




**UNIT STANDARDS REVIEW
SIGNATURE FORM**

Department of: Economics

Year: 4/22/2024

1) Department Chair:


Signature

5 MAY 2022
Date

2) Dean:


Signature

October 26, 2022
Date

3) Chair, UM Unit Standards Committee:


Signature

March 8, 2023
Date

4) Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs:


Signature

March 18, 2024
Date

EVALUATION PROCEDURES, CRITERIA AND STANDARDS
FOR PROMOTION, MERIT, TENURE, RETENTION AND SALARY INCREMENTS
TO SUPPLEMENT THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

I. UNIT STANDARDS FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

These unit standards and procedures are intended to be in addition to and consistent with those provided in the current Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). In the event of any omissions or inconsistencies, the terms of the CBA shall prevail.

A faculty member should consult Article 10 of the CBA for procedures relative to the evaluation process beyond the sections concerning the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and to determine the procedural requirements for appeals. The CBA provides for a variety of appeals of the recommendations made by various parties during the Faculty Evaluation process.

1. General Criteria

This document establishes guidelines for promotion, retention, tenure, and normal, merit, and less-than normal salary determination for the Department of Economics.

2. Preparation and Approval of Unit Standards

Changes of this document shall be recommended to the Dean and Provost by a vote of Department of Economics tenured and tenure-track faculty as follows:

- a) by a $2/3$ affirmative vote (rounded down in case of fractions) of all Department of Economics tenure-track faculty, tenured and untenured, including the chairperson during spring semester of any year; or
- b) by a unanimous affirmative vote of all Department of Economics tenure-track faculty, tenured and untenured, including the chairperson at any time.

3. Specific Standards

Section 6.200 of the CBA describes faculty members' academic responsibilities and the expectation that "... each person is expected to relate in a professional manner." Section 10.120 of the CBA specifies the general activities that shall be given consideration in evaluation. The following specific criteria indicate how the Economics Department will evaluate faculty performance in these general areas. These specific criteria establish standards, namely levels of achievement, for evaluating requests and nominations for promotion, tenure, merit increases, normal salary increments, less-than-normal salary increments, and contract termination for members of the bargaining unit. Additionally, these criteria establish standards for evaluating the performance of faculty members who are not members of the bargaining unit, although the procedures and requirements of the CBA are not applicable to them.

Note that the specific criteria for the evaluation of Economics Department faculty for promotion and tenure differ from the criteria used for the periodic evaluations required of all faculty by the CBA. Periodic evaluations that result in recommendations for normal salary increments or even merit increases do **not** necessarily imply that a tenure or promotion recommendation is likely.

A. Scholarly Activity

(1) Criteria

Any creative work, which is directly related to the field of economics, can be used to demonstrate scholarly activity. Interdisciplinary work bridging disciplinary boundaries between economics and other academic fields shall be considered as directly related to the field of economics. However, since not all scholarly work is of the same quality, the FEC shall place the work in one of three tiers listed below based upon the work's scholarly contribution. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide evidence of the scholarly work, to propose a tier and to provide documentation supporting the proposed tier. The FEC will place each work in a tier. Publication of a work (without supporting evidence) is not sufficient to obligate the FEC to evaluate the work above Tier 3. Circulation of all work to the entire department prior to the submission of the Individual Performance Record is strongly recommended to allow careful scholarly review by all members of the FEC. The FEC shall use the guidelines below to assign scholarly work to tiers. Authorship refers to either single or joint authorship.

The criteria are not ranked within tiers.

a. Tier 1 Activities

- i. authorship of an article published in a peer-reviewed journal of the highest caliber roughly corresponding to the top 100 journals in economics (Tier 1 journals). New faculty can obtain the list of Tier 1 journals from the chair or another faculty member.
- ii. authorship of a peer-reviewed published work or equivalent that has been documented to make a *major* contribution to economics. The work must be documented by the author and judged by the FEC to be the equivalent of articles appearing in Tier 1 journals

- iii. authorship of an article published in a peer-reviewed journal outside of economics that has been documented by the author and judged by the FEC to be equivalent to an article published in a peer-reviewed economics journal that falls in Tier 1.
 - b. Tier 2 Activities
 - i. authorship of an article published in a peer-reviewed economics journal that does not fall in Tier 1
 - ii. authorship of a peer-reviewed work or equivalent that has been documented to make a contribution to economics. The works must be documented by the author and judged by the FEC to be the equivalent of articles appearing in Tier 2 peer-reviewed economics journals.
 - iii. authorship of an article published in a peer-reviewed journal outside of economics that has been documented by the author and judged by the FEC to be equivalent to an article published in a peer-reviewed economics journal that does not fall in Tier 1.
 - iv. successful procurement of a grant that includes funds for a graduate research assistant for one academic year. The funding needs to be at a level equivalent to a *funded in-state teaching assistant*.
 - c. Tier 3 Activities
 - i. authorship of non-peer reviewed publications including conference proceedings, book chapters, book reviews and other published works that are not documented or judged to be equivalent to a peer-reviewed journal article.
 - ii. presentation of a paper at a professional meeting
 - iii. presentation of a paper at an invited presentation
 - iii. authorship of research manuscript written under a grant contract that is completed but not published
 - iv. authorship of a substantive external grant proposal. Substantive proposals may include funding for graduate students, or funds for a faculty member to buy-out some portion of their teaching load
 - v. authorship of a new circulated working paper
 - vi. presentation of a paper at the UM Economics Department Seminars
 - ix. award of a successful substantive external grant proposal that falls short of the funding level that would meet the criteria of a Tier 2 activity (see iv under “Tier 2 Activities” above).
 - d. Scholarly activity completed and accepted for publication but not yet published can be evaluated as if publication had taken place if the faculty member includes

documentation of acceptance. An activity that is evaluated after acceptance cannot be counted again after publication.

(2) Definition of Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding Scholarly Activity

- a. Normal Scholarly Activity: The minimum standard for a Normal evaluation of scholarly activity is one research product at Tier 3 or better per year averaged over the evaluation period.
- b. Above Normal Scholarly Activity: The minimum standard for an Above Normal evaluation of scholarly activity is one research product at Tier 3 or better per year averaged over the evaluation period including at least one research activity at Tier 2 or better during the evaluation period.
- c. Outstanding Scholarly Activity: The minimum standard for an Outstanding evaluation of scholarly activity is
 - i. one research product at Tier 3 or better per year averaged over the evaluation period and at least one research activity at Tier 1 during the evaluation period.or
 - ii. one research product at Tier 3 or better per year averaged over the evaluation period and at least two research activities at Tier 2 or better during the evaluation period.

B. Teaching

(1) Criteria

- a. Faculty must regularly meet their assigned classes and keep regular and adequate office hours.
- b. Considerations to be used in evaluating the quality of teaching include but are not limited to:
 - i. teaching effectiveness
 - ii. service as the faculty advisor for undergraduate theses, or directing other undergraduate research and/or independent study projects
 - iii. number of preparations per term
 - iv. number and quality of curricular revisions
 - v. quality of examinations including make-up examinations
 - vi. effective participation in the graduate program by teaching graduate courses, serving on graduate thesis committees or the graduate committee, or by providing assistance for graduate student projects
 - vii. development of innovative courses
 - viii. teaching of departmental core and general education courses that generally have large enrollments and are difficult to teach

- ix. receipt of honors and awards for teaching excellence
- x. teaching of writing courses
- xi. internship oversight
- xii. participation in the department's curriculum or assessment development process.
- xiii. engagement in teaching activities which promote diversity, equity and inclusion (DEI). Examples include (but are not limited to) course revisions to correct underrepresentation, actions to remove barriers that prevent students' access, the development of courses that focus on DEI, and participation in teaching-focused DEI workshops.

Documentation of performance in categories i. through xiii. in b. above is the responsibility of the faculty member.

c. Student Evaluation of Teaching

With a few exceptions (listed below), in-person, hybrid, or blended courses will be evaluated by the students enrolled using the departmental form (see the attached copy at the end of these Unit Standards). Faculty are not to handle the student evaluations until after they have been tabulated by the department administrative assistant and final grades have been turned in.

The completed student evaluation forms and summary tabulations will be made available to the student evaluation committee, FEC subcommittee, the FEC, and the individual faculty member being evaluated if requested.

The student evaluation procedure described above is mandatory for all in-person, hybrid, or blended Economics classes except for the following: ECNS 569, thesis credit courses, internships, independent studies, summer term courses, and classes with fewer than five students. Additional questions or forms may be used if the faculty member desires.

Online classes will be evaluated via the University evaluation process overseen by the Provost's office. Faculty teaching online courses can opt to exempt them from consideration by the FEC.

The SEC will review all courses evaluated by the FEC. Faculty must also meet the CBA requirement (10.230) that "[e]ach faculty member... have at least one course evaluated each semester he/she teaches" by the SEC. The SEC will be provided with a table of summary statistics that illustrate the courses taught by the faculty member, the enrollment, the evaluation response rate, and averages of question responses from the evaluation form.

(2) Definition of Normal, Above Normal and Outstanding Teaching Activity

- a. The Economics Department Teaching Evaluation Form includes a question where the student rates “overall teaching effectiveness” (OTE). The mean rating for OTE will be reported for each course taught.
- b. Definition of Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding Teaching: A prerequisite for a normal or higher teaching evaluation is regular meeting of assigned classes and keeping regular and adequate office hours.
 - i. Normal Teaching
 - (a) an OTE rating from fall and spring of at least 3.5, with no more than one course per year with an overall teaching effectiveness student rating of less than 2.5, will be viewed as the initial points in normal evaluation for teaching.
 - (b) These numerical values are not determinant of the evaluation but a beginning point for the evaluation of teaching by the FEC. The FEC will adjust this initial point upward or downward based upon the criteria listed in B.1.b.ii-xiii above.
 - ii. Above Normal Teaching
 - (a) an OTE rating from fall and spring of at least 3.75 with no more than one course per year with an overall teaching effectiveness student rating of less than 3.0, will be viewed as the initial points in Above Normal evaluation for teaching.
 - (b) These numerical values are not determinant of the evaluation but a beginning point for the evaluation of teaching by the FEC. The FEC will adjust this initial point upward or downward based upon the criteria listed in B.1.b.ii-xiii above.
 - iii. Outstanding Teaching
 - (a) an OTE rating from fall and spring of at least 4.0, with no more than one course per year with an overall teaching effectiveness student rating of less than 3.5, will be viewed as the initial points in Outstanding evaluation for teaching.
 - (b) These numerical values are not determinant of the evaluation but a beginning point for the evaluation of teaching by the FEC. The FEC will adjust this initial point upward or downward based upon the criteria listed in B.1.b.ii-xiii above.

C. University and Professional Service

The Economics Department recognizes the value of various service activities (not included above under A. Scholarly Activity or B. Teaching) as furthering the mission of the Department and/or the University. This service includes both activities directly related to the economics profession as well as activities unrelated to the profession but important to the governance of the University and the enhancement of the larger community of which the University is a part.

In evaluating service activities, the contribution of the activity to the University's mission will be central. Productive activities largely unrelated to the University's mission (e.g., operating a private business, coaching a community sports team, etc.) will not be considered service under these standards.

(1) Types of Service

The types of service in which the faculty member's performance shall be evaluated are listed below. The order of their presentation within each subcategory is not indicative of their relative importance. Specific documented evidence of accomplishments under this section must be provided by the faculty member. Included in this documentation shall be an explanation of how this activity enhances the pursuit of the mission of the Department and the University.

a. Departmental and University Service

- i. Departmental committees and affairs shall include but not necessarily be limited to:
 - (a) active membership in the Department's graduate committee or other department-level committees;
 - (b) active involvement in curricular revision;
 - (c) serving as library representative;
 - (d) active involvement in faculty and staff recruiting activities;
 - (e) scheduling of departmental classes;
 - (f) representation of the Department on university committees and in University affairs.
 - (g) serving as department chair
 - (h) serving as graduate program director
 - (i) participation in activities that support the Department's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Examples include (but are not limited to) mentoring faculty, participating in activities that support the Department's recruitment and retention of underrepresented students and faculty, and participating in curricular development that fosters inclusivity.
- ii. University service shall consist of, among other things:
 - (a) active participation in university committees and affairs
 - (b) active membership in the Faculty Senate

- (c) significant work with student groups
 - (d) significant work as representative of the Department or University before the Board of Regents, legislative committees, etc.
 - (e) participation in activities that support the University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Examples include (but are not limited to) participation in University-level committees related to DEI, attending DEI-focused trainings and professional development programs, and participating in activities that support the University's recruitment and retention of underrepresented students and faculty.
 - (f) leadership in the above university service activities should be noted where appropriate
- b. Professional Activity and Public Service Related to the Economics Profession
- i. organization of scholarly panels
 - ii. service as convention or conference panel discussant or chairperson
 - iii. professional consulting related to the department's and University's mission (e.g., professional reports, expert testimony, review of book manuscripts, etc.) where there is a significant public or academic interest aspect to the work
 - iv. membership on the editorial board of a professional journal
 - v. service as professional journal referee
 - vi. professional membership in or contribution of expertise to agencies and organizations, advisory committees and boards where there is a significant public or academic interest aspect to the work
 - vii. public lectures and presentations
 - viii. participation in non-credit educational programs as an economist (e.g., presentations in high schools or vocational/technical schools, participation in the Alumni College, etc.)
 - ix. other professional service (e.g., review of grant proposals for funding agencies, presentations at other universities, etc.)
 - x. participation in activities that support the profession's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Examples include (but are not limited to) participating in panels related to DEI, offering public lectures or presentations focused on DEI issues, and participating in professional activities that support the recruitment and retention of economists from underrepresented populations.
- c. Professional Community Service Not Necessarily Related to the Economics Profession
- i. service to civic organizations, governmental boards and advisory committees, trade associations and labor unions, etc.

- ii. other professional contributions to society's welfare
- iii. public presentations

(2) Criteria

- a. Evaluation of university and professional service shall be based on the following standards:
 - i. professional quality;
 - ii. importance to the mission of the University and/or to the profession;
 - iii. success of execution;
 - iv. arduousness.
- b. The faculty member's obligation to provide documentation of the nature and scope of each university and professional service activity shall include evidence of the ways in which this service meets all of the above standards that are applicable to it. It is strongly preferred that significant work products associated with such service activities be circulated among the faculty as soon as they become available.

(3) Definition of Normal, Above Normal, and Outstanding University and Professional Service

a. Normal Service

To be evaluated as normal or better in service, a faculty member must take his or her turn in helping the functioning of the Department by serving on recruiting, evaluation, graduate, curriculum, and other departmental committees and subcommittees.

In addition, each faculty member has a responsibility to aid the University in fulfilling its mission by engaging in university service activities of the type identified in section C.1.a.ii. Each faculty is expected to engage actively in departmental and university service of the types listed in C.1.a. above in at least one out of every two years of the evaluation period.

A faculty member's service shall be deemed normal if that member meets this responsibility at a level deemed normal according to the evaluation criteria defined by section C.2.a.

b. Above Normal Service

A faculty member's service as defined in C.1.a, b, and c above shall be deemed above normal if its quantity and its quality as judged by the standards defined by section C.2.a. substantially exceed those required for a normal rating. Examples include (but are not limited to) service on department, university, and/or professional committees that require significant time and labor; service on multiple university-level committees; and significant service to the profession.

c. Outstanding Service

A faculty member's service as defined in C.1.a, b, and c above shall be deemed outstanding if its quantity substantially exceeds that required for an above normal rating and its quality as judged by the standards defined by section C.2.a. is particularly praiseworthy. Examples include (but are not limited to) service on multiple department, university, and/or professional committees that require significant time and labor; leadership at the department, university or professional level; and awards or other recognition for service contributions.

4. Standards for Normal Salary Increment

- A. These standards are in addition to those requirements of academic responsibility provided by in section 10.110 and elsewhere in the CBA.
- B. Receipt of normal salary increments by a faculty member over a series of years does not imply that the faculty member is making progress towards promotion or tenure. The standards for promotion and tenure are stated separately and are more demanding than the standards for a normal salary increment.
- C. All tenure-track faculty, tenured and untenured, who are members of the bargaining unit shall be recommended for a normal salary increment if the FEC evaluation of that faculty member's performance meets the following standards:
 - (1) at least normal in teaching, service, and scholarship; or
 - (2) **less-than-normal** in service but in the other two categories at least normal in one and above normal in the other; or
 - (3) for tenured faculty and with the prior agreement of the department chair, meeting all of the following standards:
 - a. at least normal in service
 - b. at least above normal in teaching
 - c. having taught an additional 3-credit course in Fall or Spring semester each academic year over the department's normal teaching load and produced at least one Tier 3 scholarly work every other year.
- D. A member of the bargaining unit who is a lecturer, adjunct, or other faculty with duties devoted primarily to teaching will qualify for a normal salary increment recommendation if they meet the standard of at least normal in teaching.
- E. Research Faculty

A faculty member appointed primarily to conduct research will qualify for a normal salary increment recommendation if the Faculty Evaluation Committee judges the research to be normal given the proportional adjustment in duties during the evaluation period.

5. Standards for Merit Recognition or Outstanding Performance Award

- A. The recommendation for an award of merit recognition does not necessarily indicate satisfactory progress towards promotion and tenure. Merit awards recognize unusual productivity in particular fields of activity. The separate standards for promotion and tenure require a demonstration of productivity across research, teaching and service.
- B. As stated in CBA 10.110.3a, the criteria for a Merit Award or Outstanding Performance Awards (OPA) are “Above normal performance in at least two (2) of the three (3) areas: teaching, scholarship/creative activity, or public service; or outstanding performance or special recognition in at least one (1) of these areas, and normal performance in the remaining area or areas of assigned duties.” The FEC shall recommend a faculty member for merit recognition if they meet the merit standards of the CBA. An OPA requires Outstanding performance in at least one area of a non-tenure track faculty member’s assigned duties, with normal performance in remaining areas of assigned duties; or Above Normal performance in at least one area of assigned duties, normal performance in remaining areas of assigned duties, and significant contributions of teaching, research, and/or service above and beyond the faculty member’s assigned and contracted duties.
- C. The documentation required for a merit application shall follow the CBA section 10.210. The FEC may give greater weight to the last three-year period if the last merit or promotion was more than three years ago.
- D. A faculty member on a research appointment whose time is committed almost exclusively to research will qualify for merit if the Faculty Evaluation Committee judges the research to be outstanding given the proportional adjustment in duties.

6. Standards for Recommendation of Less-than-normal Increment

A faculty member shall be recommended for a less-than-normal salary increment when the circumstances in A., B., or C., below indicate inadequate (less-than-normal) performance of assigned duties during the time period being evaluated. If the faculty member can provide convincing evidence that the inadequate performance is an aberration that will not continue, the FEC may recommend a normal increment.

A. Failure to Maintain Satisfactory Academic Performance

The departmental member has failed to maintain satisfactory academic performance in the immediately preceding year in teaching, scholarship, and/or service when the evaluation of this performance does not satisfy the standards for a normal salary increment listed in Section 4 above.

B. Failure to Perform Assigned Departmental Duties

During the most recent period of evaluation, the FEC judges that the faculty member to a significant degree has not performed his or her assigned departmental and/or contractual professional duties. Assigned departmental duties include meeting classes as scheduled, being available for student consultation and advising, service on departmental committees, university committees, and other specific university assignments.

C. Failure to Document Normal or Better Performance

If the departmental member fails to provide the documented evidence necessary to establish normal or better performance, they may be recommended for a less-than-normal increment. If such a less-than-normal recommendation based on inadequate documentation is going to be made by the FEC subcommittee to the FEC, the faculty member will be informed in advance and allowed to correct any inadvertent, inadequate documentation. The FEC subcommittee shall specify a date by which the requested documentation must be submitted.

7. Standards for Retention/Termination

Faculty members not making satisfactory progress toward promotion and tenure or tenured faculty who are recommended for three consecutive less-than-normal salary increments may be recommended for non-renewal of contract.

8. Standards for Promotion

- A. These standards for promotion are to be applied to the time period since attaining the current rank.
- B. No tenurable faculty member shall be considered for promotion unless they have established a productive professional record in *research and teaching*. A Ph.D. degree in Economics or cognate field approved by the department is required for appointment or promotion to a tenured or tenure-track position.
- C. For promotion from assistant to associate professor, the faculty member must present a research record showing the equivalent of three (3) peer-reviewed publications at Tier 2 or higher with at least one publication at Tier 1. This is the equivalent of peer-reviewed articles in Tier 2, not Tier 2 activities. In addition, sufficient evidence that the minimum standards for tenure will be met as defined below must be demonstrated. The faculty member must also demonstrate and document a record of above normal or outstanding teaching on average over the evaluation period and at least normal in service on average over the evaluation period as defined in these Unit Standards.
- D. For promotion from associate professor to full professor the faculty member must present a research record showing the equivalent of three (3) peer-reviewed articles at Tier 2 or higher with at least one at Tier 1 since the last promotion. This is the equivalent of peer-reviewed articles in Tier 2 or higher, not Tier 2 activities. In addition, the faculty member must have at least eight (8) peer-reviewed articles at Tier 2 or higher in their credited years of service at the University of Montana. The faculty member must also demonstrate and document a record of above normal or outstanding teaching on average over the evaluation period and at least normal in service on average over the

evaluation period as defined in these Unit Standards.

- E. In evaluating whether a faculty member has met the standard for promotion, the FEC and chairperson may consider published books, book chapters, and monographs, the quality of the journal in which the article is published, the importance of the contribution made by the article, book, or chapter, and other relevant factors including their teaching and service performance.
- F. “[promotion] To Associate Professor: Except in unusual circumstances, four (4) or more years of full-time service in rank as assistant professor are required prior to the date of promotion (application may be made during the fourth year in rank)...” [CBA 10.110.1b]
“[Promotion] To Professor: Except in unusual circumstances, five (5) or more years of full-time service in rank as an associate professor are required prior to the date of promotion (application may be made during the fifth year)...” [CBA 10.110.1c] The unusual circumstances that may justify consideration for promotion before those times are an evaluation of at least Above Normal in teaching and a publication record that significantly exceeds the standard in 8.C. (for promotion to Associate Professor) or 8.D. (for promotion to Professor).
- G. The conditions for advancement in rank listed under 8.A. through 8.F. above will be used to determine whether tenurable faculty members have met the requirements for promotion specified in the CBA (Section 10.110). In general, the promotion for non-tenurable faculty members will be based on meeting the conditions for advancement in rank for their assigned duties. In addition, lecturers, adjunct faculty, and other non-tenurable faculty members with duties devoted primarily to teaching must also document a record of outstanding teaching on average over the evaluation period as defined in these Unit Standards.

9. Standards for Tenure

A faculty member will be recommended for award of continuous tenure status if they:

- A. complies with the current tenure procedures and meets the eligibility requirements set by section 10.110 of the CBA.
- B. has been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or is concurrently being recommended for promotion by the Department, and
- C. has established a productive professional record in research and teaching. To demonstrate a productive professional record in research the faculty member must normally present a research record showing the equivalent of five or more peer-reviewed publications at Tier 2 or higher with at least one publication at Tier 1 as defined above. This is the equivalent of peer-reviewed articles in Tier 2 and Tier 1, not Tier 2 or Tier 1 activities. Equivalency will consider the quantity and quality of the candidate’s research portfolio, including completed work and work in the process of review at the time of the

tenure application. The faculty member must also demonstrate and document a record of Above Normal or Outstanding teaching and at least normal service on average over the evaluation period as defined in these Unit Standards. In addition, the faculty member must demonstrate that they have an on-going research agenda.

- D. The accumulation of Normal or Merit salary increases is neither necessary nor sufficient to be recommended for tenure. One could earn a Merit for outstanding research but not meet the tenure standard if the teaching evaluation was not of an above-normal level or higher and/or the research activity before or after the merit award did not meet the cumulative research standard outlined in 9.C.

II. INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE RECORD

1. The procedures for faculty evaluation and preparation of the individual's performance record are specified in CBA sections 10.200 through 10.320.
2. The FEC, the department chairperson, or the dean may consider any relevant evidence from sources other than the faculty member being evaluated, provided that the evidence is relevant to the Department's Unit Standards and is incorporated into the record, and the faculty member is afforded an opportunity to respond to the evidence.

III. STUDENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

CBA section 10.230 specifies the procedures for the student evaluation committee.

IV. THE FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE

CBA section 10.240 specifies the procedures for the faculty evaluation committee.

1. Committee Membership

With the exception of cases 1(a) – 1(c) below, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall consist of all Department of Economics tenured and tenure-track faculty except the department chairperson.

- a. For decisions regarding tenure or promotion to associate professor, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall consist of a subcommittee of the tenured faculty only.
- b. For decisions regarding promotion to full professor, the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall consist of a subcommittee of full professors only. In cases where there are fewer than three full professors in the department, the subcommittee shall consist of all tenured faculty.

- c. For cases 1(a) and 1(b) above, if there are fewer than three tenured faculty members to serve on the subcommittee, non-tenured, tenure-track faculty members may be appointed by election to bring the subcommittee to three. No faculty member up for tenure or promotion may vote on the election of non-tenured members to the subcommittee. If there is not at least one tenured faculty member to serve on the Faculty Evaluation Committee for cases 1(a) and 1(b) above, then the Faculty Evaluation Committee will consist of all tenure-track faculty.

The Committee and subcommittee shall elect their own FEC chairperson from among their members.

2. Committee Procedures

Regarding all matters of promotion, retention, tenure, and salary, the FEC may consult with, and actively solicit the written comments of all other faculty members, the Student Evaluation Committee, and other Economics students.

The FEC or a duly elected subcommittee of the FEC may, if it deems it necessary, meet with each faculty member who is being evaluated to clarify and evaluate the documentary evidence of performance that the member has submitted to the FEC and to determine if additional documentary evidence is necessary.

Upon notification of the FEC's evaluation of a faculty member's performance, any faculty member being evaluated may request and shall be granted an opportunity to address the FEC personally regarding the FEC evaluation.

No member of the FEC shall participate in FEC deliberations or recommendations related to the evaluation of that member's own performance. The FEC shall inform faculty members of its recommendation as soon as possible and no later than November 15. In case of an less-than-normal recommendation, the FEC shall provide the faculty member involved with a confidential report explaining its reasoning.

A quorum shall consist of two-thirds of the FEC. If two-thirds of the FEC is not a whole number, it will be rounded down to the closest whole number to determine the quorum.

Recommendations of the FEC shall be made by a majority affirmative vote of those FEC members voting.

Within ten (10) working days of receipt of the recommendation from the FEC, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the FEC regarding any aspect of the FEC's recommendation or process... Within ten (10) days of receipt of the appeal, the FEC shall either grant or deny the requested remedial action and shall so notify the faculty member and make the decision a part of the record. (CBA 10.240)

3. Additional FEC Responsibilities

The FEC shall assist the chair in preparing a separate document for all untenured tenure-track faculty who are not being evaluated for tenure evaluating their progress toward meeting the departmental standards for tenure

V. DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON'S RECOMMENDATION

CBA section 10.250 specifies the procedures for the chairperson's recommendation.

1. Upon request of any faculty member being evaluated, the chairperson shall meet personally with that faculty member to discuss the recommendations and rank-order priorities to any or all of the chair's recommendations. However, the chair's merit rankings are confidential. The basis of such priorities shall be the degree to which the faculty member exceeds departmental standards. The faculty member shall sign the chairperson's recommendation attesting to having read the recommendation and any additional documentation appended by the chairperson. Within ten (10) days of receipt of the departmental chairperson's recommendation, the faculty member may submit a written appeal to the departmental chairperson regarding any aspect of the chairperson's recommendation or process. Within ten (10) days of receipt of the appeal, the chairperson shall either grant or deny the requested remedial action and shall so notify the faculty member and make the decision a part of the record. (CBA 10.250).