Department of Economics

College of Liberal Arts

Auburn University

November 2011

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT, ANNUAL REVIEW, AND PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES
Pages 1-4 Approved 8/24/09, Updated 9/30/11

The Department of Economics Faculty Development and Evaluation Manual supplements and complements the Auburn University Faculty Handbook and College of Liberal Arts guidelines. Since the basic and fundamental review of faculty takes place within the department, the purpose of these guidelines is to describe and elaborate upon the criteria and guidelines for faculty assignments, faculty evaluation, and promotion and tenure at the departmental level. Department guidelines are intended to conform to those of the Auburn University Faculty Handbook (revised 6/17/11) and the College of Liberal Arts. Therefore, it is important for faculty to study carefully the criteria, requirements, and procedures outlined in these guidelines and in the University and College documents. In event of conflict among documents, their precedence is University, College, Department. Any reference to the Faculty Handbook in this document refers to the current version.

The Economics Department's faculty evaluation process is intended to guide faculty toward enhanced success; clarify faculty goals; inform annual assignments that reflect the short and long-term vision of the department; include faculty in discussions and decisions; and provide consistent and clear criteria for promotion and tenure recommendations, as applicable.

The faculty evaluation process in the College of Liberal Arts includes several components, among them the letter of appointment, annual workload assignment, and annual performance reviews and feedback. Tenure track and Clinical track positions include provision for promotion review. Tenure track faculty are subject to a third-year review to determine the extent to which the individual is making clear progress toward tenure. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in teaching, research, outreach, and service (as applicable to the faculty member's assignment) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance at any time before tenure. The focus of the third-year review for clinical track faculty is the faculty member's progress toward achieving promotion to associate clinical professor, yet still recognizing that clinical faculty are on continuing appointments that necessitate annual contract renewal. Failure to demonstrate clear progress in assigned areas of performance (such as clinical teaching, clinical outreach, service, scholarship, professional development) may lead to the issuance of a letter of non-continuance, effective at the conclusion of the annual contract in force.

Reference to "Tenure track" faculty in this document includes tenured faculty, unless otherwise noted.

<u>The Appointment Letter</u>

The appointment letter defines broad expectations of the position, including percentages of the assignment allocated to teaching, research, outreach, and service. Examples of appointment letters may be found at the following URL:
https://sites.auburn.edu/academic/COLA/CLA_Dean/cladeptguidelines/SitePages/Home.aspx

<u>Annual Workload Assignment</u>

Annual faculty assignments reflect that faculty members working in various disciplines contribute in different ways. Annual assignment plans reflect collaborative discussion between faculty and department chair. They provide opportunity to review progress, set goals, guide faculty toward success, and clarify metrics of evaluation. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

The College of Liberal Arts Workload Guidelines state:

Initial workload assignments for tenure-track faculty (TTF) are negotiated upon hire, and are distributed across all areas of responsibility; teaching, research/creative scholarly works, outreach, extension and service. Occasionally, administrative duties may also be included as a percent of a faculty member's workload if it is part of their normal assignment. Workload assignments may be adjusted on an annual basis during the annual review process to reflect any changes in a faculty member's assignment for the following year. The department head/chair meets with each faculty member during the faculty annual review process to discuss and negotiate anticipated workload changes. The faculty member signs the annual review which includes the stated workload assignment for the following year to assure that every faculty member is aware of his/her responsibilities. The original signed annual review is to be kept in the departmental personnel file. Three copies are to be submitted to the Office of the Dean (one copy will be kept on file in the Dean's Office, one copy will be placed in the CLA's faculty personnel file and one copy will be delivered to the Office of the Provost).

Description of Types of Faculty Positions

Tenure Track Faculty (TTF)

The "typical" annual teaching assignment for "research active" TTF is 5 courses[1] (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 62.5% per year. Consistent with university guidelines, all research active TTF are assigned a minimum 25% research/creative/scholarly outreach[2] workload for promotion and tenure purposes. The annual teaching assignment for "highly productive" research TTF is 4 courses[3] (or department FTE equivalent) equaling 50% per year. The status of highly productive research TTF requires the approval of the Dean. In situations where a tenured associate professor or professor is not fulfilling a 25% requirement for scholarly activity, the department chair will provide a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to ensure that a tenured faculty member has a 100% workload. In this case, the faculty member would be assigned a differential workload with a minimum of 10% research, in order to stay current in the field for teaching purposes. It is expected that the faculty member will receive an increase in the teaching load, with the understanding that he/she cannot be promoted just on teaching. Research productivity will be considered over a 3 year period. If a faculty member is not research productive for 3 years, then there will be an increase in the teaching load proportionally. During that 3-year period, if he/she does becomes productive and demonstrates that he/she can be productive for 3 years in research, then there will be a reduction in the teaching load to acknowledge the increase in research.

Clinical Track Faculty (CTF)

CTF are generally assigned teaching loads ranging from 5-8 courses a year (or department FTE equivalent). There is not a minimum research workload requirement. According to AU guidelines[4] the clinician title series is a professional series for appointment of appropriately qualified individuals who contribute to the university's academic mission by participation in activities which (1) predominantly involve clinical practice, (2) are of contractually specified duration, and (3) operate under contracts, grants, generated income, or other designated funds. Note, however, that CTF are expected to teach in the clinical setting.

Instructors/Lecturers

Instructors and Lecturers will be assigned 100% teaching loads of 8 courses per year. Any exceptions will need approval by the Dean. In addition to the definition of teaching stated in the faculty handbook, teaching in CLA includes: holding regular office hours, mentoring and advising students, keeping current in the field, attendance of departmental meetings relevant to teaching, participating in departmental life and the engagement of students.

Non-Tenure-Track Faculty (NTTF – as designated by HR)

NTTF may be assigned some teaching; but it cannot exceed one course per semester and three courses per year.

Appendix 1 outlines the university's expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

---

[1] A course is defined as a 3 contact hour course.

[2] "In terms of your questions, it is my understanding that the former Provost said that a tenure track faculty member on hire must have a minimum of 25% research, scholarship of pedagogy or outreach, or creative activity. Therefore, I will continue that tradition." - Email from Dr. Mazey sent to Paula Bobrowski 5/10/2009.

[3] Ibid.

[4] http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/clinician_positions.html#appointment

Workload adjustment for sabbaticals and leaves. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to teaching would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% teaching appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. Faculty on sabbatical or professional development leave related to research would normally be evaluated as a temporary 100% research appointment for leave extending across the evaluation period. A similar allocation may apply for other types of leave. In any case, the evaluation metrics must add up to 100% and factor in the faculty member's regular appointment during the portion of the review period not on leave.

See Appendix 2 for Departmental Workload Guidelines.

Annual Performance Reviews and Feedback

The annual review serves as a tool for faculty development at all ranks, regardless of tenure status.

All faculty receive annual evaluations. All Tenure track faculty, Clinical track faculty, Non-Tenure track faculty, Instructors, and Lecturers should participate in formalized annual assignment planning and feedback.

Performance Descriptors. The annual review of performance in each area to which one is assigned will be assessed a performance score of 4 - Exemplary (characterizing performance of high merit), 3 - Exceeds Expectations (characterizing performance of merit), 2 - Meets Expectations (characterizing performance sufficient to justify continuation but, for areas of expected significant contribution, not sufficient to justify promotion or tenure), 1 – Marginal (characterizing performance that may not be sufficient to justify continuation) or 0 – Unacceptable (characterizing performance not sufficient to justify continuation).

See Appendix 3 for Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart.

The annual review normally covers performance for the preceding calendar year. Research productivity will be considered over a 3-year period. Evaluative statements from previous years will be consulted to determine response to previous suggestions for improvement and to determine the extent to which the individual is making progress toward promotion and tenure, if applicable, to their appointment.

See Appendix 4 for Departmental Annual Review Guidelines.

Written evaluation report

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

The unit head shall prepare a written report summarizing the major points of the conference. A copy of the report shall be provided to the faculty member within a month of the conference. If there are no objections, the faculty member shall be asked to sign it as confirmation of having seen it. If the faculty member does not agree with the material in the report, he or she may write a response to be appended to the report. A copy of the signed report and response, if there is one, is to be retained for the faculty member's departmental personnel file; another copy is to be given to the faculty member; a third copy is sent to the Office of the Provost. To the extent permitted by law, the report is to remain confidential, available only for the use of the concerned faculty member and any University officials who have supervisory power over the faculty member.

Third-Year Review

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Each department shall conduct a third year review of all its probationary faculty members. This shall take place no later than 32 months after initial appointment, normally before April 30 of the faculty member's third year. The head shall request a current vita and any supporting material the head or the faculty member deems appropriate prior to the review. The particular focus of this review is the faculty member's progress toward achieving tenure. The review therefore must address the criteria for tenure set forth in this document. To be maximally useful to the candidate and the department, the review shall involve the entire tenured faculty. In order for it to accurately reveal the judgment of tenured faculty, it shall conclude with a vote on whether or not, in the judgment of the tenured faculty, the candidate is making appropriate progress toward tenure. The result of the vote shall be announced at the meeting. Faculty should understand that this vote is not a commitment to grant or deny tenure in the future.

The head shall prepare a written report covering the findings of the review, and characterizing the nature of the vote. The procedure described above for the report on the yearly conference shall be followed, with the difference that this report may be consulted by the tenured faculty when the faculty member is a candidate for tenure; otherwise, the report is to remain confidential [to the extent allowable by law].

See Appendix 5 for Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines.

<u>Promotion and Tenure Review</u>

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of 1) teaching and/or outreach and 2) research/creative work. He or she is further expected to demonstrate over a sustained period distinctive achievement in one of these areas or achievement in both areas comparable to that of successful candidates in the discipline in the past five years. In addition, he or she is expected to have contributed some service to the University. Candidates covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines will be evaluated accordingly. For candidates not covered by Provost approved departmental promotion and tenure guidelines, the criteria for teaching, research/creative work, and outreach described below [see Appendix 1] shall be considered by the faculty in the evaluation of a candidate's performance and achievement. The candidate's employment conditions and academic assignments shall determine which criteria are most emphasized, and standards for promotion are based on the weights of each performance area as described in the letter of offer and subsequent annual evaluations. Credit shall also be given for contributions above and beyond specifically assigned duties.

Appendix 1 outlines the university’s expectations for teaching, research, outreach, and service.

Regarding tenure, the AU Faculty Handbook states:

Auburn University nurtures and defends the concept of academic tenure which assures each faculty member freedom, without jeopardy at the department, college or school, or University level, to criticize and advocate changes in existing theories, beliefs, programs, policies, and institutions and guarantees faculty members the right to support, without jeopardy, any colleague whose academic freedom is threatened. Tenure establishes an environment in which truth can be sought and expressed in one's teaching, research/creative work, outreach work, and service. In addition to demonstrating quality in the areas of 1) teaching, 2) research/creative work, 3) outreach and 4) service as described above under Promotion Criteria and, where applicable, in approved departmental guidelines, the candidate for tenure must also demonstrate potential to contribute as a productive and collegial member of the academic unit in all relevant areas.

Candidates for promotion and tenure should carefully read the Promotion and Tenure policies found in the AU Faculty Handbook. A timeline for the candidate’s submission of materials for evaluation for promotion and tenure will be established each year by the Office of the Provost.

See Appendix 6 for Departmental Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

<u>Post-Tenure Review</u>

Tenured faculty at Auburn are subject to post-tenure review as outlined on the Provost’s website at the following URL: http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies/2009-11_post-tenured-review-policy.pdf

Appendix 1

Auburn University's Expectations for Teaching, Research, Outreach, and Service

Teaching
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> Since a primary activity of the University is the instruction of students, careful evaluation of teaching is essential. Because of the difficulty of evaluating teaching effectiveness, faculty members are urged to consider as many relevant measures as possible in appraising the candidate. These include consideration of the candidate's knowledge of the subject and his or her professional growth in the field of specialization; the candidate's own statement of his or her teaching philosophy; the quality of the candidate's teaching as indicated by peer and student evaluations and teaching awards; performance of the candidate's students on standardized tests or in subsequent classes; the candidate's contributions to the academic advising of students; the candidate's development of new courses and curricula; the quality of the candidate's direction of dissertations, theses, independent study projects, etc.; and the quality of pedagogical material published by the candidate.

Research/Creative Work
The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> A faculty member engaged in research/creative work has an obligation to contribute to his or her discipline through applied and/or basic research, through creative endeavors, or through interpretive scholarship. To a large extent, each discipline and each department must determine how much and what quality of research/creative work is appropriate for promotion (and/or tenure) and judge its candidates accordingly. In appraising the candidate's work, faculty members should consider the quality and significance of the work, the quality of the outlet for publication or exhibition, and, in cases of collaborative work, the role of the candidate.
>
> Research and creative work ordinarily can be documented by a candidate's publications or performances/exhibitions. Publication subjected to critical review by other scholars as a condition of publication should carry more weight than publication that is not refereed. Nevertheless, all forms of publication, including articles intended for a non-academic audience, should be considered provided they are of high quality in relation to the purpose intended. Scholarly papers subjected to peer review and delivered at a regional or national conference and creative work subjected to peer review and performed or exhibited on a regional or national level should carry more weight than work done only on a local level.
> Successful efforts in obtaining extramural support for research/creative work (as well as for teaching and outreach programs) should also be positively considered in evaluation of the candidate.

Outreach

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> Outreach refers to the function of applying academic expertise to the direct benefit of external audiences in support of university and unit missions. A faculty endeavor may be regarded as outreach scholarship for purposes of tenure and promotion if all the following conditions are met: 1) there is a substantive link with significant human needs and societal problems, issues or concerns; 2) there is a direct application of knowledge to significant human needs and societal problems, issues, or concerns; 3) there is utilization of the faculty member's academic and professional expertise; 4) the ultimate purpose is for the public or common good; 5) new knowledge is generated for the discipline and/or the audience or clientele; and 6) there is a clear link/relationship between the program/activities and an appropriate academic unit's mission. Outreach is not expected of all faculty. Participation in this function varies from major, continuing commitments, as is the case with the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, through intermittent engagement for individual faculty as needs and opportunities for a particular expertise arise, to no involvement at all.
>
> The commitment of faculty time to outreach is a decision to be made by the faculty member with the approval of the department in which the faculty member will seek tenure and/or promotion. It may be accomplished in the initial appointment, as is typically the case for Extension faculty, in annual work plans, or during the year in response to unexpected needs. In any case, this decision should be made with due consideration to the professional development of the faculty member, the expected public benefits of the outreach activities, and mission of the department and/or other supporting units. Departmental approval carries a commitment to assess and appropriately weigh outreach contributions in salary, tenure, and promotion recommendations.
>
> Demands for quality in outreach are the same as in teaching and research/creative work; however, outreach activities are different in nature from other activities and must be evaluated accordingly. See Appendix 1 of Faculty Participation in Outreach Scholarship: An Assessment Model, which is available along with other publications on the assessment of outreach under "Outreach Publications" on the University web site. Department heads should request any material necessary from the candidate to facilitate faculty assessment of the type, quality, and effectiveness of the candidate's involvement in extension activities and evaluation of any resulting publications.

Service

The AU Faculty Handbook states:

> University service includes participating in departmental, college or school, and University governance and committee work, assisting in the recruitment of new faculty, and developing and assisting in the implementation of new academic programs. Faculty should note particularly distinctive contributions to University life on the part of the candidate, including service to the candidate's profession, such as offices held and committee assignments performed for professional associations and learned societies; and editorships and the refereeing of manuscripts.

Appendix 2

Departmental Workload Guidelines

The workload guidelines for the Department of Economics generally follows the workload guidelines set forth by the College of Liberal Arts. Specifically, one three-hour course taught to a standard (up to 50 students) class counts as 12.5% of a 100% work load requirement. This is typically broken down into 10% for work related directly to the classroom and 2.5% for service related work associated with teaching the class.

A "research active" tenure track faculty member (see Appendix 4 for the definition of "research active") is expected to teach five such courses per year. A "highly research-productive" tenure track faculty member (see Appendix 4 for the definition of "highly research-productive") is expected to teach four such courses per year. A tenured faculty member who is not research active (see Appendix 4 for the definition of "non-research active") is expected to teach six or more such courses per year. Full-time instructors and lecturers are expected to teach eight such courses per year.

Not all classes taught by the departmental faculty are standard; hence the following adjustment is made for class size: The first large (150+ student) section of a given course taught by a specific faculty member in a given semester counts as two standard classes taught; additional sections in that course, or smaller classes taught by the faculty member that semester continue count as only one course each.

Research, service, and outreach expectations are outlined in Appendix 4. The percentage allocation of work effort will be divided among the four categories, teaching research, service, and outreach so as to total 100%. The following examples illustrate the principle: A typical work load allocation for a "research active" TTF might be: Teaching – 62.5%, Research – 32.5%, Service – 5%, and Outreach – 0%. For a "highly research-productive" TTF, it might be: Teaching – 50%, Research – 45%, Service – 5%, and Outreach – 0%. For a Non- research active TTF, it might be: Teaching – 75%, Research – 10%, Service – 15%, and Outreach – 0%. For an instructor, it would be: Teaching – 100%.

The Undergraduate Programs Officer and the Graduate Programs Officer may be eligible for some course relief from their teaching requirements in view of this time consuming service contribution to the Department. The Department Chair also carries a reduced teaching load (to be negotiated with the Dean) based on the heavy administrative and service loads associated with the position.

Overload Guidelines:

A faculty member may teach one overload (including credit-granting distance education courses) per semester or up to two overloads a year if she/he has met or exceeds expectations on all assignments on the most recent faculty annual review. Faculty members given additional financial support for research or other activities are normally restricted from teaching overloads. Likewise, untenured tenure-track faculty and part-time instructional faculty are normally restricted from teaching overloads.

All courses to be taught as overloads must be approved by the chair, dean, and the provost's office. Every course (including a distance education course) that is taught as an overload is normally required to meet the enrollment minimums set forth by university policy. If an under-enrolled course is to be offered as an overload, it must obtain approval of the dean no later than one week prior to the start of the course. Types of courses that are not eligible for overload compensation are directed studies, thesis and dissertation hours, non-credit courses, internships, study abroad and practicum courses. Course overloads are prohibited during the summer semester.

Appendix 3

Workload Distribution and Performance Review Chart

DEPARTMENT (insert name here)											
Faculty	**Instruction**		**Research**		**Outreach**		**Service**		**Administrative**		**TOTAL SCORE**
Name	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	Workload %	Performance Score	
Example											
Dr. X	*0.63*	*4*	*0.25*	*3*	*0.07*	*3*	*0.05*	*3*	*0*	*0*	*3.63*
							Performance Score/Criteria				
							0	**Unacceptable**			
							1	**Marginal**			
							2	**Meets expectations**			
							3	**Exceeds expectations**			
							4	**Exemplary**			

Appendix 4

Departmental Annual Review Guidelines

The Department of Economics evaluates each of the four workload categories (research, teaching, service, and outreach) using the following numerical scale:

- Exemplary : 4
- Exceeds Expectations : 3
- Meets Expectations : 2
- Marginal : 1
- Unacceptable : 0

Occasionally, half points are awarded (such as 2.5 or 3.5) when an individual is truly borderline between two categories. If a faculty member has a zero percent workload allocation for a particular category, then no evaluation needs to be performed for that category. An overall score is calculated via a weighted average across the four categories using the workload percentages as weights. The chair should either meet with each faculty member or provide each faculty member with a draft copy of their annual evaluation before it is finalized. The chair shall make available the (anonymous) distribution of evaluations for each of the workload categories and the overall score. All faculty undergo annual evaluation. An unfavorable annual review for tenure-track faculty may result in a letter of non-continuation at any time before tenure.

Research

Research is evaluated over a rolling three-year window. Peer-reviewed academic journal articles are the main basis for evaluation, but the Department also places limited value on the publication of books (or chapters) and academic conference presentations. Pedagogically-oriented publications should be evaluated under Teaching. Publications should also be relevant to the discipline of Economics. The acceptance date of a publication generally determines its inclusion in the three-year window. It is the responsibility of the faculty member in the annual report to explain and document research accomplishments to the Chair.

The following characterizations are based on the average article characteristics as defined in Part I of Appendix 8, under the heading of ***Research***. Articles that deviate significantly from those characteristics should result in appropriate adjustments. Furthermore, the following measures apply to faculty with research weights of more than fifteen percent.

- Category 2 (Meets Expectations). The faculty member should be engaged in research activities equivalent to two (2) peer-reviewed academic journal articles during the three-year period. This is based on the average article characteristics in Appendix 8.

- Category 3 (Exceeds Expectations). The faculty member should be engaged in research activities equivalent to four (4) peer-reviewed academic journal articles during the three-year period. This is based on the average article characteristics in Appendix 8.

- Category 4 (Exemplary). The faculty member should be engaged in research activities equivalent to six (6) peer-reviewed academic journal articles during the three-year period. This is based on the average article characteristics in Appendix 8.

The classification of tenured faculty as “research active” requires a category 2 evaluation or higher (based on the above performance levels). The classification of tenured faculty as “highly research active” requires a category 4 evaluation. Untenured tenure-track faculty are automatically classified as at least “research active”. Furthermore, the production of working papers and their progress through the editorial review process will be taken into consideration until new junior faculty members have three full years completed at Auburn.

Tenured faculty with research weights of fifteen percent or less, generally perform research in order to stay current with the field in terms of teaching and/or accreditation. Consequently, such faculty are eligible to receive a category 2 evaluation if they have one peer-reviewed academic journal article during the three-year window. Note that this does not make them eligible for classification as “research active”.

Teaching

The Department of Economics values quality teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. In addition to direct classroom performance, the department also values:

- Teaching awards.
- Development of new courses and curricula.
- Advising, mentoring, and recruiting undergraduate majors and graduate students.
- Publication of textbooks, pedagogical articles (e.g. Journal of Economic Education), and other teaching materials.
- Directing thesis and dissertations, serving on dissertation and thesis committees, and high quality placement of graduate students.

The performance of a faculty member in a class is evaluated via student course evaluations, grade distributions, and/or peer review. The characteristics of a class should be taken into account when examining student course evaluation numbers. For example, large principles lectures typically have lower evaluations than small undergraduate classes, which typically have lower evaluations than graduate classes. Likewise, the nature of the material covered in class (e.g. difficult or highly technical) and the composition of students (e.g. majors vs non-majors) can be potential factors.

Service

Service encompasses a range of activities that may or may not draw on a faculty member's academic expertise. For example, service to academic organizations may include refereeing articles for peer-reviewed academic journals, which requires professional expertise. It may also include planning a convention or serving as an academic association officer or committee member. Service to the department, college or university may involve devoting time in a capacity not related to academic expertise. All such activities are considered service regardless of whether they rely on academic expertise.

The evaluation of service depends on both the quantity of service performed and the workload allocation. For example, faculty with a minimal service load of 5% would only be expected to perform one item of standard professional service (e.g. referee) and one item of standard service to the department/college/university (e.g. serve on a committee) in order to earn a category 3 (exceeds expectations) evaluation. Faculty with a higher service load (e.g. 10%) would need to perform more service in order to achieve the same evaluation.

Outreach

Traditionally, the Economics Department has engaged in very limited outreach and many faculty have a zero percent workload allocation for outreach. Any faculty member wishing to develop an outreach program or participate in outreach activities should negotiate a positive workload allocation with the department chair. A means of assessment appropriate for the proposed outreach program or activities should be discussed and agreed upon in advance. Consult the Auburn University *Faculty Handbook* for guidelines of what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure considerations.

Appendix 5

Departmental Third-Year Review Guidelines

The Third-Year Review Policy of the Department of Economics follows the guidelines and procedures set forth in the *Faculty Handbook*. It is highly recommended that the third-year review dossier follow the Promotion and Tenure format contained in the *Faculty Handbook*. The department normally performs the third-year review in April during the faculty member's third spring semester at Auburn. The Department bases its evaluation on the progress of the untenured faculty member toward the requirements for tenure. Please see Appendix 6 for a discussion of tenure and promotion. An unfavorable third-year review may result in the issuance of a letter of non-continuation.

Appendix 6

Tenure and Promotion Guidelines

I. Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

The Department of Economics bases its recommendations concerning tenure and promotion to associate professor on the performance of a candidate in the assigned areas of teaching, research, service, and outreach. Please see Auburn University's *Faculty Handbook* for additional information concerning tenure and promotion. Candidates for tenure in the Department of Economics are normally considered at the same time for promotion to the rank of associate professor and the recommendations are linked.

Teaching:

The department values quality teaching at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The performance of a faculty member in a class is evaluated via student course evaluations, grade distributions, and/or peer review. Classroom performance over the last three academic years is given more weight than performance during earlier time periods. In addition to direct classroom performance, the department also values:

- Teaching awards.
- Development of new courses and curricula.
- The ability and willingness to teach different kinds of courses.
- Advising, mentoring, and recruiting undergraduate majors and graduate students.
- Publication of textbooks, pedagogical articles (e.g. Journal of Economic Education), and other teaching materials.
- Directing thesis and dissertations, serving on dissertation and thesis committees, and high quality placement of graduate students.

Service:

Candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to have contributed some service to Auburn University and to the profession. Service expectations are relatively low as most junior faculty focus on research and teaching during the earlier portions of their academic careers. For example, simply providing professional service as a referee for academic journals and serving on a committee (dept, college, or university) would be sufficient. Strong accomplishments in the area of service will certainly be taken into account, but they are not required.

Outreach:

Consult the Auburn University Faculty Handbook for what constitutes outreach for promotion and tenure consideration. Outreach is not expected of all faculty and each faculty should work with the department chair to define any outreach assignments during the annual review/planning meeting.

Research.

Scholarly achievement for tenure and promotion to associate professor is primarily based on the publication of papers in peer-reviewed academic journals during the time frame under consideration. While the Economics Department may hire faculty with the expectation that they teach in a certain area, there is no corresponding expectation regarding a specific area of economic research. Publishing papers in peer reviewed economics and related journals is taken as *prima facie* evidence of publishing in the appropriate field. Both volume and quality are taken into account when evaluating a research portfolio. Article length, number of authors, and the reputation/influence of journals are all metrics relevant to judging volume and quality. The following characteristics would generally be deemed average in regards to the research of a successful candidate:

- Seven papers accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals. These papers should be research-oriented (as opposed to pedagogical) and their topics should be relevant to the discipline of Economics.

- This number of papers is based on the average article characteristics described below. Fewer or more papers should be required if the average characteristics of the candidate's papers deviate significantly from those described below.

    - An average article length of around 12 (published) pages.

    - An average of around 2.67 authors with equally weighted contributions.

    - An average journal quality similar to those on page 1350 of Kalaitzidakis, Mamuneas, and Stengos [2003].[4]

---

[4] Kalaitzidakis, Pantelis, Theofanis P. Mamuneas, and Thanasis Stengos. 2003. "Rankings of Academic Journals and Institutions in Economics." *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1: 1346-1366.

- These are journals that are not considered “top” journals, but they are generally well regarded. A few examples would be journals such as the Journal of Banking and Finance, Applied Financial Economics, Journal of Macroeconomics, Journal of Regulatory Economics, Kyklos, Empirical Economics, B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics, Review of Industrial Organization, Journal of Risk and Insurance, etc…

- Articles in journals of even higher quality, similar to those on page 1349 of Kalaitzidakis, Mamuneas, and Stengos [2003], should count extra or be used to balance against articles of lower quality.

III. Promotion to the Rank of Professor

The Department of Economics bases its decision concerning promotion to the rank of Full Professor primarily on the performance of the candidate in the area of research. The candidate’s performances in the other assigned areas (teaching, outreach, service) only become major issues if they are unusually poor. The following characteristics generally outline the research portfolio of the average successful candidate.

- Twenty papers accepted for publication in peer reviewed journals. These papers should be research-oriented (as opposed to pedagogical) and their topics should be relevant to the discipline of Economics.

    - This number of papers is based on the average article characteristics described in the ***Research*** section of Part I above. Fewer or more papers should be required if the characteristics of the papers deviates significantly from those averages.

    - At least five of the papers should be in higher quality journals (similar to those on page 1349 of Kalaitzidakis, Mamuneas, and Stengos [2003]).

- In order to ensure a reasonably steady flow of research over the candidate’s professional life up to the application date, the candidate’s research performance during the past five calendar years (from the application date) should meet the research standards (average successful candidate) for promotion to associate professor detailed in the ***Research*** section of Part I above. Hence the candidate should highlight the articles accepted for publication during the past five calendar years.