Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion Policy
Department of Economics

May 22, 2018

Part II: Academic Unit Criteria, Standards and Processes

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of NTTF in Years One-Six

A. Teaching

I. Description of Criteria

Teaching effectiveness by continuing NTTF is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the evaluation of NTTF who are under review for reappointment. Performance measures used in the evaluation of teaching include: quality of undergraduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning and scholarship of engagement.

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, evaluators should examine the candidate's entire teaching portfolio, which may contain any of the following:

1. Effective delivery of classroom instruction
   - Student evaluations (required) – using questions and weights specified by the Department's evaluation policy document.
   - Peer evaluations (required).
   - Documented outcome assessment results
   - Evidence of appropriate use of technology, active learning activities, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

2. Effective delivery in Non-Classroom settings; e.g.
   - The results of guiding undergraduate research
   - Materials used and generated from teaching independent studies
   - Documentation of the advising of special projects
   - Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, internships, service learning, and the like)

3. Professional Development and Teaching Support Activity; e.g.
   - Syllabi
   - Teaching philosophy statement

Course development
Curriculum/program development
Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
Innovative teaching methods development
Professional development related to teaching
Textbooks/instructional materials development
Supportive letters
Teaching awards
Real-world experiences (business experience, consulting, board memberships, etc.) that enhance teaching
Scholarship (publications, scholarly presentations, etc.) that enhances teaching

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, method of delivery, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, number of students, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Furthermore, evaluators should be sensitive to the possibility that students sometimes base their evaluations on inappropriate characteristics of the instructor (age, gender, race, etc.) Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations, and comparisons between candidates and departments should be made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of faculty subject to APRs and EPRs. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. These written evaluations will be provided to the evaluators by the Department administrative staff.

When considering any of the evidence related to teaching, it should be recognized that candidates will generally begin their teaching career with a modest amount of success, and that this success generally will grow over the first years of their career. Moreover, even the most successful candidates may experience uneven success when they attempt to move from basic teaching methods to those that are more demanding of both students and instructors.

II. Specific Teaching Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the Economics faculty who are eligible to vote on an NTTF's reappointment are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's teaching record

satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the relevant voting-eligible Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising and/or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score between good and excellent over the period to be examined; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations over the period to be examined; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, evidence of significant methodological development, or multiple improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work.

2. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising activities and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the good value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating over the period to be examined ; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, evidence of some methodological development, or some improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work.

3. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/academic advising and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement

and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical fair candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, evidence of some methodological development, small improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work.

4. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score below the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, limited evidence of some methodological development, or minimal improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work.

5. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

B. Service

I. Description of Criteria

Service contributions by continuing NTTF (at the Department, College, University, professional organization, and external community levels) through outreach and engagement are important to the overall mission of the University. NTTF will generally provide less service, and will serve in fewer leadership positions than TTF, but their participation in service activities is still a valued and required part of their duties. The Department defines service as the performance of departmental, collegiate, University, professional, and community activities, which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community through projects for mutual benefit; and contributions to an NTTF's profession.

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the Department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession/discipline or external community evolves during a faculty member's academic career. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

1. University Governance
   Leadership positions
   Participation on College committees
   Participation on Department committees
   Participation on University committees
   Attendance at department meetings
   Participation in face-to-face and email regarding departmental governance
   Other University governance activities

2. Professional Activities
   Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
   Leadership positions in professional organizations
   Membership in professional organizations

3. Service Recognition Awards

4. Other Service Activities
   Participation in ceremonies and recognitions
   Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
   Support department programs that provide services to students
   Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
   Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative experiences for students
   Administrative assignments
   Advising student clubs
   Oversee preparation for student competitions
   Editorial boards
   Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
   Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
   Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
   Provide support to external communities for the teaching of economics or in an interdisciplinary course
   External development activities related to the profession of economics.

In general, the evaluation of any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document and include in the dossier any evidence supporting an argument regarding the significance of a service contribution. Such evidence may include minutes from meetings, statements from administrators, letters from external connections, and other documentation of service activity. Such documentation is essential when categorizing the significance of the service contribution (see below).

II. Specific Service Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

"Substantial" or "Major" activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

"Significant" activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring "some" commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the "(a)" condition below, in general they will not contribute to the "(b)" or "(c)" conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the Economics faculty who are eligible to vote on an NTTF's reappointment are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the relevant voting-eligible Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in

professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.

2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.

3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.

4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.

5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

D. Overall Recommendation

I. APRs

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching and service categories to form an overall recommendation. In the case of APRs, each member should choose one of the following statements:

Strongly recommend that the candidate be reappointed.
Recommend that the candidate be reappointed.
Recommend that the candidate not be reappointed.
Strongly recommend that the candidate not be reappointed.

As with the evaluation of teaching and service, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

(1) A candidate receiving a strong recommendation for reappointment will typically have excellent or good teaching performance, and excellent or good service performance.
(2) A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for reappointment will typically have good or fair teaching performance, and good or fair service performance.

(3) A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against reappointment will typically have a teaching or service performance below the level judged fair.
(4) A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against reappointment will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against reappointment.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be reappointed. The results of these votes, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

II. EPRs

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching, research, and service categories to form an overall recommendation. In the case of EPRs, each member should choose one of the following statements:

Strongly recommend that the candidate be reappointed.
Recommend that the candidate be reappointed.
Recommend that the candidate not be reappointed.
Strongly recommend that the candidate not be reappointed.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

(1) A candidate receiving a strong recommendation for reappointment will typically have excellent or good teaching performance, and excellent or good service performance.
(2) A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for reappointment will typically have good or fair teaching performance, and good or fair service performance.
(3) A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against reappointment will typically have a teaching or service performance below the level judged fair.
(4) A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against reappointment will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against reappointment.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be reappointed. The result of these votes, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF APR and EPR Materials

A. APR

Most material used in APRs will have been created and gathered during the previous academic year. These include, but are not limited to, updated Curriculum Vitae and Faculty Service Reports. At the appropriate time, the Chair of the Department will ask the faculty to provide any relevant updates on this information, in the form of either updated materials or short correspondence. These materials should include all evidence on the teaching and service that match the activities described above. The department office will provide detailed information on student evaluations, as well as the form and scale of the student evaluation, and the Department policy pertaining to evaluations.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

B. EPR

The material used in EPRs will be submitted electronically using the standard university system for this purpose. Material to be provided should include, but is not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, recent APRs, and summaries and evidence of teaching and service. The department office will provide detailed information on student evaluations, as well as the form and scale of the student evaluation, and the Department policy pertaining to evaluations.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the NTTF APR Process

For the purposes of transparency and effective signaling to candidates, all voting faculty should participate in the process described above during the APR process. They will transmit their evaluations (both in the 3 areas and overall) to the chair, who will relay this information to the candidate. The Chair will summarize these evaluations as part of an independent evaluation.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards used in NTTF Promotion Review

A. Teaching

I. Description of Criteria

Teaching effectiveness by continuing NTTF is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of NTTF who are under review for reappointment. Performance measures used in the evaluation of teaching include: quality of undergraduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning and scholarship of engagement.

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, evaluators should examine the candidate's entire teaching portfolio, which may contain any of the following:

1. Effective delivery of classroom instruction
   - Student evaluations (required) – using questions and weights specified by the Department's evaluation policy document.
   - Peer evaluations (required).
   - Documented outcome assessment results
   - Evidence of appropriate use of technology, active learning activities, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

2. Effective delivery in Non-Classroom settings; e.g.
   - The results of guiding undergraduate research
   - Materials used and generated from teaching independent studies
   - Documentation of the advising of special projects
   - Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, internships, service learning, and the like)

3. Professional Development and Teaching Support Activity; e.g.
   - Syllabi
   - Teaching philosophy statement
   - Course development
   - Curriculum/program development
   - Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
   - Innovative teaching methods development
   - Professional development related to teaching
   - Textbooks/instructional materials development
   - Supportive letters

Teaching awards
Evidence of instructor mentoring or other teaching leadership activities
Real-world experiences (business experience, consulting, board memberships, etc.) that enhance teaching
Scholarship (publications, scholarly presentations, etc.) that enhances teaching

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, method of delivery, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, number of students, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Furthermore, evaluators should be sensitive to the possibility that students sometimes base their evaluations on inappropriate characteristics of the instructor (age, gender, race, etc.) Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations, and comparisons between candidates and departments should be made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of faculty subject to APRs and EPRs. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. These written evaluations will be provided to the evaluators by the Department administrative staff.

When considering any of the evidence related to teaching, it should be recognized that candidates will generally begin their teaching career with a modest amount of success, and that this success generally will grow over the first years of their career. Moreover, even the most successful candidates may experience uneven success when they attempt to move from basic teaching methods to those that are more demanding of both students and instructors. As instructors gain more experience, they are also encouraged to gradually take on mentoring roles for younger faculty.

II. Specific Teaching Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's teaching record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising and/or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score between good and excellent over the period to be examined; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations over the period to be examined; (3) have an average of more than two non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, evidence of significant methodological development, multiple improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work, or extensive mentoring activities.

2. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising activities and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the good value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating over the period to be examined ; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, evidence of some methodological development, some improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work, or significant mentoring activities.

3. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/academic advising and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical fair candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a small degree of

professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, evidence of some methodological development, small improvements in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work, or some mentoring activities.

4. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score below the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development, minimal improvement in teaching based on real-world experiences or scholarly work, or minimal mentoring activities.

5. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

B. Service

I. Description of Criteria

Service contributions by continuing NTTF (at the Department, College, University, professional organization, and external community levels) through outreach and engagement are important to the overall mission of the University. NTTF will generally provide less service, and will serve in fewer leadership positions than TTF, but their participation in service activities is still a valued and required part of their duties. Moreover, NTTF who desire promotion should expect to increase the level and quality of their service above what prevailed in their first few years with the University. The Department defines service as the performance of departmental, collegiate, University, professional, and community activities, which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community through projects for mutual benefit; and contributions to an NTTF's profession.

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the Department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's

profession/discipline or external community evolves during a faculty member's academic career. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

1. University Governance
   Leadership positions
   Participation on College committees
   Participation on Department committees
   Participation on University committees
   Attendance at department meetings
   Participation in face-to-face and email regarding departmental governance
   Other University governance activities

2. Professional Activities
   Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
   Leadership positions in professional organizations
   Membership in professional organizations

3. Service Recognition Awards

4. Other Service Activities
   Participation in ceremonies and recognitions
   Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
   Support department programs that provide services to students
   Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
   Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative experiences for students
   Administrative assignments
   Advising student clubs
   Oversee preparation for student competitions
   Editorial boards
   Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
   Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
   Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
   Provide support to external communities for the teaching of economics or in an interdisciplinary course
   External development activities related to the profession of economics.

In general, the evaluation of any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document and include in the dossier any evidence supporting an argument regarding the significance of a service contribution. Such evidence may include minutes from meetings, statements from administrators, letters from external connections, and other documentation of service activity. Such documentation is essential when categorizing the significance of the service contribution (see below).

II. Specific Service Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

"Substantial" or "Major" activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

"Significant" activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring "some" commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the "(a)" condition below, in general they will not contribute to the "(b)" or "(c)" conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's service performance, the Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least two Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.

2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least two Department, College, or University committee requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.

3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.

4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.

5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

D. Overall Recommendation

I. Promotion to Lecturer

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching and service (and possibly research) categories to form an overall recommendation. Each member should choose one of the following statements:

Strongly recommend that the candidate be promoted to lecturer.
Recommend that the candidate be promoted to lecturer.
Recommend that the candidate not be promoted to lecturer.
Strongly recommend that the candidate not be promoted to lecturer.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and possibly research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

1. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation for promotion to lecturer will typically have excellent or good teaching performance, and excellent or good service performance.
2. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for promotion to lecturer will typically have good teaching performance, and good or fair service performance.

3. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against promotion to lecturer will typically have only a fair teaching performance, or a good teaching performance combined with an unacceptable service performance.

4. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against promotion to lecturer will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against reappointment.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be reappointed. The result of these votes, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

I. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching and service (and possibly research) categories to form an overall recommendation. Each member should choose one of the following statements:

Strongly recommend that the candidate be promoted to senior lecturer.
Recommend that the candidate be promoted to senior lecturer.
Recommend that the candidate not be promoted to senior lecturer.
Strongly recommend that the candidate not be promoted to senior lecturer.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and possibly research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

1. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation for promotion to senior lecturer will typically have excellent teaching performance, excellent or good service performance.

2. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for promotion to senior lecturer will typically have excellent or good teaching performance, and good service performance.

3. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against promotion to lecturer will typically have a teaching or service performance below the level judged good.

4. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against promotion to lecturer will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against reappointment.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be reappointed. The result of these votes, the tally of

individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of NTTF Promotion Materials

The material used in promotion decisions will be submitted electronically using the standard university system for this purpose. Material to be provided should include, but is not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, recent APRs, and summaries and evidence of teaching, service, and possibly research. The department office will provide detailed information on student evaluations, as well as the form and scale of the student evaluation.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in APRs and EPRs of TTF

A. Teaching

I. Description of Criteria

Teaching effectiveness by continuing TTF is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of TTF who are under review for reappointment. Performance measures used in the evaluation of teaching include: quality of undergraduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning and scholarship of engagement.

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, evaluators should examine the candidate's entire teaching portfolio, which may contain any of the following:

1. Effective delivery of classroom instruction
   - Student evaluations (required) – using questions and weights specified by the Department's evaluation policy document.
   - Peer evaluations (required).
   - Documented outcome assessment results

Evidence of appropriate use of technology, active learning activities, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

2. Effective delivery in Non-Classroom settings; e.g.
   The results of guiding undergraduate research
   Materials used and generated from teaching independent studies
   Documentation of the advising of special projects
   Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, internships, service learning, and the like)

3. Professional Development and Teaching Support Activity; e.g.
   Syllabi
   Teaching philosophy statement
   Course development
   Curriculum/program development
   Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
   Innovative teaching methods development
   Professional development related to teaching
   Textbooks/instructional materials development
   Supportive letters
   Teaching awards

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, method of delivery, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, number of students, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Furthermore, evaluators should be sensitive to the possibility that students sometimes base their evaluations on inappropriate characteristics of the instructor (age, gender, race, etc.) Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations, and comparisons between candidates and departments should be made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of faculty subject to APRs and EPRs. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. These written evaluations will be provided to the evaluators by the Department administrative staff.

When considering any of the evidence related to teaching, it should be recognized that candidates will generally begin their teaching career with a modest amount of success, and that this success generally will grow over the first years of their career. Moreover, even the most

successful candidates may experience uneven success when they attempt to move from basic teaching methods to those that are more demanding of both students and instructors.

II. Specific Teaching Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's teaching record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising and/or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score between good and excellent over the period to be examined; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations over the period to be examined; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.

2. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising activities and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the good value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating over the period to be examined ; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

3. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/academic advising and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical fair candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

4. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score below the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.

5. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

B. Research

I. Description of Criteria

Research effectiveness typically refers to academic work that adds to the body of knowledge in the profession. Unpaid work that leads to reports for internal or external clients can be evaluated under the research component; paid work for external clients cannot be counted under research,

unless the subsequent report has a measurable impact (e.g., an environmental report that subsequently has a policy impact). Grant-funded work can also be evaluated under the research component. The Department defines research as activities that include presentations of the research to other academics; written work that follows the economics profession's pipeline (submission, revise and resubmit, acceptance); written work in a nonacademic setting that provides policy implications for the client or society.

Research activity is an essential part of a TTF's record. Particular emphasis is placed upon publications and presentations juried by professional peers at the regional and national levels. The evaluation of research involves assessing both the quantity and quality of research activity and output. While judgments of research productivity of the candidates are based on the total research record over the period to be considered, it should be recognized that journals' publication process can be cause delays and intermittency in a candidate's research record. Moreover it should be recognized that candidates will generally begin their research career with relatively low productivity, and that this productivity generally grows over the first several years. Also, research performed and published while candidates are at BGSU is given primary emphasis.

Evaluators examine candidates' evidence of research productivity, which may include any of the following:

1. Publications
    - Books (non-textbooks)
    - Journal articles
    - Monographs
2. Presentations
    - Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
    - Proceeding publications
    - Program chair for professional conferences or discussant
3. Other Contributions
    - Published book reviews
    - Published cases
4. Research Recognition
    - Appointment to editorial board of refereed journals
    - Appointment to editorships of refereed journals
    - Attainment of research grants
    - Receipt of research honors and awards
5. Research Support Activities
    - Miscellaneous research support activities
    - Reviewing for journals/conferences
6. Professional Development Activities Related to Research (Institutional Outreach)
7. Work under Review
8. Work in Progress

Evaluators give the greatest weight to refereed publications. Generally, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Our department values collaborative work, and so co-authored papers should not necessarily be discounted, especially if evidence is provided that the author's efforts were essential to the success of the paper. Our department values interdisciplinary work, and so our view is that quality journals can be found in general, field, and specialty journals in Economics or Legal Studies, a journal in another discipline that relates to the candidate's discipline, or an explicitly interdisciplinary journal. Regularly-sized contributions to a journal are given greater weight than "shorter papers", comments, and replies. Articles published in elite, or top quality journals are valued more highly than those in good quality journals, which in turn are valued more highly than those in average quality journals. (Please refer to the Department's current journal classification policies, available from the departmental office, for an explanation of how journals are placed in these categories.) Evaluators should use the Department's classification as a starting point, but should also use their own judgement as to the quality of papers when performing their assessment. Finally, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity (with perhaps some growth with time) is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at one point in the candidate's academic career.

The assessment of research quality involves substantial judgment. Quality is difficult to assess, and involves consideration of the research itself, the channel in which the research is published, and the review process it has undergone. This process requires a careful examination and synthesis of information provided by the candidate regarding activities and publications in addition to knowledge of the quality of the publication outlet. It is therefore important that the department and candidate provide to the evaluators appropriate information regarding the quality of the journals in which publications have appeared, and information about the quality of the specific articles published by the candidate. This information may include statements from journal editors, statements from independent reviewers, citation statistics, journal acceptance rates, impact factor statistics, and other metrics relevant to the evaluation of the publication.

II. Specific Research Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of research activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's research performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's research record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The research performance of candidates for reappointment is eligible to be judged **Excellent** if, over the period being examined, it includes: (a) evidence of quality research including an average of over one publication per year, (more than 1 for APR, more than 3 for EPR) with at least one of the publications being very good in

quality (a journal article rated A or A+, or a comparable research accomplishment); (b) evidence of successful attainment of significant research grant(s), research award(s), presentations of work at national or regional professional meetings, or other research related activities; and (c) multiple examples of work in progress that are likely to lead to future research achievements.

2. The research performance of candidates for reappointment is eligible to be judged **Good** if, over the period being examined, it includes: (a) evidence of quality research including an average of approximately one publication per year (1 or more for APR, 3 or more for EPR), with at least one of the publications being good in quality (a journal article rated B or higher, or a comparable research accomplishment); (b) evidence of the successful attainment of a research grant, or presentations of work at national or regional professional meetings, or other research-related activities; and (c) some evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.

3. The research performance of candidates for reappointment is eligible to be judged **Fair** if, over the period being considered, it includes: (a) demonstration of the ability to conduct research as evidenced by publication (1 for APR, 2 for EPR) in a journal rated in any of the categories in the department's journal list or recent promising submissions of new research to a journal of good quality; (b) evidence of involvement in other endeavors listed in other research-related activities; and (c) some evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.

4. The research performance of candidates for reappointment is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if, over the period being considered, it includes: (a) minimal publication (0 for APR, 1 for EPR) in journals rated in any of the categories in the department's journal list, and the possibility of some submissions of research that do not rise to the standards described in the fair category; and (b) very limited evidence of work in progress that is unlikely to lead to future research achievements.

5. Candidates for reappointment who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

C. Service

I. Description of Criteria

Service contributions by continuing TTF (at the Department, College, University, professional organization, and external community levels) through outreach and engagement are critical to the overall mission of the University. TTF shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community or to the profession. The Department defines service as the performance of departmental, collegiate, University, professional, and community activities, which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community through projects for mutual benefit; and contributions to a TTF's profession.

Given the belief that effectiveness in teaching and a solid research record should be established prior to dedicating considerable time to service, service expectations are modest during the probationary years for TTF. Once teaching effectiveness and a research record is established, and tenure is achieved, service expectations are increased.

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the Department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession/discipline or external community evolves during a faculty member's academic career. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

1. University Governance
   Leadership positions
   Participation on College committees
   Participation on Department committees
   Participation on University committees
   Attendance at department meetings
   Participation in face-to-face and email regarding departmental governance
   Other University governance activities

2. Professional Activities
   Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
   Leadership positions in professional organizations
   Membership in professional organizations

3. Service Recognition Awards

4. Other Service Activities
   Participation in ceremonies and recognitions
   Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
   Support department programs that provide services to students
   Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations

Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative experiences for students
Administrative assignments
Advising student clubs
Oversee preparation for student competitions
Editorial boards
Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
Provide support to external communities for the teaching of economics or in an interdisciplinary course
External development activities related to the profession of economics.

In general, the evaluation of any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

It is the responsibility of the candidate to document and include in the dossier any evidence supporting an argument regarding the significance of a service contribution. Such evidence may include minutes from meetings, statements from administrators, letters from external connections, and other documentation of service activity. Such documentation is essential when categorizing the significance of the service contribution (see below).

II. Specific Service Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

"Substantial" or "Major" activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

"Significant" activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring "some" commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that

seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the "(a)" condition below, in general they will not contribute to the "(b)" or "(c)" conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's service performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.

2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.

3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.

4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.

5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

D. Overall Recommendation

I. APRs

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching, research, and service categories to form an overall recommendation. In the case of APRs, each member should choose one of the following statements:

Recommend that the candidate receive an indication that strong progress is being made towards tenure.

Recommend that the candidate receive an indication that adequate progress is being made towards tenure.

Recommend that the candidate receive an indication that somewhat insufficient progress is being made towards tenure.

Recommend that the candidate receive an indication that clearly insufficient progress is being made towards tenure.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

(1) A candidate receiving a vote of "strong progress" will typically have excellent or good teaching performance, excellent or good research performance, and at least fair performance with respect to service.

(2) A candidate receiving a vote of "adequate progress" will typically have good or fair teaching performance, good or fair research performance, and at least fair performance with respect to service. However, an excellent rating in teaching or research could compensate for a marginally unacceptable rating in a different category.

(3) A candidate receiving a vote of "somewhat insufficient progress" will typically have a teaching or research performance below the level judged fair, or a service performance that is clearly unacceptable.

(4) A candidate receiving a vote of "clearly insufficient progress" will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a vote of "somewhat insufficient progress".

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the departmental evaluators will meet to generate a consensus recommendation as to whether the candidate is, or is not, making adequate progress towards tenure. This recommendation, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

II. EPRs

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching, research, and service categories to form an overall recommendation. In the case of EPRs, each member should choose one of the following statements:

Strongly recommend that the candidate be reappointed.
Recommend that the candidate be reappointed.
Recommend that the candidate not be reappointed.
Strongly recommend that the candidate not be reappointed.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

(1) A candidate receiving a vote of a strong recommendation for reappointment will typically have excellent or good teaching performance, excellent or good research performance, and at least fair performance with respect to service.

(2) A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for reappointment will typically have good or fair teaching performance, good or fair research performance, and at least fair performance with respect to service. However, an excellent rating in teaching or research could compensate for a marginally unacceptable rating in a different category.

(3) A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against reappointment will typically have a teaching or research performance below the level judged fair, or a service performance that is clearly unacceptable.

(4) A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against reappointment will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against reappointment.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be reappointed. The result of these votes, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of TTF APR and EPR Materials

A. APR

Most material used in APRs will have been created and gathered during the previous academic year. These include, but are not limited to, updated Curriculum Vitae and Faculty Service Reports. At the appropriate time, the Chair of the Department will ask the faculty to provide any relevant updates on this information, in the form of either updated materials or short correspondence. These materials should include all evidence on the teaching, research,

and service activities that match the activities described above. The department office will provide detailed information on student evaluations, as well as the form and scale of the student evaluation.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

B. EPR

The material used in EPRs will be submitted electronically using the standard university system for this purpose. Material to be provided should include, but is not limited to, Curriculum Vitae, recent APRs, and summaries and evidence of teaching, service, and possibly research. The department office will provide detailed information on student evaluations, as well as the form and scale of the student evaluation.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the performance reviews under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Unit Faculty Involvement in the TTF APR Process

For the purposes of transparency and effective signaling to candidates, all tenured faculty should participate in the process described above during the APR process. They will transmit their evaluations (both in the 3 areas and overall) to the chair, who will relay this information to the candidate. The Chair will summarize these evaluations as part of an independent evaluation.

Academic Unit Criteria and Standards Used in TTF Tenure and Promotion Review

I. Decisions Regarding Tenure and Promotion from Assistant to Associate

A. Equivalence of Decisions on Tenure, and Promotion of Assistant to Associate

The criteria (evidence to be examined) for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are identical to those for the granting of tenure. Please see the relevant sections below. (See this page, page 34, and page 37.)

The specific standards for each category (teaching, research, and service) for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor are identical to those for the granting of tenure. (See pages 32, 35, and 38.)

The overall recommendation for promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor is identical to those for the granting of tenure. (See page 40.) Thus, a vote on a candidate's tenure decision will also serve as the vote on a candidate's promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor.

B. Teaching

I. Description of Criteria

Teaching effectiveness by continuing TTF is vital to the development and enhancement of the intellectual quality and academic integrity of the University. Achievement in this area is of critical importance to the Department's evaluation of TTF who are under review for tenure and promotion. Performance measures used in the evaluation of teaching include: quality of undergraduate teaching; instructional development; and other contributions to student learning and scholarship of engagement.

Teaching involves activities both inside and outside of the classroom. While the greatest weight is given to classroom teaching, evaluators should examine the candidate's entire teaching portfolio, which may contain any of the following:

1. Effective delivery of classroom instruction
   Student evaluations (required) – using questions and weights specified by the Department's evaluation policy document.
   Peer evaluations (required).
   Documented outcome assessment results
   Evidence of appropriate use of technology, active learning activities, inclusion of service learning, speakers, site visits, and other external resources.

2. Effective delivery in Non-Classroom settings; e.g.
   The results of guiding undergraduate research
   Materials used and generated from teaching independent studies
   Documentation of the advising of special projects
   Oversight of student related activities (directed readings, special studies, internships, service learning, and the like)

3. Professional Development and Teaching Support Activity; e.g.
   Syllabi
   Teaching philosophy statement
   Course development
   Curriculum/program development
   Participation in undergraduate and graduate curricular activities
   Innovative teaching methods development

Professional development related to teaching
Textbooks/instructional materials development
Supportive letters
Teaching awards

While student evaluations are important indicators of effectiveness in the classroom, factors such as the level of the course, method of delivery, whether the course is required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, number of students, time of day, and nature of the evaluation instrument can all affect student ratings. Furthermore, evaluators should be sensitive to the possibility that students sometimes base their evaluations on inappropriate characteristics of the instructor (age, gender, race, etc.) Therefore, judgment should be applied in the interpretation of student evaluations, and comparisons between candidates and departments should be made cautiously.

In addition to student evaluation of the candidate's performance as a teacher, evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance by the candidate's peers is extremely important in providing appropriate evidence of the candidate's ability as a teacher. The department is responsible for performing yearly, systematic peer evaluation of candidates for tenure and promotion. These evaluations will include yearly written evaluation of the candidate's classroom performance and teaching materials, as well as other teaching related activities. These written evaluations will be provided to the evaluators by the Department administrative staff.

II. Specific Teaching Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's teaching record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising and/or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score between good and excellent over the review period ; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations over the review period; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom educational

delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.

2. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising activities and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the good value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating over the review period; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; and (4) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

3. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/academic advising and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical fair candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

4. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable. While evaluators will exercise their

professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score below the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; and (4) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.

5. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

B. Research

I. Description of Criteria

Research effectiveness typically refers to academic work that adds to the body of knowledge in the profession. Unpaid work that leads to reports for internal or external clients can be evaluated under the research component; paid work for external clients cannot be counted under research, unless the subsequent report has a measurable impact (e.g., an environmental report that subsequently has a policy impact). Grant-funded work can also be evaluated under the research component. The Department defines research as activities that include presentations of the research to other academics; written work that follows the economics profession's pipeline (submission, revise and resubmit, acceptance); written work in a nonacademic setting that provides policy implications for the client or society.

Research activity is an essential part of a TTF's record. Particular emphasis is placed upon publications and presentations juried by professional peers at the regional and national levels. The evaluation of research involves assessing both the quantity and quality of research activity and output. While judgments of research productivity of the candidates are based on the total research record, research performed and published while candidates are at BGSU is given greater emphasis.

Evaluators examine candidates' evidence of research productivity, which may include any of the following:

1. Publications
   Books (non-textbooks)
   Journal articles
   Monographs
2. Presentations
   Papers presented at meetings of professional associations not included in the proceedings
   Proceeding publications

Program chair for professional conferences or discussant
3. Other Contributions
   Published book reviews
   Published cases
4. Research Recognition
   Appointment to editorial board of refereed journals
   Appointment to editorships of refereed journals
   Attainment of research grants
   Receipt of research honors and awards
5. Research Support Activities
   Miscellaneous research support activities
   Reviewing for journals/conferences
6. Professional Development Activities Related to Research (Institutional Outreach)
7. Work under Review
8. Work in Progress

Evaluators give the greatest weight to refereed publications. Generally, refereed publications are given greater weight than non-refereed publications. Our department values collaborative work, and so co-authored papers should not necessarily be discounted, especially if evidence is provided that the author's efforts were essential to the success of the paper. Our department values interdisciplinary work, and so our view is that quality journals can be found in general, field, and specialty journals in Economics or Legal Studies, a journal in another discipline that relates to the candidate's discipline, or an explicitly interdisciplinary journal. Regularly-sized contributions to a journal are given greater weight than "shorter papers", comments, and replies. Articles published in elite, or top quality journals are valued more highly than those in good quality journals, which in turn are valued more highly than those in average quality journals. (Please refer to the Department's current journal classification policies, available from the departmental office, for an explanation of how journals are placed in these categories.) Evaluators should use the Department's classification as a starting point, but should also use their own judgement as to the quality of papers when performing their assessment. Finally, a research record that provides evidence of a continuous stream of activity (with perhaps some growth with time) is evaluated more positively than a record showing only a burst of activity at one point in the candidate's academic career.

The assessment of research quality involves substantial judgment. Quality is difficult to assess, and involves consideration of the research itself, the channel in which the research is published, and the review process it has undergone. This process requires a careful examination and synthesis of information provided by the candidate regarding activities and publications in addition to knowledge of the quality of the publication outlet. It is therefore important that the department and candidate provide to the evaluators appropriate information regarding the quality of the journals in which publications have appeared, and information about the quality of the specific articles published by the candidate. This information may include statements from journal editors, statements from independent

reviewers, citation statistics, journal acceptance rates, impact factor statistics, and other metrics relevant to the evaluation of the publication.

II. The Role of External Peer Review

For matters related to the external peer review of research, the department will follow the external review policy which is available from the Office of the Provost.

III. Specific Research Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of research activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's research performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to use their professional judgement to determine which of the following categories the candidate's research record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The research performance of candidates is eligible to be judged **Excellent** if, over the period being examined, it includes: (a) evidence of quality research including an average of over one publication per year, with at least one of the publications being very good in quality (a journal article rated A or A+, or a comparable research accomplishment); or a total of three publications rated A or A+; or a total of two publications rated A+; (b) evidence of successful attainment of significant research grant(s), research award(s), presentations of work at national or regional professional meetings, or other research related activities; and (c) multiple examples of work in progress that are likely to lead to future research achievements.

2. The research performance of candidates is eligible to be judged **Good** if, over the period being examined, it includes: (a) evidence of quality research including an average of approximately one publication per year, with at least one of the publications being good in quality (a journal article rated B or higher, or a comparable research accomplishment); or at least two publications rated A or A+; (b) evidence of the successful attainment of a research grant, or presentations of work at national or regional professional meetings, or other research-related activities; and (c) some evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.

3. The research performance of candidates is eligible to be judged **Fair** if, over the period being considered, it includes: (a) demonstration of the ability to conduct research as evidenced by publishing an average of at least 0.75 refereed journal

articles in a journal rated in any of the categories in the department's journal list; or an average of at least 0.5 such refereed articles supplemented with recent submissions of new research to a journal rated B or higher; (b) evidence of involvement in other endeavors listed in other research-related activities; and (c) modest evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.

4. The research performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if, over the period being considered, it includes: (a) an average of less than 0.75 publications of any quality per year along with minimal submitted research, or an average of less than 0.5 publications of any quality per year with some submitted research; and (b) very limited evidence of work in progress that is unlikely to lead to future research achievements.

5. Candidates for reappointment who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

C. Service

I. Description of Criteria

Service contributions by continuing TTF (at the Department, College, University, professional organization, and external community levels) through outreach and engagement are critical to the overall mission of the University. TTF shall provide evidence of appropriate service to the University community or to the profession. The Department defines service as the performance of departmental, collegiate, University, professional, and community activities, which fall into three domains: involvement in internal affairs and institutional governance; professional expertise shared with the external community through projects for mutual benefit; and contributions to a TTF's profession.

Given the belief that effectiveness in teaching and a solid research record should be established prior to dedicating considerable time to service, service expectations are modest during the probationary years for TTF. Once teaching effectiveness and a research record is established, and tenure is achieved, service expectations are increased.

Participation in activities that benefit students, faculty, the programs, and the mission of the Department and/or College and/or University, as well as service to the candidate's profession/discipline or external community evolves during a faculty member's academic career. Activities considered in the evaluation of the service component include:

1. University Governance
   Leadership positions

Participation on College committees
Participation on Department committees
Participation on University committees
Attendance at department meetings
Participation in face-to-face and email regarding departmental governance
Other University governance activities

2. Professional Activities
   Involvement in activities of professional organizations at the local, regional, and national levels
   Leadership positions in professional organizations
   Membership in professional organizations

3. Service Recognition Awards

4. Other Service Activities
   Participation in ceremonies and recognitions
   Help recruit, retain, advise and place students
   Support department programs that provide services to students
   Facilitate site visits for courses or student organizations
   Support study abroad, internship, and cooperative experiences for students
   Administrative assignments
   Advising student clubs
   Oversee preparation for student competitions
   Editorial boards
   Unpaid professional consulting to government or other nonprofit organizations
   Work with agencies external to the University in an area of importance to the community and the academic unit.
   Development of educational opportunities that connect with external communities
   Provide support to external communities for the teaching of economics or in an interdisciplinary course
   External development activities related to the profession of economics.

In general, the evaluation of any particular University governance activity, professional activity, or other service activity varies by the nature of the assignment, the degree of involvement/time/leadership required by the candidate, the level of involvement, and the tasks/accomplishments of the committee. Further, significant participation can be defined in terms of the quantity and quality of service activities.

It is the responsibility of the candidate and department to document and include in the dossier any evidence supporting an argument regarding the significance of a service contribution. Such evidence may include minutes from meetings, statements from administrators, letters from external connections, and other documentation of service activity. Such documentation is essential when categorizing the significance of the service contribution (see below).

II. Specific Service Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

"Substantial" or "Major" activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

"Significant" activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring "some" commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the "(a)" condition below, in general they will not contribute to the "(b)" or "(c)" conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's service performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) spend at least 3 academic years serving on a (single or combination of) Department, College, or University committees requiring substantial commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a major contribution to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.

2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) spend at least 3 academic years on a (single or combination of) Department, College, or University committees requiring at least a significant commitment of time and energy; and (c) make a significant contribution to Departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.

3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time and energy.

4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time and energy.

5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

D. Overall Recommendation

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching, research, and service categories to form an overall recommendation. Each member should choose one of the following statements:

A strong recommendation that the candidate be granted Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

A standard recommendation that the candidate be granted Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

A standard recommendation that the candidate not be granted Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

A strong recommendation that the candidate not be granted Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the evaluators should recall that teaching and research are considered to be central to the University's mission, and thus carry more weight than service in their evaluation of candidates. Therefore, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

a. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor will typically have excellent teaching performance and good research performance, good teaching and excellent research performance, or excellent performance in both teaching and research; and at least fair performance with respect to service.

b. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for tenure and promotion to associate professor will typically meet the following combination of performance ratings:

i. Good in teaching and research, and fair or better in service.

Two alternative, but relatively rare combinations are also possible:

ii. Excellent in teaching, fair in research, and fair or better in service;

iii. Excellent in research, fair in teaching, and fair or better in service;

These combinations allow that a candidate may achieve an extraordinary degree of excellence in one category that compensates for a less than impressive performance in another.

However, it should be noted that a candidate who has merely one performance category rated as good, along with other performance categories rated fair or lower, may very well not rise to the level that justifies a standard recommendation for tenure.

c. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against tenure and promotion to associate professor will typically have a teaching or research performance below the level judged fair, or a service performance that is clearly unacceptable.

d. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against tenure and promotion to associate professor will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against tenure.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be tenured and promoted. The result of this vote, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

II. Decisions Regarding Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

A. Criteria for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The criteria (evidence to be examined) for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are identical to those for the granting of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate. For the sake of brevity they are not repeated here. Please see the relevant sections above. All of the evidence to be examined for the promotion from Associate Professor to Professor shall be limited to the most recent six year period.

B. Standards for Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

The standards for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor are somewhat different from those for the granting of tenure and promotion from Assistant to Associate. In general they require leadership or mentoring roles in teaching, leadership positions in service, and the development of a significant research reputation. They are described in some detail below:

1. Specific Teaching Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of teaching activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's teaching performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's teaching record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve excellent success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) achieve excellent success in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising and/or teaching development activities. Recognitions such as awards for outstanding teaching are additional evidence of excellence in teaching. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical excellent candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score between good and excellent over the period to be examined; (2) have a mixture of good and excellent peer evaluations over the period to be examined; (3) have an average of more than one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; (4) have a record of substantial curricular development and evaluation and/or teaching mentorship over the period to be examined; and (5) have a high degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at multiple developmental conferences, new course development, or evidence of significant methodological development.

2. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Good** if, when compared with Economics faculty members with the same or similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve a high degree of success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/ academic advising activities and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical good candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the good value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the good rating over the period to be examined ; (3) have an average of about one non-classroom educational delivery activity per semester; (4) have a record of significant

curricular development and evaluation and/or teaching mentorship over the period to be examined; and (5) have a significant degree of professional development, as evidenced by an award, attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

3. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience, they: (a) achieve moderate success in classroom teaching as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and students; and (b) participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/academic advising and/or teaching development activities. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical fair candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score near the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average near the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; (4) have a record of limited curricular development and evaluation and/or teaching mentorship over the period to be examined; and (5) have a small degree of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference, participation in new course development, or evidence of some methodological development.

4. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they fail to achieve at least moderate success in classroom teaching, as indicated by evaluations made by the Department Chair, their colleagues, and their students, when compared to those in the Economics Department with similar amounts of experience. While candidates may participate significantly and effectively in non-classroom teaching/advising activities, this alone is not adequate to allow them to be classified as higher than Marginally Unacceptable. Candidates who fail to achieve more than moderate success in the classroom must participate in professional development activities related to teaching if their performance is to be classified as other than Clearly Unacceptable. While evaluators will exercise their professional judgement and some amount of tradeoff is possible among the following categories, a typical marginally unacceptable candidate will: (1) have an average student evaluation score below the "average" value over the period to be examined; (2) have peer evaluations with an average below the "average" rating over the period to be examined; (3) have limited evidence of non-classroom educational delivery activity; (4) have a record of no curricular development and evaluation and/or teaching mentorship over the period to be examined; and (5) have a minimal amount of professional development, as evidenced by attendance at a developmental conference or limited evidence of some methodological development.

5. The teaching performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if it does not meet the requirements to be classified as Marginally Unacceptable.

II. Specific Research Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of research activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's research performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's research record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The research performance of candidates is eligible to be judged **Excellent** if, over the period being examined, it includes: (a) evidence of quality research including an average of over one publication per year, with at least two of the publications being very good in quality (journal articles rated A or A+, or a comparable research accomplishment); or a total of four publications rated A or A+; or a total of three publications rated A+; (b) evidence of successful attainment of substantial research grant(s), research award(s), presentations of work at national or regional professional meetings, or other research related activities; and (c) multiple examples of work in progress that are likely to lead to future research achievements.

2. The research performance of candidates is eligible to be judged **Good** if, over the period being examined, it includes: (a) evidence of quality research including an average of approximately one publication per year, with at least two of the publications being good in quality (a journal article rated B or higher, or a comparable research accomplishment); or at least three publications rated A or A+; (b) evidence of the successful attainment of a research grant, or presentations of work at national or regional professional meetings, or other research-related activities; and (c) some evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.

3. The research performance of candidates is eligible to be judged **Fair** if, over the period being considered, it includes: (a) demonstration of the ability to conduct research as evidenced by publishing an average of at least 0.75 refereed journal articles in a journal rated in any of the categories in the department's journal list; (b) evidence of involvement in other endeavors listed in other research-related activities; and (c) modest evidence of work in progress that is likely to lead to future research achievements.

4. The research performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if, over the period being considered, it includes: (a) less than an average of 0.75 publications of any quality per year; and (b) very limited evidence of work in progress that is unlikely to lead to future research achievements.

5. Candidates for reappointment who do not meet the requirements for Marginally Unacceptable are judged **Clearly Unacceptable** in research.

III. Specific Service Standards (to be applied to preceding criteria)

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. For the purposes of this document, service activities can be placed into 4 groups:

"Substantial" or "Major" activities should be those in the top quarter of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, leadership, and importance of accomplishment;

"Significant" activities are those in the second quartile of faculty service activities in terms of time and effort commitment, leadership, and importance of accomplishment;

Activities denoted as requiring "some" commitment should be those that are in the third quartile with respect to time, effort, leadership, and accomplishment.

The bottom quartile of service activities should be reserved for activities that require little effort or commitment. These may include mere attendance at meetings, participation in groups that seldom meet and meet only briefly, or membership in committees that cede nearly all duties to the leadership. While activities in this group may help satisfy the "(a)" condition below, in general they will not contribute to the "(b)" or "(c)" conditions.

The following standards are applied in the evaluation of service activities. As they are likely to be the evaluators with the most knowledge regarding the candidate's service performance, the tenured Economics faculty are arguably well-positioned to determine which of the following categories the candidate's service record satisfies. Evaluators at other levels should be able to apply these standards themselves, follow the logic employed by the tenured Economics faculty, and make their own important and independent assessment.

1. The service performance of candidates is judged **Excellent** if they: (a) effectively participate in basic departmental governance and service activities; (b) spend at least 4 academic years serving on a (single or combination of) Department, College, or University committees requiring substantial commitment of time, energy, or leadership; and (c) make major contributions to departmental, College, or University governance and/or hold major office in professional associations at the regional or national level and/or make outstanding contributions in a professional activity or in another service activity listed.

2. The service performance of candidates is judged **Good** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; (b) spend at least 4 academic years on a (single or combination of) Department, College, or University committees requiring at least a significant commitment of time, energy, or

leadership; and (c) make a significant contribution to Departmental, College, or University governance or to professional associations at the regional or national level or participate in exemplary fashion in at least one professional activity or other service activity as listed.

3. The service performance of candidates is judged **Fair** if they: (a) effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities; and (b) each year serve on at least two Department, College, or University committee requiring at least some commitment of time, energy, and leadership.

4. The service performance of candidates is judged **Marginally Unacceptable** if they effectively participate in departmental governance and service activities, but do not serve each year on at least one Department, College, or University committee requiring some commitment of time, energy, and leadership.

5. The service performance of candidates is judged **Clearly Unacceptable** if they do not effectively participate in departmental governance and support activities.

C. Overall Recommendation

Each evaluator shall use their evaluations in the teaching, research, and service categories to form an overall recommendation. Each member should choose one of the following statements:

A strong recommendation that the candidate be promoted to Professor.
A standard recommendation that the candidate be promoted to Professor.
A standard recommendation that the candidate not be promoted to Professor.
A strong recommendation that the candidate not be promoted to Professor.

As with the evaluation of teaching, service, and research, each evaluator should use their professional judgement when choosing their recommendation. However, the evaluators should recall that teaching and research are considered to be central to the University's mission, and thus carry more weight than service in their evaluation of candidates. Therefore, the following guidelines should be kept in mind:

a. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation for promotion to professor will typically have excellent teaching performance and good research performance, good teaching and excellent research performance, or excellent performance in both teaching and research; and at least fair performance with respect to service.

b. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation for promotion to professor will typically meet the following combination of performance ratings:

i. Good in teaching and research, and fair or better in service.

Two alternative, but relatively rare combinations are also possible:

ii. Excellent in teaching, fair in research, and fair or better in service;

iii. Excellent in research, fair in teaching, and fair or better in service;

These combinations allow that a candidate may achieve a high degree of excellence in one category that compensates for a less than impressive performance in another.

However, it should be noted that a candidate who has merely one performance category rated as good, along with other performance categories rated fair or lower, may very well not rise to the level that justifies a standard recommendation for promotion to professor.

c. A candidate receiving a standard recommendation against promotion to professor will typically have a teaching or research performance below the level judged fair, or a service performance that is clearly unacceptable.

d. A candidate receiving a strong recommendation against tenure and promotion to associate professor will have levels of performance that do not rise to the level typical for a standard recommendation against promotion to professor.

These individual recommendations will be tallied, and the results will be reported to the departmental evaluators. Each of the departmental evaluators will then vote yes or no as to whether the candidate should be promoted. The result of these votes, the tally of individual recommendations, and a summary of the evaluations for each category, will be transmitted to the Chair of the Department.

Academic Unit Procedures for Creation and Submission of Tenure and Promotion Materials

1. TTF faculty who wish to be considered for tenure promotion to Professor should contact the Chair of the Department during the year before the review will occur, as outlined by the C.B.A and the Office of the Provost.

2. The Tenure and/or Promotion Review process requires that the TTF member compile a dossier (with the help of the Department office) consisting of his/her curriculum vitae (CV), all APRs for the period being considered if applicable, a summary of any EPRs performed during the period being considered, and the following additional supporting materials:

    a. Teaching
        i. Student evaluations, as well as the form and scale of the evaluations, and the

Department policy pertaining to evaluations.
(provided by department office).

ii. Peer evaluations (required for promotion to professor, provided by department office).
iii. List of courses taught.
iv. Teaching philosophy statement.
v. Lists and documentation of accomplishments of guided undergraduate research, thesis research, independent studies, directed readings, service learning supervision, and special projects, if any.
vi. Evidence of teaching awards, if any.
vii. Evidence of course development and/or program development, if any.
viii. Evidence of professional development related to teaching, or the acquisition of innovative teaching methods, if any.
ix. Evidence of Textbooks/instructional materials development, if any.
x. Letters of support, if any.

b. Service
   i. A listing of all University, College, and Department committees on which they serve or have served, any leadership roles in the committee, and the accomplishments of the committee. If the candidate would like these accomplishments to be considered "major" or "substantial" (see service criteria for definitions), supporting documentation should be provided.
   ii. A listing of the professional organizations with which they are members, any accomplishments or activities engaged in, and any leadership roles.
   iii. A listing and brief description of any service recognition awards, or other service activities performed.

c. Research
   i. A listing of Publications, Presentations, Published book reviews or cases, Research Recognitions, Research Support Activities, Professional Development Activities Related to Research, Work under Review, and Work in Progress. Documentation related to the quality of the work may be included as part of the list, or attached separately when more convenient.
   ii. External reviews, conducted in accordance with the guidelines described above, will be added to the research documentation by the department office and chair.

The schedule and deadlines necessary for completing the evaluations under this section shall comply with the timelines required by the Office of the Provost/VPAA.

Approved by the Department of Economics

Chair _____ Date 5/22/18

Reviewed by the Dean _____ Date 5/31/18

✓ concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):

Reviewed by the SVPAA/Provost _____ Date 6/4/18

X concur _____ do not concur for the following reason(s):