriate. For instance, SIRs are particularly unsuitable for graduate and other courses with only a small number of students. As such, the faculty member may use an alternate form of evaluation acceptable to the University and the department. If an alternative method is employed, the candidate should explain the validity of any instruments used. The number of classes for which student evaluations are submitted should be in accordance with the latest Memorandum of Agreement on Recontracting and Tenure (MOA). The faculty member, at his or her discretion, may use more than the minimum, although this is not required or expected.

Expectations: While there are no *exact* measures that would demonstrate teaching effectiveness on student evaluations, we expect that scores in major areas of measurement (if SIRs are being used, examples of major areas of measurement would include the overall evaluation, faculty-student interaction, preparedness, and knowledge of the course material) should be near or above the averages for similar institutions and courses. Such comparisons, however, should be made with caution, due to differences within the universe of faculty and courses factored into the average score (faculty of all levels of teaching experience are measured, as are courses from all types of four-year institutions, and of varying levels of rigor and popularity).

If a candidate's evaluation results deviate significantly from a national or regional benchmark, it should be up to the candidate, when appropriate, to explain the divergence. Candidates should also demonstrate that they have used, or will use, their evaluations to strengthen their teaching.

New Courses: From time to time, a faculty member will create new courses. As such, allowances should be made when evaluations for such a course are lower than other courses that person has taught more frequently.

Limitations: A candidate's SIRs must be assessed with an understanding of their limitations. Faculty should not be penalized for the occasional outlier(s) in a particular course. We recognize that competence in teaching does not mean making *every* student happy. Even the best teachers, through no fault of their own, sometimes have students who give unreasonably low scores.

Overall Interpretation of Student Evaluations: With the above in mind, the department will examine evaluations for overall trends, recognizing that what is important is that a sizeable majority of students view the candidate as an effective teacher. It is only when a considerable portion of a class, as indicated by the number and percentage of students, has a negative view of a candidate that this will be taken as less-than-acceptable teaching.

Furthermore, teaching effectiveness must be demonstrated by consistently strong scores *across* evaluations. One course, or a small percentage of the total number of courses, that is noticeably weaker than others should not create an impression of teaching ineffectiveness if most course evaluations, overall, are sufficiently strong.

#### Peer Observations

In-class peer observations must be conducted and written by tenured faculty members; the number submitted should be in accordance with the latest MOA. It is expected that these observations should show sufficient student engagement, a high level of content expertise, strong organizational skills, efficient use of classroom time, familiarity with students (e.g., recognizing them by name), appropriate pedagogical methodologies, and enthusiasm for the candidate's subject. The faculty member conducting the observation should, where appropriate, include in writing constructive criticism and/or identify areas for improvement.

#### Other Indications of Teaching Effectiveness

In addition to SIR survey responses, a candidate is encouraged to include informal indicators of teaching effectiveness in their re-contracting materials. For instance, SIRs also include the opportunity for students to provide, in a structured setting, handwritten qualitative feedback that can be submitted along with the traditional SIR response sheet. Another example would be email or written correspondence from current or former students. Absence of these indicators, however, should not reflect negatively on a candidate, since no student can be compelled to write to their professors or provide qualitative feedback as part of a SIR. It will be the policy of the Department of Law and Justice Studies, however, that faculty administering SIRs announce the opportunity to provide qualitative feedback; it will be up to students to do so if they wish.

Candidates are also encouraged to attend workshops designed to enhance their pedagogical skills. While this is not a requirement, we would encourage faculty within their first three years of teaching at the college level to attend a minimum of one workshop, either through Rowan University or other venue.

### New Faculty

We recognize that first-year faculty will spend a great deal of time preparing new courses and that there will be a learning curve for those who are new to the classroom. As such, while a candidate should describe their course development efforts, we anticipate that initial student evaluations should serve as an early point of reference from which a candidate is expected to show improved scores over time and grow as a teacher. It should be noted, however, that opportunities for improvement may be limited if a candidate's initial evaluations are sufficiently strong.

### Pedagogy and Best Practices

The Law and Justice Studies Department recognizes the divergent teaching styles of faculty and as such, there is no one "correct" style of teaching. However, there is a body of literature that indicates "best practices" in education. While such practices will vary depending upon the source, we believe it incumbent upon the candidate to demonstrate how some of these practices are incorporated into the classroom. The candidate is expected to discuss the teaching methods used and how these are indicative of proven techniques by citing examples from various courses.

### **(2a) Scholarly and Creative Activity (for Assistant Professors)**

#### Assessing Scholarly and Creative Activity

We are interested in an active or continuing agenda of scholarly and creative activity. At each review the candidate's folder will be evaluated for his or her research record and promise for continued scholarship.

Scholarly activity can be demonstrated in many different ways and published in many journals outside of traditional criminal justice and criminology journals because Law and Justice Studies is a multi-disciplinary field of study with important practical implications. Collecting original data is a valuable contribution to the knowledge base, but it must be acknowledged that it requires considerable time and may delay the publication of articles and thus is commendable but not required. Specific examples of valued scholarly activity include, but are not limited to:

- A. Papers in refereed journals or conference proceedings
- B. Law review articles
- C. Books or chapters in books, textbooks, workbooks, or other media productions
- D. Edited works in books or textbooks or workbooks
- F. Monographs
- G. Obtaining or applying for research grants
- H. Papers, roundtables, or demonstrations presented at academic or professional meetings
- I. Acting as a Chair or a Discussant of a panel at a professional meeting
- J. Acting as a reviewer for the research of others

- K. Other papers and reports (e.g., trade, in-house, government or technical)
- L. Articles appearing in professional publications or the popular press aimed at disseminating research results or contributing to empirically-based policies
- M. Translations, abstracts, reviews, or criticisms
- N. Documented work performed in pursuit of the advancement of the scholarship of teaching
- O. Documentation of instructional and classroom research to benefit the teaching-learning enterprise
- P. Reports or presentations to practitioners in the criminal justice system as a consultant or expert witness
- Q. Computer software
- R. Book reviews and encyclopedia entries
- S. Editing a journal of peer-reviewed articles or a scholarly book

The expectations outlined here recognize that candidates might not have actual publications by their second year, as new faculty typically must spend a considerable amount of time preparing new classes and adjusting to a new career; furthermore, the publishing process can take years. This is an especially important consideration in our discipline, since journal or law review articles are generally long-20 to 30 pages in length for the former and considerably longer for the latter. We would nonetheless expect evidence of an ongoing research agenda that shows the promise of future publications.

### Benchmarking

Using the Carnegie Foundation's Classification of Institutions of Higher Education to divide their sample into "research institutions" and "other institutions" Frost, Phillips, and Clear (2007)<sup>1</sup> found that for "other institutions," the average "total publications (e.g. articles published in journals and law reviews, chapters, books, and edited books)" in the first five years was 2.98.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, the authors cited data from the Association of Doctoral Programs in Criminology and Criminal Justice indicating that the time faculty members are expected to devote to research ranges from 20% to 65%. If a faculty member at Rowan University is on a reduced load of 3-3 and therefore devoting 25% of his or her time to research, faculty at Rowan University fall on the lower end of the range for percent of time devoted to research. See attached Appendix, for additional information about benchmarking.

---

<sup>1</sup> Frost, N.A., Phillips, N.D., & Clear, T.R. (2007). Productivity of Criminal Justice Scholars Across the Career. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18, 428-443.

<sup>2</sup> Although Rowan University is a state-designated research university, it would not be considered a "research institution" under this definition, thus the data from "other institutions" is the appropriate benchmark for our purposes.

### Expectations for Tenure and Recontracting in Law and Justice Studies:

The totality of a candidate's scholarly production and the promise of future quality research will determine whether tenure is warranted. Because of the variety of types of scholarship, some of which are valued more heavily than others, it is impossible to provide a precise number of what is expected. The expectations detailed below are based on the 3-3 teaching load currently in place for new and research-active faculty for the first two years. After the first two years of service, tenure-track faculty are expected to apply for continued adjusted load and to maintain an active research agenda both pre- and post-tenure.

Publications: The refereed journal article is the most typical type of scholarship in the field of criminal justice, followed by the research monograph or book.<sup>3</sup> While the research monograph or book in the field is highly valued and can be used to substitute for refereed journal articles, it is not usually required in the discipline. As such, it is expected that a candidate's scholarly record includes refereed journal articles or the equivalent. For example, a law review article could substitute for a refereed journal article and a book published by an academic press or respected trade publisher would be considered equivalent to two or more refereed journal articles depending on the quality and significance of the book in the field. Letters of acceptance for publication will satisfy the publication requirements. Articles that have been given a "revise and resubmit" status will not satisfy the publication requirements but will be considered as evidence of research potential.

Conference Presentations: Professional meetings provide an occasion for the dissemination of research as well as the opportunity for feedback and constructive criticism from professional colleagues. This, in turn, helps to refine ongoing scholarship and generate new lines of inquiry. As such, we expect candidates hired to have presented scholarly papers/works, including poster sessions and round tables, at national, regional or international meetings by the time they apply for tenure. Acting as a Chair or a Discussant of a panel at a professional meeting is also of importance to active involvement and will be considered by the time a candidate applies for tenure.

Journal Quality: As indicated in Frost et al.'s (2007) research, "the average criminal justice scholar publishes infrequently in prestigious journals and the vast majority of journal publications appear in "other" journals." Moreover, it is particularly unusual for scholars to publish in prestigious journals during the first five years of their career. Thus, Law and Justice Studies faculty are not required to publish in top-tier journals, especially given the fluctuation in the rankings of the top 20 criminal justice and criminology journals over the course of ten years and that there are many criminal justice journals not covered in Journal Citation Reports' calculation of impact factors (Jennings, et. al. 2009)<sup>4</sup>. However, faculty are encouraged to

---

<sup>3</sup> Gabiddon, S. L., Higgins, G. E. & Martin, F. (2011). Moving through the faculty ranks: An exploratory study on the perceived importance of book publishing and publishing in peer-reviewed journals in criminology/criminal justice. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 22 (2): 165-180.

<sup>4</sup> Jennings, W.G., Higgins, G.E. & Khey, D.N. (2009). Exploring the stability and variability of impact factors and associated rankings in criminology and criminal justice journals, 1998-2007. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 20 (2): 157-172.

provide information about the quality of their peer-reviewed publications and an article in a prestigious journal will be given additional weight in the evaluation process.

Multiple Authorship: Because multiple authorship is the norm in our discipline, candidates are not required to have sole-authored publications. More often than not, scholars collaborate as articles in social science journals are generally 20 to 30 pages long, and law reviews are often much longer. Multiple authorship has become more common as the literature that needs to be reviewed has increased and the methodology and analysis have become more sophisticated. See attached Appendix for further details regarding multiple authorship.

Candidates should describe their contribution to multiple-authored works and how their efforts were necessary for the success of the work. They should explain what was unique about their input and approximate what percentage of the total effort it constituted. This becomes especially important because we recognize that the order of listed authors does not always reflect their relative contributions; authors are sometimes listed in alphabetical order, in order of seniority, or starting with the principal investigator(s) on a grant. It is expected that candidates will be the lead author on at least one of the co-authored works, and they should explain why they were listed as first author. It should be clear that candidates are establishing their own research agenda and not merely assisting with the research of others.

Grants: Securing funds (internal or external) to support scholarly research is considered a valuable contribution to the scholarly process, and faculty members are encouraged to apply for funds that support research and scholarly activities. However, we understand that external funding is highly competitive and limited. Additionally, there is limited availability of internal funding; therefore, grant awards should be considered a positive toward tenure, but not required. Unfunded research grant proposals constitute valuable research activity and should not be dismissed for their scholarly contributions. In cases of unfunded research, reviewers' comments should be considered. See Appendix for additional details regarding grants.

External Reviewer: Candidates hired after July 14, 2014 will have to provide a report from an external reviewer for their seventh year contract and tenure. The purpose of using an external reviewer is to advise the university as to the broader impact and value of a faculty member's scholarly work in the discipline.

If Rowan's Teaching Load is Increased: If Rowan's teaching load is increased, research expectations will have to be reduced and, if a faculty is teaching more than the 3-3 load currently in place for new and research active faculty guaranteed during the first two years, then new and reduced expectations would apply. Candidates who have received positive feedback in each of their pre-tenure reviews can expect a favorable tenure decision providing they have fulfilled what they promised in their earlier recontracting materials.

## **(2b) Professional Development (for Instructors)**

### *Assessing Professional Development*

Probationary faculty with the rank of Instructor are expected to engage in Professional Development rather than Scholarly or Creative Activity. As indicated in Appendix A of the 2013 MOA, Professional Development consists of "those activities which improve an



Instructor's currency in a field of expertise or teaching, maintains their standing within a profession or discipline, or expands their area of expertise" (p. 28).

As mandated by Appendix A of the 2013 MOA, probationary faculty with the rank of Instructor are expected to engage in activities that assist them in "maintaining currency in their discipline,...improve their abilities as teachers,... deepen and/or broaden, their knowledge of discipline-specific content,... and/or strengthen their understanding and application of the pedagogy of particular disciplines" (p. 28).

These activities can include any of the following activities, which have been adopted from Appendix A of the 2013 MOA:

- A. Participating in professional conferences focusing on criminal justice issues
- B. Attending professional conferences focusing on criminal justice issues
- C. Acquiring and/or maintaining certifications and/or licenses relating to policing, courts, or corrections
- D. Participating in professional conferences focusing on pedagogy specific to the field of criminal justice
- E. Attending professional conferences focusing on pedagogy specific to the field of criminal justice
- F. Participating in workshops or training that focus on teaching and learning
- G. Attending workshops or training that focus on teaching and learning (including, but not limited to, Rowan University Faculty Center workshops and programs)
- H. Developing or enhancing skills in the assessment of learning in subject matter taught in the Department of Law and Justice Studies
- I. Any other activities that enhance knowledge of criminal justice subject matter or pedagogy

The Law and Justice Studies Department incorporates the standards in Appendix A of the MOA which state:

Characteristics of Excellence in Professional Development for Instructors are

- A. The activity is directly related to the area of expertise or area of instruction.
- B. The activity prepares the instructor for future teaching assignments
- C. The activity results in certification or licensure that is appropriate for the area of instruction or for the practice of teaching within a specific discipline
- D. The activity is recognized as maintaining standing within a profession or discipline
- E. The activity permits the demonstration of leadership within a profession or discipline

### **(3) Contribution to University Community**

Contribution to the University Community requires the candidate to participate in the shared governance process and to use their expertise, knowledge and professional judgments for the betterment of the institution.

Active participation and leadership in campus activities and governance includes, but is not limited to:

- A. Chairing a department, college, or university committee
- B. Contributing to tasks central to the department's day-to-day activities,
- C. Helping the department meet the expectations of the College and the University
- D. Program Coordination
- E. Senate participation
- F. Union Participation.
- G. Mentoring other faculty or staff within the candidate's own Department, College, or University
- H. Representing the institution for advancement in activities such as open houses, and the recruitment of students.

In the candidate's first year, basic departmental service (attending departmental meetings, attending departmental functions, etc.) is expected. By the second year, basic departmental service is expanded to include mentoring of majors and service on at least one departmental committee. By the third year and beyond, departmental service continues and the candidate may wish to assume a leadership role. In addition, the candidate is expected to engage in basic college and university service (membership on college committees, all-university committees or task forces, interdisciplinary advisory boards, etc.).

### **(4) Contribution to the Wider and Professional Community**

The candidate should address social or institutional issues beyond the Rowan campus(es) using his or her expertise, knowledge, and seasoned professional judgments. The candidate's activities may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- A. Consulting or providing technical assistance to public or private organizations.
- B. Briefings, seminars, lectures, conferences targeted for general audiences.
- C. Summaries of research, policy analyses, or position papers for the general public or target audiences.
- D. Reviewing journal articles

E. Contributing to disciplinary and professional organizations.

F. Service to accreditation bodies or nation examining boards.

G. Leadership positions in recognized professional organizations

The department expects some level of professional service, if only membership in professional organizations, each year. In addition, the department recognizes the value of service to the general public, especially if that service advances our discipline and/or the department, college, or university in some way.

## APPENDIX

**Benchmarking:** A recent journal article analyzing scholarly production in criminal justice, as well as information obtained from two nearby institutions who responded to our inquiries about their tenure and recontracting criteria are relevant for the purposes of benchmarking.

Relying on a random sample of members of our two national professional organizations, Frost, Phillips, and Clear (2007)<sup>5</sup> looked at scholarly productivity in five-year increments and found that productivity increased slightly post-tenure and then stabilized. The authors explained this result with the same rationales presented above: during the first five years of their careers, new faculty are busy with new teaching responsibilities and adjusting to a new environment; this takes time away from their research. The substantial time lag between submitting an article and having it accepted for publication, moreover, can be well over a year.

As indicated in the Benchmarking section of this document, Frost et al. (2007) reported on a study of productivity at institutions designated as “research institutions” using the Carnegie Foundation’s Classification and “other institutions.” For the whole sample of criminal justice scholars, including those from research institutions, the mean numbers of articles published in prestigious and other journals are 0.7 (0) and 3.10 (2) respectively, with medians in parentheses.

The Department of Criminology at The College of New Jersey (TCNJ) has very clear standards governing expectations for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor that were revised in August of 2014.<sup>6</sup> Successful candidates must demonstrate “continued well-mentored research with undergraduates,” have made three presentations at local, regional and/or national meetings, and a combination of at least two of the following:

- major research proposal funded or favorably reviewed
- two papers published in a refereed journal and at least one additional manuscript that has been submitted to a referred journal and is under review
- a research report prepared for a governmental agency which resulted in a significant contribution to the field, as demonstrated by a change to policy and/or practice

(2014, p. 7). If a candidate has additional scholarly output in one of these three categories, such as an additional journal article, that is accepted as a substitute for scholarly output in either of the other two categories.

It should be noted that the standard teaching load at TCNJ is 3-3, and faculty can apply for two year grants that reduce the teaching load to 2-3.

Stockton University was the second of two institutions to respond to our inquiries. Their standards do not specify the quantity of publications required for tenure, but they place considerable emphasis on the applied nature of the discipline and state that the wide range of

---

<sup>5</sup> Frost, N.A., Phillips, N.D., & Clear, T.R. (2007). Productivity of Criminal Justice Scholars Across the Career. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education*, 18, 428-443.

<sup>6</sup> Department of Criminology, The College of New Jersey (2014) *Disciplinary Standards for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion*.

activities we define as scholarship is appropriate in our field. They also make it clear in their description of scholarship that “(p)ublic or professional presentations, research, projects, reports, or demonstrations that may bridge teaching, scholarship and service and extend outside of the college into the community are particularly valuable to our field” (p.5). A faculty member who teaches at Stockton indicated that successful candidates typically have three publications when the tenure decision is made. The standard teaching load at Stockton is 3-3.

Multiple Authorship: As indicated in the Tenure and Recontracting document, multiple authorship has become the norm in our discipline. A recent article in a journal published by one of the two leading national criminal justice organizations reported that over 70% of the articles published in the discipline’s most respected journals during the last three years reviewed, 2006-2008, were articles with multiple authors (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2011)<sup>7</sup>. Tewksbury and Mustaine (2011) report that the mean number of authors has increased in the 44 year time period reviewed to reach 2.5 authors per article.

Grants: The Tenure and Recontracting document encourages faculty to seek internal and external funding for their research, but it is recognized that it can delay publications and is highly competitive in our field. If someone is working on a grant they may be precluded from publishing anything until the grant application or research is complete.

We understand that external funding is highly competitive and limited because of the “proliferation of noncompetitive funded projects for faculty members working with criminal justices agencies” (Clear, T., 2001)<sup>8</sup> and typically awarded to faculty in research universities with a 1-2 teaching load.

We recognize that the significance of an external research award is a complicated mix of grant size and prestige of the funding agency. Thus receiving a successful research award is highly valued and carries great weight toward scholarly activity.

---

<sup>7</sup> Tewksbury, R. & Mustaine, E. E. (2011). How many authors does it take to write an article? An assessment of criminology and criminal justice article author composition. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 22, 12-23.

<sup>8</sup> Clear, T.R. (2001). Has academic criminal justice come of age? *Justice Quarterly* 18(4): 709-726.