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The WKU Faculty Handbook and the GFCOB Tenure and Promotion Guidelines provide the procedural basis for promotion and tenure within the Department of Economics. They also present general criteria for promotion and tenure evaluation. Candidates for promotion or tenure are directed to the university and college documents for these procedures and general criteria. Within the general university and college guidelines, individual departments have the responsibility of determining specific criteria for each rank. This document serves that purpose for the Department of Economics, particularly by incorporating more detailed expectations and quality elements. In any cases where the Faculty Handbook or GFCOB Guidelines conflict with the Departmental Guidelines, the former take precedence. This document applies to faculty seeking promotion or tenure after July 1, 2013. For faculty in Assistant or Associate Professor positions at WKU prior to this date, the Committee should adjust evaluation for time spent by the faculty member under prior promotion and tenure expectations since hire or last promotion.

Promotion and Tenure Criteria

University policy requires that faculty members demonstrate sustained achievement (pg. 21) and a tangible record of exceptional or high quality performance according to department/division standards in the areas of teaching effectiveness, research/creative activity, and university/public service (pgs. 26-27). The following sections specify minimum levels of activities for each rank for these levels of achievement. Meeting these minimum levels does not guarantee promotion or tenure. While this document specifies and illustrates some of the items that candidates should submit for evaluation, each applicant may submit additional items that they believe are most reflective of their contributions. It is the applicant’s responsibility to provide the Committee with the appropriate
evidence for evaluation. In addition to specific criteria below, the working relationship of the applicant to other faculty and students with regard to creating a non-hostile environment, promoting the objectives of the university, college, and department will be considered.

**Teaching Effectiveness**

Departmental faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching and contribute in substantial ways to student learning on an ongoing basis. Effective teaching is a requirement for promotion in rank and the granting of tenure.

Consistent with the Gordon Ford College of Business Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, at a minimum, effective teaching consists of (a) the satisfactory presentation of appropriate and current material in a clear, organized, understandable, and technologically efficient manner, (b) the continuing concern with the components of the teaching role that occur outside the classroom, such as mentoring and being accessible to students, (c) providing career and academic advice, and (d) being cooperative in developing, scheduling, and teaching courses in a variety of locations and delivery methods. Candidates are responsible for demonstrating that these minimum requirements have been met.

Some of the minimum requirements are noted below:

- Meeting classes as scheduled
- Distributing and following clearly developed, current course syllabi
- Using current and appropriate instructional materials and technology
- Being well prepared for class
- Presenting appropriate material satisfactorily in the classroom
- Using fair and appropriate procedures to evaluate student performance
- Being reasonably accessible to students
• Returning examinations and other assignments within a reasonable period of time

Additional examples of teaching activities can be found in the Guidelines to the *Faculty Activities and Appraisal Report*, Gordon Ford College of Business.

Candidates are expected to provide evidence of student learning - teaching effectiveness for either the tenure or promotion process. The evidence may include

• Student evaluations (including written comments on the evaluations)
• Self-appraisals and peer reviews
• Written comments of present and former students
• Alumni surveys

The Department also recognizes the importance of many other types of teaching-related activities that are vital and will be evaluated. These activities are subdivided into the following *Category I* activities requiring a larger time investment by the faculty member and *Category II* activities requiring lesser time investment. Candidates should submit evidence regarding continuous and consistent involvement in these activities for evaluation. Examples of activities within each category are provided below:

*Category I Teaching Activities*

• Conducting an independent study with a student
• Serving as the committee chair a graduate student’s final project
• Serving as an advisor for an honors student’s thesis
• Creating a new course (counts as two activities)
• Teaching a course that was not offered by the same faculty member during the previous two years.
• Teaching a course at a regional campus.
• Developing an alternative delivery method for an existing course (e.g. adapting a class for Interactive TV or Web delivery)

• Teaching a one-time honors colloquium

• Developing instructional materials such as texts, software, cases, study guides, test banks

• Making major technological additions and/or modifications to existing courses

• Facilitating student attainments such as student presentations at conferences, student publication of articles

• Conducting a Study-Away or a Study-Abroad course

• Teaching “overload” course

**Category II Teaching Activities**

• Serving as an adviser for a graduate student’s final project

• Serving as an adviser for an honors augmentation project

• Conducting review sessions open to all students on a regular basis

• Making minor technological additions and/or modifications to existing courses

• Providing students with career and academic advice

• Conducting skill-building workshop for graduate students
**Scholarly (Research/Creative) Activity**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate a record of continuing effort and output in scholarly activity. Departmental promotion and tenure committees may consider any evidence that is relevant in determining whether the candidate is active and effective at scholarly (research/creative) activities. Given the dynamic nature of information technology, the exact format or venue of one’s scholarly contributions is subject to change. Committees will evaluate the quantity and quality of activities.

The GFCB and the Department recognize that a wide variety of activities reflect scholarship. The following activities list provides examples but is *not* necessarily comprehensive and is subject to change over time:

- Publication of an article in a peer-reviewed journal (discipline-related or education journal), hard copy or on-line
- Publication of a book or monograph
- Publication of an article in conference proceedings
- Presentation of an original paper at a professional meeting
- Publication of a chapter in a book
- Publication of an article in a non-refereed journal
- Preparation of an innovative, technical or consulting report that is available for peer-review
- Publication of a textbook, case, study guide, workbook, or other instructional material
- Organization of or presentation at a workshop to disseminate research
- Additional examples of scholarly activities can be found in the *Guidelines to the Faculty Activities and Appraisal Report*, Gordon Ford College of Business.
Research Quality Points

In keeping with GFCB guidelines, the Department expects candidates to publish articles in refereed journals along with other activities. In addition to quantity of articles published, the quality of the journal publications will be considered. The Departmental Committee will use the following point system to evaluate the quality of refereed articles (See attached listing of journals by quality points assigned):

Category I (3 quality points)

This category includes “elite” refereed journals such as the American Economics Review and “high quality” such as Economic Inquiry, and Southern Economic Journal.

Category II (2 quality points)

This category includes “quality refereed journals” such as the National Tax Journal.

Category III (1 quality point)

This category includes “supporting” refereed journals not listed in the other two categories.

Journals that do not appear on the list should be included in Category III unless the candidate presents evidence from the Social Science Citation Reports “Impact Factor,” RePec-St. Louis Federal Reserve impact factors, Google Scholar “h-index” relating the journal to median values in a higher category or by presentation of a ranking list from an economics M.A.- or Ph.D-granting institution. Journals in fields closely related to economics should be included using these methods. The journal ranking list will be updated over time based on this approach. In cases of disputed quality point assignments, the faculty applicant may petition the Dean to
seek an external judgment on ranking from a department head/chair at a peer institution of the Dean’s choosing. The department list will be sent to this external reviewer.

Books or monographs will be counted as equivalent to refereed journal publications for tenured faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor or higher. Books will receive a Category II ranking by default. However, a faculty member may document evidence such as citation counts, reputation of the publishing press and evaluated by dispassionate third parties, for inclusion as a Category I publication.

The Committee may also evaluate the impact of research published prior to the candidate’s last promotion date. Candidates are encouraged to submit evidence of significant impacts of such prior research.

*Promotion to Associate Professor:* The scholarly activity requirements for consideration for promotion to Associate Professor are a minimum of 8 activities, with a minimum of 3 peer-reviewed journal articles, books, or chapters in a book and summing to at least 5 quality points.

*Promotion to Professor:* The scholarly activity requirements for consideration for promotion to the rank of professor are a minimum of 10 activities since appointment to the rank of Associate Professor and, within the last five years and since promotion to Assistant Professor, a minimum of 4 peer-reviewed journal articles or books or chapters and summing to at least 7 quality points.
University/Professional/Public Service

Candidates must demonstrate sustained university/professional/public service. By their nature, service activities are diverse and the exact array of appropriate service activities may evolve over time. Attention to these Departmental objectives as well as cooperation of the faculty member in performing service activities will be considered. Only those activities that bear some relationship to the candidate’s role as a faculty member or that makes use of his or her professional expertise can be used as evidence of demonstrated achievement in this area. The Committee will evaluate contributions in view of special compensation (monetary, teaching release time) and expectations associated with special assignments such as Center Directors, Coordinators, and other roles. Various service activities that can be considered are listed below. The list is illustrative, not comprehensive. Each academic year of service may be counted as one activity per GFCB criteria.

- Chair or member of a departmental, college or university committee, board, council, task force or senate
- Departmental liaison to university unit
- Faculty sponsor, advisor, or executive secretary for a student chapter of a professional club, fraternity, or honor society
- President, vice president, division chair, proceedings editor, or other officer of a state, regional, or national learned society or professional organization
- Chair or member of a local, state or national governmental board, agency or commission
- Community activities that utilizes the faculty member’s professional expertise
- Presentations/activities within schools that utilizes the faculty member’s professional expertise
- Preparation of pre-publication text reviews
• Journal manuscript referee or editor
• Organizing or presenting an executive seminar
• Contribute to websites, blogs, and other media outlets using professional expertise
• Authorship of reports for the university using professional expertise
• Coordinating or advising undergraduate or graduate programs and students
• Coordinating/directing associated departmental Centers
• Interviews for media outlets
• Preparation of grant proposals

Service Quality Points

The quality of the candidate’s service activities (i.e., the effort involved, value to the university, college, department, or broader community or discipline, favorable external exposure, name recognition, etc.) will be considered in evaluating the candidate’s contributions. To incorporate a quality dimension to service contributions, candidates for promotion or tenure should list their service activities in one of the three following categories according to an estimate of the amount of annual time devoted to the activity.

Category I (3 quality points per activity; More than 15 hours per year on the activity)
Category II (2 quality points per activity; 5-14 hours per year on the activity)
Category III (1 quality point per activity; 0-4 hours per year)
Promotion to Associate Professor: Candidates for promotion to Associate Professor must have engaged in a minimum of 10 activities (GFCB requirement) with a minimum of 20 quality points.

Promotion to Professor: A candidate for promotion to Professor must have engaged in a minimum of 15 service activities (GFCB requirement) with a minimum of 30 quality points since appointment to the rank of Associate Professor and within the last five years, a minimum of 10 service activities (GFCB requirement) with a minimum of 20 quality points.