

Submitted: September 2023

Approved by the Dean's Office and Office of the Provost: 9/7/2023

Department of Economics Criteria for Post Tenure Review

In accordance with University regulations and those of the Board of Governors and state law, all tenured faculty members within the Department of Economics undergo a post-tenure review every five years. This review aims to evaluate their performance over the preceding five-year period. The review packet, containing materials to be assessed, includes a narrative detailing the faculty member's accomplishments during the specified timeframe, the annual performance reviews from the past five years, the faculty member's CV, and their disciplinary record (if applicable).

The Department of Economics' guidelines for post-tenure review ensure that faculty members are evaluated against nationally recognized standards consistent with the discipline's expectations at research universities. These guidelines stem from quantifiable department criteria used for annual evaluations. The post-tenure review process hinges on the faculty member's assignments and contributions over the five-year period under consideration.

Rating categories for post-tenure review shall include the following:

1. Exceeds expectations: a clear and significant level of accomplishment beyond the average performances of faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Performance is appreciably greater than the average college faculty member of the candidate's present rank and field at top-tier research institutions. Must have sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
2. Meets expectations: expected level of accomplishment compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit. Sustained record commensurate with the academic standards of a top-tier research institution; evidence of at least a satisfactory performance rating in each annual evaluation during the previous five years and satisfactory or greater assessment in each area of assignment; sustained and satisfactory professional conduct and performance of academic responsibilities and compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies.
3. Does not meet expectations: performance falls below the expected range of annual variation in performance compared to faculty across the faculty member's discipline and unit but is capable of improvement. A faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation during one of the previous five years without evidence of a trajectory of subsequent improvement or exhibited unsatisfactory performance in any single area of assignment over multiple years or pattern of non-compliance with state law, Board of Governors' regulations, and university regulations and policies may be deemed to not meet expectations.
4. Unsatisfactory: failure to meet expectations that reflect disregard or failure to follow previous advice or other efforts to provide correction or assistance, or performance that involves incompetence or misconduct as defined in university regulations and policies. A

faculty member who has received an overall unsatisfactory annual evaluation two or more of the previous five years or unsatisfactory performance in two or more areas of assignment over three of the last five years of the review period may be deemed unsatisfactory. Demonstrates a consistent pattern of failing to perform duties assigned by the University or sustained violations of applicable state and federal law and applicable published College, University, and Board of Governors regulations, policies, and procedures.

The following criteria for post-tenure review in the Department of Economics are drawn from university-approved criteria for annual evaluations:

Research

Post-tenure review of research will be based on the previous five years of research evaluations and assignments for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five years. The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Given the variety of forms of research, quality, and publication, there are numerous ways to receive this rating:
 - a. At least three high-quality peer-reviewed articles (published or accepted) or extramural research grants from prestigious funding agencies or
 - b. At least five peer-reviewed articles (published or accepted), book chapters, proceeding articles, or research grants or
 - c. At least two peer-reviewed articles (published or accepted), book chapters, proceeding articles, or research grants and ten items from the following list:
 - i. Submissions to peer-reviewed journals
 - ii. Publicly available working papers
 - iii. Research grant submitted
 - iv. Participation in academic conferences as presenters, discussants, session organizers, or chairs
 - v. Invited presentations to other departments
 - vi. Scientific instruments, software, codes, and/or databases
 - vii. Evidence of recognition of research accomplishments through citations, invitations to research organizations (e.g., NBER), articles in reading lists of other universities, and others.
 - d. An equivalent combination of selections from the above
2. Meets Expectations: Given the variety of research quality and publication forms, there are numerous ways to receive this rating:
 - a. At least one high-quality peer-reviewed article (published or accepted) or extramural grant from prestigious sources or
 - b. At least two peer-reviewed articles (published or accepted), book chapters, proceeding articles, or research grants or
 - c. At least five from the following list:
 - i. Submissions to peer-reviewed journals
 - ii. Publicly available working papers
 - iii. Research grant submitted

- iv. Participation in academic conferences as presenters, discussants, session organizers or chairs
 - v. Invited presentations to other departments
 - vi. Scientific instruments, software, codes, and/or databases
 - vii. Evidence of recognition of research accomplishments through citations, invitations to research organizations (e.g., NBER), articles in reading lists of other universities, and others.
- d. An equivalent combination of selections from the above
3. Does not meet expectations: Less than five from the following list and minimal evidence of an ongoing significant research project:
- i. Submissions to peer-reviewed journals
 - ii. Publicly available working papers
 - iii. Research grant submitted
 - iv. Participation in academic conferences as presenters, discussants, session organizers or chairs
 - v. Invited presentations to other departments
 - vi. Scientific instruments, software, codes, and/or databases
 - vii. Evidence of recognition of research accomplishments through citations, invitations to research organizations (e.g., NBER), articles in reading lists of other universities, and others.
4. Unsatisfactory: No evidence of research or publications over the five years under review.

Teaching

Post-tenure review of teaching will be based on the previous five years of teaching evaluations and assignments for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five years. The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: Evidence (syllabi and other documents) that classes are taught in a manner that not only meets university guidelines but reflects courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet stated goals of the course. In addition, one of the two requirements must be met:
 - a. Student evaluations are above the average for the department and the college for that level of instruction, and there is an absence of patterns of criticism or complaints in the written commentary.
 - b. Student evaluations are at or above the average for the department and the college for that level of instruction and a high level of student mentoring at the graduate level (e.g., Ph.D. dissertations and Master's oral examinations)
 - c. Evidence of high-quality teaching through teaching awards, fellowships, and grants.
2. Meets expectations: Evidence (syllabi and other documents) that classes are taught in a manner that not only meets university guidelines but reflects courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet stated goals of the course.

3. Does not meet expectations: There is little evidence (syllabi and other documents) that classes are taught in a manner that not only meets university guidelines but reflects courses that challenge students intellectually, stimulate their interest, and develop their skills through assessments designed to meet stated goals of the course with student ratings consistently below departmental averages. A pattern of missing classes.
4. Unsatisfactory: Evidence that the faculty member consistently lacked the required elements of a teaching portfolio; student ratings significantly below the college average with significant patterns of criticism or complaints in written commentary.

Service

Post-tenure review of service will be based on the previous five years of service evaluations and assignments for each year. The post-tenure review evaluation will be provided as one cumulative evaluation of the five-year period. For reference, the following are deemed typical types of service in various categories; however, this list is not exhaustive.

Department

- G&E Committee
- Undergraduate Programs Director, MA Program Director, or PhD Program Director.
- Graduate, Undergraduate, Research, Search Committees
- Recruiting
- Ad hoc Committees
- Mentorship

College/University

- School of Social Sciences Committees
- CAS Committees
- University Committees
- Faculty Senate
- Informal/ad hoc committees

Profession

- Journal Manuscript review
- Book Manuscript review
- External review for tenure and promotion
- Letters of Recommendation
- Conference panel organizer
- Conference panel chair
- Officer in professional organization
- Editing journal or book series

Community

- Work with public schools
- Public lecture

- Community engaged work
- Talk to the media about economics events

Evaluations will not be primarily based on their participation in committees but rather on the amount of work they were asked to perform. For instance, the chair of a committee typically has additional tasks and responsibilities compared to a regular committee member.

The criteria are as follows:

1. Exceeds expectations: At least five items of Department service plus 20 other items from the above list with substantial work on some of these activities.
2. Meets expectations: At least five items of Department service plus ten other items from the above list
3. Does not meet expectations: No departmental service plus five items from the above lists.
4. Unsatisfactory: No departmental service and less than five items from the above list.

The post-tenure review requires one holistic evaluation score. This will be the weighted average according to annual assignments based on the scores in teaching, research, and service.