

SAGE Junior Faculty Professional Development Teaching Awards

The deadline for nominations is September 1, 2026.

Nominations sent to: Joseph DeLeeuw, deleeuw2@gmail.com

Copy nomination to: Kimberly D. Dodson, dodsonk@uhcl.edu

The intent of the Sage Junior Faculty Development Teaching Awards is to provide deserving junior faculty with travel reimbursement scholarships to participate in the Annual Meeting and to attend a Teaching Workshop that ACJS will organize at each yearly meeting. Up to four award recipients will be selected. The awards may not be awarded every year.

Eligibility criteria:

To be eligible for an award, the applicant must:

1. Be a current ACJS member at the time of application.
2. Have received most recent graduate degree within the past 5 years.
3. Have taught full time for less than 5 years. There is no limit on part-time teaching experience.
4. Be currently teaching in a criminal justice/criminology program at a regionally accredited institution of higher education.
5. Be an untenured faculty member or doctoral level teaching assistant.
6. Have submitted a complete electronic application by the due date.
7. Self-nominations by applicants are allowed.

Selection criteria: Only those individuals who meet the eligibility criteria will be evaluated based on the selection criteria.

The Subcommittee for this Award will examine the full applications of all eligible applicants against the selection criteria. The applicants will be placed in one of 3 categories based on the selection criteria:

1. Category 1 = yes, should be funded; these applications will be separated into the four priorities specified below; then the applications will be ranked within category, if necessary.
2. Category 2 = could be funded.
3. Category 3 = no, do not fund; These applications will receive no further consideration for funding.

Applications placed in the “Should be Funded” category will have all the following characteristics:

1. The applicant has clearly identified needs for teaching improvement.
2. The applicant has clearly identified strengths as a teacher.

3. The applicant has a well-developed teaching improvement agenda with specific plans.
4. The applicant has clearly identified strategies/ideas that can be shared with other participants in the Teaching Workshop.
4. The applicant clearly expresses the manner in which sharing ideas and refining them will benefit the teaching of participants in the workshop.
5. The applicant expressed a clear interest in teaching and improvement of teaching.
6. The applicant was articulate in the presentation of application materials.
7. The applicant demonstrated commitment to attendance at ACJS as a means to facilitate professional development in areas of teaching competence.
8. The applicant clearly states the need for the award.
9. The applicant has a clearly delineated itemized budget.

Applications placed in the “Could be Funded” category will have the following characteristics:

1. The applicant has somewhat clearly identified needs for teaching improvement.
2. The applicant has somewhat clearly identified strengths as a teacher.
3. The applicant has a teaching improvement agenda that is not clearly developed and/or lacks specific plans.
4. The applicant has somewhat clearly identified strategies/ideas that can be shared with other participants in the Teaching Workshop.
5. The applicant somewhat clearly expresses the manner in which sharing ideas and refining them will benefit the teaching of participants in the workshop.
6. The applicant expressed a clear interest in teaching and improvement of teaching.
7. The applicant was somewhat articulate in the presentation of application materials.’
8. The applicant demonstrated commitment to attendance at ACJS as a means to facilitate professional development in areas of teaching competence.
9. The applicant clearly states the need for the award.
10. The applicant has a clearly delineated itemized budget.

Applications placed in the “Do not Fund” category will have the following characteristics:

1. The applicant vaguely states or fails to state needs for teaching improvement.
2. The applicant vaguely states or fails to state strengths as a teacher.

3. The applicant vaguely states or fails to state a teaching improvement agenda.
4. The applicant vaguely states or fails to state strategies/ideas that can be shared with other participants in the Teaching Workshop.
5. The applicant vaguely states or fails to state the manner in which sharing ideas and refining them will benefit the teaching of participants in the workshop.
6. The applicant vaguely states or fails to express a clear interest in teaching and improvement of teaching.
7. The applicant is vague or inarticulate in the presentation of application materials.
8. The applicant demonstrated little or no commitment to attendance at ACJS as a means to facilitate professional development in areas of teaching competence.
9. The applicant vaguely states or fails to state the need for the award.
10. The applicant has a vague or unclearly delineated itemize budget.

If there are more applicants in category 1 than can be funded with the monies available, the following priorities will be used for determining which applicants to fund.

1. First priority will be given to new full-time faculty (junior faculty at four year and community colleges).
2. Second priority will be given to applicants who have recently received the Ph.D. and have accepted a position.
3. Third priority will be given to applicants who are ABD and have accepted a teaching position.
4. Fourth priority will be given to applicants who are ABD and are currently TAs.
5. The above priorities are to be used within category 2 if sufficient funding is available to provide awards to some applicants in the “could be funded” category.