

Department of Economics
College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

May 31, 2009

Approved by the Provost: June 2009

I. Introduction

Standards and processes for reappointment, promotion and tenure of faculty are governed by Article V and Appendix A of the Laws of the Regents. These are further delineated in a series of CU Administrative Policy Statements. Campus guidance is supplied in UCCS Policy # 200-001. These documents require the establishment of departmental criteria which are to be used throughout the review process.

These criteria are to be considered guidelines for the general review of candidates toward reappointment, promotion and tenure in the Department of Economics at the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs. The criteria are based on appropriate and current standards of professional performance in our discipline. Each candidate's case will be reviewed and judged on its individual merits and circumstances. The department is committed to quality teaching, strong research/creative work, and effective service to the university, the profession, and the community. The evaluation process assumes: possession of an appropriate terminal degree; competent education and training in the discipline(s); conduct which reflects the professional and academic standards for generating, validating, disputing, and transmitting knowledge; and an appreciation of and respect for the rights, duties, and privileges associated with academic freedom and collegial responsibilities.

When these criteria are applied to faculty who were granted time toward tenure, the work performed during the years granted toward tenure shall be considered equivalent to work performed at UCCS. While a faculty member's career record will be considered in personnel actions described here, the main emphasis of evaluation will be on work performed at UCCS and, in particular, progress since the last review.

At this time, the Department of Economics is not using the Faculty Responsibility Statement as part of its Promotion, Tenure, and Evaluation Criteria.

II.a. Initial Review

The candidate's total record, including teaching, research and service, shall be evaluated. No specific rating in each area is required, but the record must show sufficient potential of future success to justify reappointment. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus.

TEACHING

The candidate's teaching shall be evaluated by multiple means including, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires (FCQs) and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. The candidate is expected to show potential for continued development as a teacher. Candidates should demonstrate that their courses are coherently organized and thoughtfully presented. Furthermore, candidates will be expected to demonstrate a commitment to teaching, evidence of which will be good interaction with students, concern with curriculum, and satisfactory development of skills in presenting material. Improvement and innovations in teaching methods and in curriculum development and contribution to the department will be taken into consideration.

SCHOLARLY WORK

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge, and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. The candidate is expected to demonstrate a well-designed research plan and the potential for continued development as a researcher and progress toward publication. This might include drafts of work in progress, presentations at professional meetings, and/or articles submitted for publication.

SERVICE

The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. At this stage, the candidate is expected to be involved in departmental meetings and activities.

II.b. Comprehensive Review

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." The candidate must demonstrate sufficient progress toward tenure to justify reappointment. This will typically be a rating of at least meritorious in all three areas. The review may also take into account issues of material bearing such as strategic goals of the department, college and campus. The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research, per campus policy.

TEACHING

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means including, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious requires student evaluations that are at or above the departmental average and other evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent requires student evaluations which are above the departmental average, other evidence of effective teaching, and strong evidence of dedication to student learning. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

SCHOLARLY WORK

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. A rating of meritorious requires reasonable progress toward tenure as demonstrated by submission of research proposals, professional presentations, publications, and by letters of evaluation of the candidate's work. A meritorious rating requires a minimum of one peer-reviewed publication such as a journal article or book chapter (these may be published or accepted in final form). A rating of excellent requires at least three peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles or book chapters (these may be published or accepted in final form). Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts may be substituted for publications. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met. Other non-refereed items will be considered in the evaluation of scholarly work, but these items will not normally serve to replace the above requirements.

SERVICE

The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and some service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus, community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

II.c. Review for Promotion to Associate Professor and Awarding of Tenure

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will each be evaluated separately as "below expectations," "meritorious," or "excellent." The candidate must be rated as, at least, meritorious in all three areas and must receive a rating of excellent in either teaching or research. The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research, per campus policy.

TEACHING

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means including, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and updating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. A rating of meritorious requires student evaluations that are at or above the departmental average and other evidence of effective teaching. A rating of excellent requires student evaluations which are above the departmental average, evidence of effective teaching, and dedication to student learning. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations.

SCHOLARLY WORK

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. A meritorious rating requires a minimum of three peer-reviewed publications such as a journal articles or book chapters (these may be published or accepted in final form). A rating of excellent requires at least five peer-reviewed publications such as journal articles or book chapters (these may be published or accepted in final form). Receipt of peer-reviewed grants or contracts may be substituted for publications. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity specified has not been met. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity but cannot serve to replace the core publication expectations.

SERVICE

The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. A rating of meritorious requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and service to the college, campus, community or profession. A rating of excellent requires meeting service responsibilities within the department and multiple service contributions to the college, campus,

community, or profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered.

II.d. Review for Promotion to Full Professor

The candidate's record in teaching, research, and service will be evaluated as a whole as below expectations, meritorious, or excellent. Promotion requires "a record that, taken as a whole, is judged to be excellent; a record of significant contribution to both graduate and undergraduate education, unless individual or departmental circumstances require a stronger emphasis or singular focus on one or the other; and a record, since receiving tenure and promotion to associate professor, that indicates substantial, significant, and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in teaching and working with students, research, scholarship or creative work, and service." The department will solicit letters from respected scholars in the candidate's field(s) of research, per campus policy.

TEACHING

The candidate will be expected to demonstrate effective teaching evaluated by multiple means that will include, at a minimum, Faculty Course Questionnaires and two other means of evaluation. Examples of other means of evaluation are provided in the appendix to this document. This evaluation includes contributions to the breadth, depth, and needs of the department and up-dating curriculum and course materials. In addition to classroom teaching, the candidate's work with students outside of the classroom as a mentor, research advisor, independent study director, intern supervisor and similar activities shall be considered here. In evaluating teaching, course content, level and size will be considered in interpreting student evaluations. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a teacher since tenure must be demonstrated through development of new and revised curriculum, new pedagogical techniques, participation in professional development, work with students outside the classroom and other areas of teaching such as those in the appendix.

SCHOLARLY WORK

The department recognizes that scholarship can take many forms. Our department emphasizes fundamental discovery, scholarly work that integrates existing knowledge and applied research. We recognize scholarly study of teaching and learning issues in our field as a form of research. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment as a researcher since tenure must be demonstrated through refereed publications, peer-reviewed grants and other areas of research such as those indicated in the appendix. Exceptional quality of scholarly work may be considered to raise an evaluation in cases where the quantity is less. Presentations at professional meetings and non-refereed publications may be considered as secondary evidence of ongoing research activity.

SERVICE

The department recognizes service to the campus, community and to our profession. In evaluating service both the quality and quantity of service contributions will be considered. Substantial, significant and continued growth, development, and accomplishment in service since tenure must be demonstrated through provision of service to the department, college, campus, university, community and in our profession. We recognize that different faculty at this level will fulfill this requirement very differently. The appendix lists some issues that may be considered.

III. Post-tenure Review

Recognizing the many different ways in which post-tenure faculty contribute to the University, we define “meeting expectations” for purposes of post-tenure review as consisting of three elements, each of which must be met: 1) having achieved a rating of “meeting expectations” or higher on each of the annual merit reviews included in the time period under review, 2) having met the goals of the faculty member’s current professional plan, and 3) having submitted an acceptable professional plan which indicates an ability to achieve “meeting expectations” or higher ratings in the future. If a faculty member is deficient in meeting this standard, the committee shall consider the total record of the faculty member during the review period to determine whether strengths in some time periods or some activities compensate for the deficiency such that a rating of “meeting expectations” is still appropriate. Ratings of “exceeding expectations” or “outstanding” will be awarded for exceeding these standards.

IV. Appendix: Examples of Tools for Faculty Evaluation

1. TEACHING

- 1.1. Student Evaluation of Teaching
- 1.2. Teaching Awards and Other Outstanding Accomplishments in Instruction
- 1.3. Peer Evaluation of Teaching
- 1.4. Alumni Evaluation
- 1.5. Quality of Doctoral Dissertation and Master's Thesis Supervision and Graduate Committee Contributions
- 1.6. Student Advising
- 1.7. Innovations in Teaching
- 1.8. Creativity in Teaching
- 1.9. Participation in Teaching-Related Subject Activities
- 1.10. Effectiveness of Students in Succeeding Courses and/or in the Pursuit of Graduate Education and/or in Careers
- 1.11. Student Supervision in Professional Experience Activities, Internships, and/or Independent Studies
- 1.12. Evaluation of Student Performance in departmental examinations and assessments
- 1.13. Preparation of Course Material
- 1.14. Student Development/Encouragement (Centers of Excellence, Library Knowledge, Learning Disability Recognition, Encouragement of Students)
- 1.15. Course Organization
- 1.16. New Course Development
- 1.17. Teaching Improvement Activity (Workshops, Conferences)
- 1.18. Role Modeling and Mentoring Based on a Teaching Experience on Any Educational Level
- 1.19. Teaching Contribution at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
- 1.20. Risk Factor Involved in the Teaching Venture
- 1.21. Contributions of teaching to diversity

2. RESEARCH/ SCHOLARLY WORK

- 2.1. Peer Judged Publications
- 2.2. Papers Prepared for Professional Conferences
- 2.3. Recognition by other Scholars of Research and Publications
- 2.4. Creative Work
- 2.5. Readings

- 2.6. Un-sponsored Research
- 2.7. Grants and Contracts (Sponsored Research)
- 2.8. Professional Reputation (Both Inside and Outside University)
- 2.9. Evidence of Capacity for Future Achievements
- 2.10. Participation in Development Workshops
- 2.11. Participation in Career Development Activity (Workshops, Conference, Summer Schools, etc)
- 2.12. Papers Presented at Professional Workshops, Conferences
- 2.13. Long-Term Research Projects
- 2.14. Expert and Technical Consultation of Research Projects
- 2.15. Role Modeling and Mentoring of Research on Any Educational Level
- 2.16. Risk Factor Involved in the Research Venture
- 2.17. Cultural and societal impact
- 2.18. Contribution to diversity

3. SERVICE

- 3.1. Departmental, College, Campus and University Committees
- 3.2. Administrative Service (such as program director, chair, center director ...)
- 3.3. Service to the Profession and Discipline (Local, State, National, International Level)
- 3.4. Consultation and Public Service
- 3.5. Role Modeling and Mentoring on Any Educational Level
- 3.6. Reviewing Research Proposals
- 3.7. Reviewing Books in Scholarly Journals
- 3.8. Reviewing Grant Proposals
- 3.9. Refereeing Manuscripts
- 3.10. Participation at Professional Conferences, Specifically Organizational Activities (Organizational Activities, Local Planning Committees, Site Visit Details, Activities Involved in Local, Regional and National Meetings, etc.)
- 3.11. Membership In and/or Office-holding in Professional Associations.
- 3.12. Service Contribution to Education at Any Level and at Any Institution in Addition to the University of Colorado
- 3.13. Contribution to diversity through service
- 3.14. Participation in faculty governance

This is a list of suggestions and is NEITHER all-inclusive nor a list of requirements. Items are not ranked or grouped in any order of importance.