**Linfield College Department of Economics**
**Discipline-Specific Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**
**January 22, 2018**

Contents:

**Linfield College Department of Economics**
**Discipline-Specific Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

## Part 1: Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor and the Simultaneous Granting of Tenure

The Economics Department's guidelines for promotion to associate professor and the simultaneous granting of tenure focus on outcomes in the three areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service identified in the Linfield Faculty Handbook. While the department does not assign precise weights to the relative importance of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service in the mentoring and evaluation of candidates for promotion with tenure, the department's ordinal ranking for these activities is teaching effectiveness, followed by professional achievement, followed by service, in keeping with the Faculty Handbook.

Our guidelines specify a mentoring-based evaluation process that annually identifies activity-related objectives for promotion to associate professor with tenure for candidates in each of the three areas, and evaluates progress in achieving them. The process is designed to facilitate the mentoring and assessment of candidates through the promotion and tenure decision. The record of annual objective-setting and achievement-assessment will provide a clear, written, track record of advice received, effort made, and accomplishments achieved. In this way, we maximize transparency so as to minimize uncertainty and the potential for misunderstanding. As in all situations, it will be incumbent upon the candidate to make the case for tenure and promotion to associate professor.

These guidelines will be shared with candidates for open positions during their campus visits. After coming to Linfield, new tenure-track professors and the department chair will meet annually. These meetings will identify objectives in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service and assess their achievement using the evaluation rubrics provided as Attachment 2 to be included in the candidate's professional development file.

### I. Teaching

Teaching effectiveness will be evaluated by students and departmental colleagues. Self-appraisals will also be used in the process. A departmental recommendation of promotion to associate professor with tenure presumes the candidate's evaluations of teaching by both students and faculty are more positive than not. When the evaluations suggest needed improvements, the candidate's file should document the actions taken, and how those actions improved the teaching outcomes.

The department encourages student-faculty collaborative teaching as occurs, for example, in the design and operation of its courses where students may serve as peer instructors in ECON 439. Such student-faculty collaborative teaching is evaluated as part of teaching whereas student-faculty collaborative research is evaluated a part of professional achievement.

In the economics department, successful teaching exhibits all the following outcomes.

1. knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter
2. attention to the organization of courses as it relates to the level and preparation of the students
3. organization and effective use of class time
4. high expectations for each student
5. respect for students' viewpoints
6. use of effective and fair grading methods
7. what students take from their courses
8. availability for consultation with students
9. consistent and effective attention to the needs of advisees.

*Evaluation Methods –*

- All tenured department members will observe at least one of the candidate's classes each year, review the syllabi for those classes, and report their observations about outcomes 1. through 9. to the department chair. They will use the department's teaching evaluation rubric included as Attachment 1 of these guidelines, which is to be included in the candidate's file.
- In consultation with the department chair, the candidate may choose to periodically draft questions soliciting feedback from students about specific aspects of pedagogy. The questions could provide the candidate and the department with information useful for mentoring. These questions need not be included in the candidate's professional development folder and they do not replace the faculty course evaluations. The questions could provide information about outcomes 1. through 9.
- The college's student teaching evaluations will be used to provide evaluative information about outcomes 1. through 9. When assessing the candidate's student teaching evaluations, the department will focus on the percentage of students who respond that they either strongly agree or agree with the evaluations' statements. Less emphasis will be placed on the candidate's averages relative to the all-faculty averages on each statement.
- As per the faculty handbook, the candidate will produce written self-appraisals that address outcomes 1. through 9.

Objectives associated with these nine teaching outcomes will be mutually agreed upon by the candidate and the department chair. Objective setting and assessment of their achievement will be documented using the evaluation rubric provided as Attachment 2 in these Guidelines, which is to be included in the candidate's file.

**II. Professional Achievement**

The following outcomes constitute forms of professional achievement in the economics department. They are ordinally segmented into the primary-Tier 1, and the secondary-Tier 2, sets. The outcomes in each tier are then ordinally ranked. While the economics department values all forms of professional achievement (Tier 1 and Tier 2), some level of achievement associated with Tier 1 outcomes is a necessary, but not necessarily sufficient, condition for a positive departmental recommendation of promotion with tenure.

In the economics department, peer-review means the evaluation of the candidate's work by one or more people competent to review that work. Such reviewers include, for example, referees for journals and conference submissions, session chairs at conferences, and editors of journals and books. Peer review may be either blind or open. The department views both individual and co-authored works as examples of professional achievement. No prejudice is automatically ascribed to the ordering of authors' names on co-authored works. But, if the candidate's professional achievements include co-authored works, the narrative self-appraisal should provide summary information about the co-authors' relative contributions to the work.

Good economics research is time-intensive and it improves with professional feedback. For this reason, developing a research project should include making presentations of one's research in venues where critiques are provided by professional peers. Therefore, the department expects that a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure will have examples of invited and/or peer-reviewed presentations among their professional achievements (Tier 1, Item 2). Being invited to present one's research at events such as departmental workshops and symposia outside of Linfield signals that peers find the research to be of interest and worthy of discussion. Acceptance of research for presentation at peer-reviewed conferences provides a positive signal about the quality of the research.

All else held constant, the likelihood of a positive departmental recommendation of promotion to associate professor with tenure rises if the candidates' professional achievements also include peer-reviewed publications (Tier 1, Item 1). Economics and related-field journals are typical venues for these publications. Peer-review of journal submissions provide an evaluative method for gauging the quality of a manuscript's professional contribution. Journals usually have a double-blind referee process. Referees are typically not paid. An author can submit a manuscript to only one journal at a time. It may be months before an editor receives the referees' reports, makes an editorial decision, and sends a response to the author. A manuscript's outright acceptance is rare. Most non-rejections come in the form of a request to revise and resubmit. If a manuscript is under peer-review at a journal, it should be noted on the candidate's CV as "under review" with citation of the journal to which the manuscript was submitted. If a manuscript has been accepted for publication, but not yet published, it should appear on the candidate's CV as "forthcoming" with citation of the journal where the manuscript will be published.

Outcomes in both Tier 1 and Tier 2 may be either disciplinary or interdisciplinary in nature. The department encourages student-faculty collaborative research. This research is evaluated as part of professional achievement. Student-faculty collaborative teaching as occurs, for example, in ECON 439 is evaluated a part of teaching.

Tier 1 (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. peer-reviewed publication in such venues as professional journals, book chapters, or books. This can include peer-reviewed work on the scholarship of teaching and peer-reviewed collaborative research with students.
2. peer-reviewed and invited professional conference presentations. This can include peer-reviewed work on the scholarship of teaching and peer-reviewed collaborative research with students.

Tier 2 (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. receiving external grants of high merit (e.g., Fulbright, etc.)
2. receiving internal grants (e.g., faculty development and collaborative research grants)
3. non-peer reviewed work, as occurs in venues like newspaper op-ed pieces and some collaborative research with students
4. work in progress as summarized in draft papers circulated for comment but not yet submitted for peer review
5. applied work in the field of expertise, as occurs with activities like consulting or providing testimony
6. peer recognition by professional societies/organizations.
7. work in professional societies/organizations (e.g., an officer of the organization)
8. speeches to community organizations as part of professional outreach efforts

Evaluation Methods –

- All tenured faculty members will review the record and content of the candidate's professional work, forwarding observations about it to the department chair.
- For promotion to associate professor with tenure, and with the approval of the dean of faculty, a sample of the candidate's professional work may be sent to an external, peer evaluator for review and comment. This external evaluation could be used, for example, when peer review of work submitted to a journal has not yet been completed and an external quality evaluation is desired.
- As per the faculty handbook, the candidate will produce written self-appraisals that address outcomes in both Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Objectives associated with these outcomes will be mutually agreed upon by the candidate and the department chair. Objective setting and assessment of their achievement will be documented using the evaluation rubric provided as Attachment 2 in these Guidelines, which is to be included in the candidate's file.

**III. Service**

Service will be evaluated by departmental colleagues. Self-appraisals will also be used in the process. In the economics department, the following outcomes represent the various forms of service. They are ordinally segmented into the primary-Tier 1, and the secondary-Tier 2, sets. The outcomes in each tier are then ordinally ranked. The department does not require candidates to specialize in one service activity or to assume a service leadership role. As an alternative, candidates may fruitfully choose to provide a diverse portfolio of contributions.

Tier 1: (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. participation on college-wide standing committees and working groups of the faculty
2. participation in departmental and divisional affairs
3. work with student activities and organizations
4. assistance with the external relations work of the college (e.g., recruiting students, speaking to alumni groups, etc.)

Tier 2: (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. service to a professional society/organization in roles ranging from a volunteer, to a referee, to an officer.
2. service to the external community as occurs, for example, when professional advice is provided pro bono to governmental and other community organizations
3. service to OCE.

Evaluation Methods –

- The candidate may solicit comments from individuals (faculty, administrators, students, alumni, etc.) who have served with the candidate on various faculty committees and working groups or collaborated with her/him on other service functions.
- All tenured faculty members will review the record and content of the candidate's service, forwarding observations about it to the department chair.
- As per the faculty handbook, the candidate will produce self-appraisals of her/his service in both Tier 1 and Tier 2.

Objectives associated with these outcomes will be mutually agreed upon by the candidate and the department chair. Objective setting and assessment of their achievement will be documented using the evaluation rubric provided as Attachment 2 in these Guidelines, which is to be included in the candidate's file.

**Linfield College Department of Economics**
**Discipline-Specific Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

## Part 2: Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor

The Economics Department's guidelines for promotion to full professor focus on outcomes in the areas of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service as listed in the Faculty Handbook. While the department does not assign precise weights to the relative importance of teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service in the mentoring and evaluation of candidates for promotion to full professor, the department's ordinal ranking for these activities is teaching effectiveness, followed by professional achievement, followed by service, in keeping with the Faculty Handbook.

Receiving a favorable departmental recommendation for promotion to full professor requires that the candidate exhibit a continuing commitment to excellence in teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service; focusing on the outcomes for these areas identified in Attachment 3. To be deemed excellent, the level of activity in each area should build upon, and not qualitatively diminish, relative to the level exhibited in the period before tenure and promotion to associate professor. In this way, the successful candidate will display the capacity for internally-motivated, continuing, intellectual growth and development that is the hallmark of a dynamic scholar worthy of special merit in the economics department. As in all situations, it will be incumbent upon the candidate to make the case for promotion to full professor, in particular that he/she has demonstrated "special merit" in each of the three areas of the Faculty Handbook.

To demonstrate special merit, the candidate for full professor is expected to conceptualize, articulate, and carry out a professional plan. The conceptualization phase begins immediately after promotion to associate professor with tenure. In this phase, the candidate should discuss with department colleagues the possible objectives, and activities to accomplish them, associated with the teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service outcomes. As the conceptualization phase ends, the candidate should work with the department chair (or, if the candidate is the chair, with a senior member of the department) to articulate a professional development plan. This will be done using the form provided in Attachment 4 of these Guidelines, which is to be included in the candidate's professional development file. The candidate will work to accomplish the objectives of this plan and consult with the department chair (or a senior colleague if the candidate is the chair) to assess and update the plan bi-annually using the same form.

Evaluation of the professional plan, and achievement of its objectives, are a central component of the departmental recommendation of promotion to full professor. Before going up for promotion to full professor, classroom teaching by associate professors will be observed at least once by all tenured faculty. Candidates may choose to periodically draft questions soliciting feedback from students about specific aspects of pedagogy in the same manner as may the candidates for promotion to associate professor and tenure. And, with the approval of the dean of faculty, the department may choose to have samples of the candidate's professional work sent to an external, peer evaluator for review and comment. This external evaluation could be used, for example, when peer review of work submitted to a journal has not yet been completed and an external quality evaluation is desired.

In the written, bi-annual, self-appraisals for promotion to full professor, the candidate must build the case for promotion with specific reference to the teaching evaluations, the professional plan and updates, and the achieved plan objectives. In a like manner, colleague appraisals will explicitly reference both the candidate's teaching evaluations and the professional plan.

Activities in pursuit of the plan objectives should be those undertaken by dynamic scholars striving to become better teachers, remain professionally active, and serve the college. Profiles of activities for three pseudonymous associate professors with tenure - Friedman, Keynes, and Schultz - all of whom were promoted to full professor at Linfield, illustrate key characteristics of a dynamic scholar. These characteristics can be summarized as follows.

- *Teaching Effectiveness.* The candidate's teaching reverberates and has a significant impact within the Linfield community and perhaps beyond. The candidate should have strong teaching evaluations and his/her teaching should demonstrate innovative leadership with regard to pedagogy and/or curriculum development.
- *Professional Achievement.* The candidate's professional activities should signal visibility, recognition, and engagement as created by peer-reviewed publications and presentations (Tier 1, Items 1 and 2), as well as activities from Tier 2.
- *Service.* The candidate should have a solid record of leadership to either the college, the department, or the professional community.

*Professor Friedman -*

After his promotion to associate professor with tenure, Friedman's teaching evaluations were more positive than not, with a majority of the students either strongly agreeing or agreeing with a majority of statements on the college's teaching evaluations. Friedman designed and taught a January term course to Austria and the Czech Republic. His preparation for teaching that course included two years studying German, at Linfield, with Linfield students.

As an associate professor with tenure, Friedman presented a paper at a regional economics conference. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. As part of a student-faculty collaborative research project, he and a Linfield student presented a co-authored paper at a national higher education conference. Friedman also presented a financial planning model for Linfield that was of his design at a conference for higher education planning and facilities administrators.

After his promotion to associate professor with tenure, Friedman served as the chair of the faculty's curriculum committee when the Linfield Curriculum was adopted and implemented. After this, he chaired Linfield's strategic planning process for two years. That process led to adoption of the college's strategic agenda for 2000-2005. Friedman subsequently began service as the associate dean of faculty in the college's Office of Academic Affairs.

*Professor Keynes -*

After promotion to associate professor with tenure, Professor Keynes maintained course evaluation scores that were more positive than not, with a majority of the students either strongly agreeing or agreeing with a majority of statements on the college's teaching evaluations. He also created and offered new courses in the Economics of Sports, an Inquiry Seminar, and a travel course to Australia. He received the Edith Green Distinguished Professor Award.

Keynes presented two conference papers, one of which had been published in a peer-reviewed journal with the other having been accepted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal at the time of the promotion decision. Keynes also assumed co-authorship of an existing field textbook in economics. His work on the new edition was completed at the time of the promotion decision, but publication was in progress. He also became author of an instructor's manual to supplement a principles of economics textbook. The new edition of this manual had been published by the time of the promotion decision. Keynes also authored and updated web content for a principles of economics textbook and began original co-authorship on a field textbook in economics with two colleagues at a nearby institution.

Professor Keynes served as division representative on two standing committees (Staffing and P&T), and as chairperson of Staffing for two years. He served on multiple search committees for new and replacement faculty and staff positions, mostly as an outside representative. Keynes also served as department chairperson and department liaison to DCE (now OCE).

*Professor Schultz -*

Professor Schultz arrived at Linfield from an R1 land grant university as an associate professor. As an associate professor at Linfield, Schultz taught twenty-four courses (including five new preparations). The student evaluations were more positive than not, with a majority of the students either strongly agreeing or agreeing with a majority of statements on the college's teaching evaluations. He advised six students in their transition to assistantship-funded graduate programs.

At Linfield, Schultz's professional work as an associate professor included the publication of five peer-reviewed journal articles and presentation of three conference papers (including one co-authored with Linfield students as part of a student/faculty collaborative research project). He also published two technical reports/extension bulletins and received two Fulbright Senior Specialist grants.

Schultz served as the SBS representative on the Curriculum Committee for six semesters (including as acting chair for one semester). He served on the GERC IS Subcommittee, was a member of Linfield College Assessment Team, was the coordinator of the Environmental Studies Program, and held multiple committee and executive appointments with the Western Agricultural Economics Association including as the chair of the "Best Teaching Award" Committee and the "Best M.S. Thesis" Committee.

**Attachment 1: Linfield College Department of Economics**
**Teaching Evaluation Rubric for Assistant Professors**

Classroom observation of:

Course:
Date:
Location:
Faculty observer:

General observations:

The Faculty Handbook identifies nine areas where faculty are evaluated for teaching effectiveness. These are addressed in turn, identifying strengths, weaknesses, and potential strategies for improvement, as relevant.

| | |
|---|---|
| *Knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter* | • |
| *Attention to the organization of courses as it relates to the level and preparation of the students* | • |
| *Organization and effective use of class time* | • |
| *High expectations for each student* | • |
| *Respect for students' viewpoints* | • |
| *Use of effective and fair grading methods* | • |
| *What students take from their courses* | • |
| *Availability for consultation with students* | • |
| *Consistent and effective attention to the needs of advisees* | • |

**Attachment 2: Linfield College Department of Economics**
**Faculty Evaluation Rubrics for Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure**
**(To be included annually in the candidate's PT file as part of**
**the department's annual evaluation report)**

**Candidate's Name:**
**Date of Evaluation:**

**Teaching**

| **Outcomes** | **Rating** (Based on the summary below, the candidate is Exceeding, Meeting, or Is Not Meeting the department's expectations for promotion and tenure) |
|---|---|
| Knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter | |
| Attention to the organization of courses as it relates to the level and preparation of the students | |
| Organization and effective use of class time | |
| High expectations for each student | |
| Respect for students' viewpoints | |
| Use of effective and fair grading methods | |
| What students take from their courses | |
| Availability for consultation with students | |
| Consistent and effective attention to the needs of advisees | |

**Summary of progress made in the area of teaching effectiveness during this evaluation period (drafted by the Chair and the Candidate):**

**Identification of activities to be undertaken in the area of teaching effectiveness during the next evaluation period and the goals associated with them (drafted by the Chair and the Candidate):**

**Department Chair's Signature/Date:** **Candidate's Signature/Date:**

**Professional Achievement**

| **Outcomes** | **Rating** (Based on the written summary below, the candidate is Exceeding, Meeting, or Is Not Meeting the department's expectations for promotion and tenure.) |
|---|---|
| Peer reviewed publications (Tier 1, Item 1) | |
| Peer reviewed and invited presentations (Tier 1, Item 2) | |
| External grants of high merit (Tier 2, Item 1) | |
| Internal grants (Tier 2, Item 2) | |
| Non-peer reviewed work (Tier 2, Item 3) | |
| Work in progress (Tier 2, Item 4) | |
| Applied work in field of expertise (Tier 2, Item 5) | |
| Peer recognition by professional societies/organizations (Tier 2, Item 6) | |
| Work in professional societies (Tier 2, Item 7) | |
| Outreach efforts (Tier 2, Item 8) | |

**Summary of progress made in the area of professional achievement during this evaluation period (drafted by the Chair and the Candidate):**

**Identification of activities in the area of professional achievement to be undertaken during the next evaluation period and the goals associated with them (drafted by the Chair and the Candidate):**

**Department Chair's Signature/Date:** **Candidate's Signature/Date**

Service

| **Outcomes** | **Rating** (Based on the written summary below, the candidate is Exceeding, Meeting, or Is Not Meeting the department's expectations for promotion and tenure.) |
|---|---|
| Participation in standing committees and working groups of faculty (Tier 1, Item 1) | |
| Participation in departmental and divisional affairs (Tier 1, Item 2) | |
| Work with student activities and organizations (Tier 1, Item 3) | |
| Assistance with external relations (Tier 1, Item 4) | |
| Service to a professional society/organization (Tier 2, Item 1) | |
| Service to the external community (Tier 2, Item 2) | |
| Service to OCE (Tier 2, Item 3) | |

**Summary of progress made in the service area during this evaluation period (drafted by the Chair and the Candidate):**

**Identification of activities in the service area to be undertaken during the next evaluation period and identification of the goals associated with them (drafted by the Chair and the Candidate):**

**Department Chair's Signature/Date:** **Candidate's Signature/Date:**

## Attachment 3: Linfield College Department of Economics
## Teaching Effectiveness, Professional Achievement, and Service Outcomes for Candidates Seeking Promotion to Full Professor

The teaching effectiveness, professional achievement, and service outcomes for associate professors seeking promotion to full professor are the same as the outcomes for assistant professors seeking promotion to associate professor with tenure. The outcomes for professional achievement and service are ordinally segmented into the primary-Tier 1, and the secondary-Tier 2, sets. The outcomes in each tier are then ordinally ranked.

The department encourages student-faculty collaborative teaching as occurs, for example, in the design and operation of its courses where students may serve as peer instructors in ECON 439. Such student-faculty collaborative teaching is evaluated as part of teaching whereas student-faculty collaborative research is evaluated a part of professional achievement.

In the economics department, peer-review means the evaluation of the candidate's work by one or more people competent to review that work. Such reviewers include, for example, referees for journals and conference submissions, session chairs at conferences, and editors of journals and books. Peer review may be either blind or open. The department views both individual and co-authored works as examples of professional achievement. No prejudice is automatically ascribed to the ordering of authors' names on co-authored works. But, if the candidate's professional achievements include co-authored works, the narrative self-appraisal should provide summary information about the co-authors' relative contributions to the work.

Good economics research is time-intensive and it improves with professional feedback. For this reason, developing a research project should include making presentations of one's research in venues where critiques are provided by professional peers. Therefore, the department expects that a candidate for promotion to full professor will have examples of invited and/or peer-reviewed presentations among their professional achievements (Tier 1, Item 2). Being invited to present one's research at events such as departmental workshops and symposia outside of Linfield signals that peers find the research to be of interest and worthy of discussion. Acceptance of research for presentation at peer-reviewed conferences provides a positive signal about the quality of the research.

The department also expects that the professional achievements of a candidate for promotion to full professor will include peer-reviewed publications. Economics and related-field journals are typical venues for these publications. Peer-review of journal submissions provide an evaluative method for gauging the quality of a manuscript's professional contribution. Journals usually have a double-blind referee process. Referees are typically not paid. An author can submit a manuscript to only one journal at a time. It may be months before an editor receives the referees' reports, makes an editorial decision, and sends a response to the author. A manuscript's outright acceptance is rare. Most non-rejections come in the form of a request to revise and resubmit. If a manuscript is under peer-review at a journal, it should be noted on the candidate's CV as "under review" with citation of the journal to which the manuscript was submitted. If a manuscript has been accepted for publication, but not yet published, it should appear on the candidate's CV as "forthcoming" with citation of the journal where the manuscript will be published.

**Teaching:**

In the economics department, successful teaching exhibits all of the following outcomes.

1. Knowledge of and enthusiasm for the subject matter
2. Attention to the organization of courses as it relates to the level and preparation of the students
3. Organization and effective use of class time
4. High expectations for each student
5. Respect for students' viewpoints
6. Use of effective and fair grading methods
7. What students take from their courses

8. Availability for consultation with students
9. Consistent and effective attention to the needs of advisees

**Professional Achievement:**

Professional achievement is composed of the following outcomes.

Tier 1 (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. peer-reviewed publication in such venues as professional journals, book chapters, or books. This can include peer-reviewed work on the scholarship of teaching and peer-reviewed collaborative research with students.
2. peer-reviewed and invited professional conference presentations. This can include peer-reviewed work on the scholarship of teaching and peer-reviewed collaborative research with students.

Tier 2 (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. receiving external grants of high merit (e.g., Fulbright, etc.)
2. receiving internal grants (e.g., faculty development and collaborative research grants)
3. non-peer reviewed work, as occurs in venues like newspaper op-ed pieces and some collaborative research with students
4. work in progress as summarized in draft papers circulated for comment, but not yet submitted for peer review
5. applied work in the field of expertise, as occurs with activities like consulting or providing testimony
6. peer recognition by professional societies/organizations
7. work in professional societies/organizations (e.g.. an officer of the organization)
8. speeches to community organizations as part of professional outreach effort

**Service:**

The following outcomes constitute various forms of service in the department.

Tier 1: (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. participation on college-wide standing committees and working groups of the faculty
2. participation in departmental and divisional affairs
3. work with student activities and organizations
4. direct assistance with the external relations work of the college (e.g., recruiting students, speaking to alumni groups, etc.)

Tier 2: (departmental ordinal ranking within this tier)

1. service to a professional society/organization in roles ranging from a referee to a volunteer to an officer.
2. service to the external community as occurs, for example, when professional advice is provided pro bono to governmental and other community organizations
3. service to OCE.

**Attachment 4: Linfield College Department of Economics**
**Professional Development Plan Template for Candidates Seeking Promotion to Full Professor**
**(To be included in the candidate's PT file)**

**Candidate's name:**

**Date:**

**This is:**

_________ a professional plan for the academic years _________ to ___________.

_________ an update of the professional plan for the academic years _________ to ___________.

For the teaching, professional achievement, and service outcomes itemized in Attachment 3 of the Guidelines, identify objectives to be achieved and the activities planned for doing so.

**Teaching**

**Professional Achievement**

**Service**

**Department Chair's Signature/Date:**
**(or signature of senior department member if the chair is the candidate)**

**Candidate's Signature/Date:**

## Attachment 5: Supporting Documents

To facilitate the evaluation of our Guidelines, we provide three supporting documents.

The first is *The Statement of Evaluation Criteria, Standards and Procedures* for the economics department at the University of Puget Sound (pages 17-26). These standards and procedures are quite similar in design and intent to our guidelines. Please note that Puget Sound's economics department uses a tiered, ordinal ranking for their category "professional growth" like the one we have adopted for professional achievement and service in our Guidelines. Our Professional Achievement outcomes (Tiers 1 and 2) align with UPS's Professional Growth (Tier II). Our Service outcomes (Tiers 1 and 2) align with UPS's Service (Tiers I, II, and III)

The second supporting document is the statement of *Scholarship in the Department of Economics* for the Department of Economics from Whitman College (pages 27-28). The categories of professional activity identified by Whitman's economics faculty exhibit overlap with those identified in our Guidelines.

The third document is a letter of evaluation from Professor Norris Peterson of the economics department at Pacific Lutheran University providing a review of our Guidelines (page 29). Professor Peterson served as the external evaluator for our departmental review completed in spring 2013 and provided helpful comments on an earlier draft of these Guidelines. His deep knowledge of the department and experience as a dean at PLU make him uniquely qualified to review and evaluate our Guidelines.

University of Puget Sound

Source:

http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/3116_Economics%20Evaluation%20Standards,%20approved%20November%202000.pdf

# DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

## Statement of Evaluation Criteria,

## Standards and Procedures

10/00

## PURPOSE

This document is intended to serve as a guide to Economics faculty in the evaluation process and is designed to serve both the evaluee and those undertaking the evaluation. It also serves to fulfill the requirement of the Faculty Code of the University of Puget Sound that "Departments shall state in writing the criteria, standards and needs of the department used in the deliberative process in relation to the University's standards and needs." This document should be viewed as a complement to the criteria and procedures for tenure and promotion that are detailed in the Faculty Code (or, the Code). Evaluees, in particular, should review the Code and discuss any questions about it or this document with the department chair and other colleagues. Additionally, the evaluee should carefully review the "University Evaluation Criteria" and "Evaluation Procedures" memoranda distributed by the Professional Standards Committee, in consultation with the Faculty Advancement Committee. These documents are sent to evaluees in the summer prior to the year of evaluation.

The Faculty Code identifies several areas of assessment for tenure and promotion. For tenure, they are teaching, professional growth, university service and the needs of the department. The factors for promotion are similar, but not identical: teaching, professional growth, advising students, university service, and community service related to professional interests and expertise. To be granted tenure, the evaluee must demonstrate excellence in the areas of teaching and professional growth and also establish a record of service. To be promoted, the evaluee must demonstrate the "highest standards," while advancement to full professor requires "distinguished service in addition to sustained growth" in the above areas. At the departmental level, the same high standards are applied equally to all evaluations. In all cases, as the Faculty Code states, "the responsibility for demonstrating he or she meets the standards for tenure or promotion rests with the evaluee."

This document is organized according to the criteria identified in the Faculty Code. For each criterion, the departmental standard is defined and evidence to establish that the standard has been met is discussed. The last section of the document outlines the departmental procedures to be followed for evaluation.

## DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Teaching excellence is the first and most important criterion against which performance by professors is evaluated. There is no simple working definition of teaching excellence that is appropriate for all situations, nor an unambiguous way to determine when excellence has been achieved. The following guidelines, however, represent generally accepted components of teaching excellence and evidence that can be used to evaluate teaching performance.

### COMPONENTS OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

Excellence in teaching necessarily requires success in the following four areas: course content, course design, teaching pedagogy, and course management/student relations.

#### Course Content

1. Currency: Courses should reflect or be informed by current theory, policy, and real-world events.
2. Level: Content should be appropriate given the course level and the students' backgrounds.
3. Rigor: The course should present an appropriate degree of rigor given the nature of the material and the general standards set by other departmental courses at the same level.
4. Specific Content: Content should be consistent with the role of the course within the department and the university.

#### Course Design

1. Texts and Readings: Written materials should be appropriate to the content of the course; they should be chosen so as to maximize student mastery and understanding of the course material.
2. Assignments: Student assignments should be designed to maximize student understanding of the course content.
3. Quantity and Quality of Effort: The course should require of students an appropriate amount of high quality effort.

#### Pedagogy

1. Effective Communication: Professors should communicate course ideas and concepts clearly and monitor student understanding effectively.
2. Student Feedback: Professors should solicit and respond to student questions effectively and provide prompt and appropriate feedback to students regarding their performance on class assignments.
3. Motivation: Professors should use appropriate and successful techniques to motivate students to complete course assignments and to master course content.
4. Flexibility: Professors should realize when class performance has failed and take swift action to remedy any situation that is detrimental to the quality of the course.

#### Course Management And Student Relations

1. Course Expectations: Expectations regarding student behavior and student performance, both in general and for particular assignments, should be clearly and regularly communicated.

2. Appropriate Behavior: Professors should engage in appropriate behavior with regard to students in all academic settings.
3. Student Contact: Professors should provide ample opportunities for student contact outside the classroom, especially through regularly-scheduled office hours.
4. Enthusiasm for Learning: Professors in their dealings with students should attempt to display and communicate an enthusiasm for learning.
5. Honesty: Professors should be honest with their students and demonstrate respect for them.

## EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE

While a wide variety of measurements may be used to assess teaching excellence, every evaluation must include the following four types of evidence:

A. Student evaluations, for the previous four semesters of teaching in tenure cases, and two semesters of teaching in cases of promotion, 3-year and 5-year evaluations;

B. Course materials for all evaluated courses, including syllabi, examinations, assignments, and assigned written materials.

C. A personal statement of teaching philosophy and performance assessment. (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under "Procedures" at the end of this document.)

D. An on-going process of classroom visitation.

It is the responsibility of the evaluee to include the first three types of evidence in his or her file. Classroom visitation, however, is the collective responsibility of the evaluee's departmental colleagues.

Other types of evidence that the evaluee may wish to submit or that colleagues may wish to consider as evidence for teaching excellence include: letters from university colleagues with whom the evaluee has collaborated on teaching activities; materials from non-evaluated departmental courses or courses taught outside the Economics department; student performance on course assignments, discussions with colleagues, team-teaching experience, video-recording of classroom activities, attendance at teaching seminars, letters from students, or a demonstrated novel or innovative teaching pedagogy.

## DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR EXCELLENCE: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

Successful evaluation at tenure and promotion is predicated upon the evaluee achieving and maintaining excellence in the area of professional growth. Within the liberal-arts environment, it is desirable that the Economics faculty be composed of diverse individuals with varying interests and different areas of expertise within the discipline. Because of this heterogeneity it is to be expected that the set of activities which constitute a high level of professional growth and development will vary from individual to individual within the department. Nonetheless, the department is able to delineate, in broad terms, the parameters defining professional growth for its members.

### COMPONENTS OF EXCELLENCE IN PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The department clearly recognizes that there are a number of different types of activities that constitute professional growth. Particular evaluees, therefore, may have very different research agendas and developmental strategies depending upon their own individual areas of inquiry. In recognition of these differences among individuals, the department has established a two tier system for classifying the kinds of activities which are acceptable in demonstrating excellence in professional growth. These tiers are identified as General Activities (Tier I) and Specific Activities (Tier II).

In order for an individual to meet the departmental standards for excellence in professional growth, the department must be convinced that the individual has:

A. Met all criteria identified in Tier I: General Activities, and
B. Engaged in a reasonable number of activities from Tier II which indicates, in both the level of effort and quality of output, a sustained and continuing intellectual commitment to professional growth.

### TIER I: GENERAL ACTIVITIES

1. Maintain currency in the areas of macroeconomic and microeconomic theory consistent with the requirements for effectively teaching the Intermediate Theory Courses.
2. Remain current and informed on changes in the discipline and the general condition of the economy.
3. Maintain an interest and currency in at least two upper-level teaching areas acceptable to the department.

### TIER II: SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

1. Publish in scholarly journals in the appropriate field;
2. Author, edit, or contribute to research monographs, books, or more general works in a relevant area;
3. Present papers or participate as a discussant in national/regional/specialty area conferences;
4. Conduct consulting-based research which contributes to the individual's professional development by clearly making a substantive or novel contribution to the evaluee's research program;
5. Author texts or develop software suitable for classroom use;
6. Contribute to the department's working papers series;
7. Participate in community service activities where the individual is involved in professional development;

8. Share in the governance of the professional organizations in the individual's area of expertise;
9. Participate in seminars or colloquia which present recent advances in economic theory or formal modeling techniques;
10. Referee or review manuscripts for scholarly journals or academic publications;
11. Engage in certain, specific types of class related activities (See below*).

*Arguments necessary for considering coursework as part of professional growth must include evidence that the faculty member has: developed a new course outside the individual's (previous) area of expertise, used the results of their own professional development to improve course material, or integrated new theoretical developments or empirical analyses into class materials. The department will use the evaluations together with course material submitted by the individual being evaluated to determine if these objectives have been met. The burden of proof, though, is always on the evaluee to demonstrate that any particular professional activity qualifies as professional growth and development.

## EVIDENCE OF EXCELLENCE: PROFESSIONAL GROWTH

The evaluee is responsible for providing the following evidence to the department as part of the evaluation file:

A. A personal statement which should include a description and assessment of past activities related to professional growth as well as the evaluee's future research agenda. (This constitutes part of the self-evaluation described under "Procedures" at the end of this document.)

B. A copy of all published and unpublished research, reports, and/or documents related to professional growth. (In the case of conflict arising from the release of proprietary information, the individual and the chair of the departmental evaluation committee will agree on a mutually acceptable form for disseminating this evidence.)

C. Course syllabi, reading lists, class handouts, and any other material which might be needed by the department in order to judge the content of a course being offered as a contribution to professional growth in either tier I or II. (Because many of these materials would be provided as part of the evidence pertaining to excellence in teaching, only those which were not reproduced earlier are necessary here.)

The evaluee may choose at his or her discretion to include other types of evidence to establish excellence in the area of professional growth. Such evidence could include the names and addresses of any individuals outside of the department or the university who can provide evidence of professional growth, letters of evaluation from outside referees, or any other materials as deemed appropriate by the evaluee.

## DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR ACADEMIC AND CAREER ADVISING

The department recognizes the vital role that advising plays in the educational mission of the university. Therefore, department members must conscientiously undertake advising duties consistent with the needs of the department and the university.

### COMPONENTS OF SATISFACTORY ADVISING

Advisors should foster independence of thought and action and a sense of responsibility for academic and career planning in their advisees. Although individual advising styles may differ considerably, the common elements in every effective style include appropriate knowledge, openness and availability.

#### Knowledge

Advisors must have a good working knowledge of university curricula, rules, regulations and policies; an in-depth knowledge of their own departmental curriculum; a sufficient awareness for student support offices to make appropriate referrals; and a familiarity with advising resources. Advisors should maintain and be familiar with their advisees' academic records and any other pertinent information provided by the university.

#### Openness

Advisors must show a readiness to serve in advising; to welcome student questions and concerns (personal, academic, and career-related); and to make appropriate referrals.

#### Availability

Advisors must make themselves available to students at reasonable times both formally through regular advising appointments and informally, including discussions with students who are not their advisees.

### EVIDENCE OF SATISFACTORY EXCELLENCE

It is the responsibility of individuals being evaluated to demonstrate an awareness of the components of satisfactory advising and to describe and evaluate their advising accordingly.

## DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR UNIVERSITY SERVICE

University service is one of the areas of assessment for tenure and promotion identified in the Faculty Code. While department members are required to undertake their share of university service, such service carries less weight than teaching and professional growth in evaluation decisions.

University service results in public goods which collectively benefit the university community. Because of its public and collective nature, the overall benefits of university service and the contributions of an individual faculty member to the final product are difficult to assess and measure. Nonetheless, the Department has delineated various types of service and specified its expectations regarding each component.

### COMPONENTS OF UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The components of university service have been divided into three sets. The first set (I) identifies general departmental service activities. The second set (II) identifies specific departmental service activities. The third set (III) identifies specific university service activities outside the department. Individuals in the department are responsible for all of the activities in set (I). Individuals in the department should choose activities from both set (II) and set (III) which complement their talents and interest. Non-tenured career faculty are not expected to participate in either (II) or (III) for the first year.

I. General Departmental Service Activities

1. Recruitment and hiring of economics faculty;
2. Evaluation of departmental colleagues;
3. Selection of departmental teaching assistants;
4. Participation in departmental meetings and functions.

II. Specific Departmental Service Activities

1. Acting as department chair;
2. Acting as departmental representative;
3. Drafting statements on departmental statements and procedures;
4. Drafting statements for periodic curriculum reviews;
5. Drafting departmental statements for accreditation report;
6. Participation in other department service activities.

III. University Service Activities Outside The Department

1. Member of the faculty senate;
2. Member of a standing committee;
3. Member of a trustee committee;
4. Member of an ad hoc committee;
5. Participation in cocurricular activities;
6. Participation in activities that contribute to a creative and intellectual atmosphere on campus;
7. Participation in other university service activities.

EVIDENCE OF SATISFACTORY UNIVERSITY SERVICE

The individual being evaluated is responsible for providing an evaluation of her or his university service activities. The evaluee may choose to include letters from university colleagues or written reports of their service activities.

## DEPARTMENTAL STANDARDS FOR COMMUNITY SERVICE

Community service related to professional interests and expertise is one of the criteria identified in the Faculty Code for promotion. Community service can enhance the reputation of the university, contribute directly to the professional growth of a faculty member and add significantly to the mission of the university. Community service that enhances the reputation of the university or adds significantly to the mission of the university can also contribute to university service.

Community service activities will vary among individuals, depending upon their interests and the manner in which they choose to apply their expertise to community needs. Individuals should choose those community activities appropriate to their interests and preferences.

Similar to university service, community service is a shared, public enterprise and thus an individual's contribution is difficult to measure. The evaluee should include a description of any community service activities related to professional interests or expertise in the evaluation file.

## ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT
## STATEMENT OF PROCEDURES
## DEPARTMENTAL EVALUATION OF COLLEAGUES

Responsibilities of the Evaluee

As required by the Faculty Code, the evaluee should prepare an evaluation file, including in it a current curriculum vita. The file should also include a self-assessment of performance with respect to each of the criteria, identifying specific ways in which concerns or weaknesses will be addressed or improvements will be sought. The self-evaluation should also include a statement of goals and objectives, both for the period leading up to the current evaluation and for the time to be covered in the next one. The file should also contain all evidence required to establish excellence in teaching and professional growth, and evidence necessary to establish that satisfactory standards have been met in advising, university, and community service. Specific types of evidence required for each criterion are discussed earlier in this document. The evaluee may also choose to include any other types of evidence he or she believes is appropriate for the evaluation process.

Timing of Evaluation

Evaluation as discussed in this document pertains to all evaluations after the first and second-year evaluations. In those cases, the evaluation file is prepared as discussed here and submitted to the Faculty Advancement Committee. At the end of each year of the first two years of a non-tenured faculty member's appointment, the department chair shall write an evaluation report and send it to the individual, to the Dean, and to the Faculty Advancement Committee, as required by the Faculty Code.

Departmental Recommendation Procedure

When a member of the Economics department is being evaluated, the departmental recommendation procedure shall be:

1. Tenure-line faculty members of the department shall examine the evaluation file prepared by the candidate and take whatever other actions as shall be required by the Code in such cases. Faculty on leave may be excused by the department chair. Members shall determine if, based on this evidence, the candidate meets the departmental criteria for tenure and/or promotion. Individual members will write a letter of assessment based on the evaluation file and any other appropriate evidence the individual considers in his or her recommendation. The letter should include a specific recommendation regarding the tenure and/or promotion decision. Additionally, the Professional Standards Committee requests that faculty include in their individual letters "a statement detailing the courses they visited and the days they visited them."

2. Tenure-line faculty members of the department will forward their individual letters of evaluation to the chair or some person appointed by the chair who will prepare a written draft of the departmental recommendation. After the draft has been reviewed by all members of the department participating in the review, excluding the evaluee, a meeting shall be held to discuss the recommendation. The recommendation letter shall then be revised as necessary to include suggestions and concerns made by departmental members during its review and meeting. If a consensus cannot be reached regarding the recommendation, the departmental letter shall reflect the lack

of consensus. The letter shall include a summary of the substance of the individual letters and a summary of the department's deliberations. (Note that the Faculty Code allows for faculty members to send their individual letters and recommendations directly to the Dean; the recommendation of any who chose this option would not then appear in the departmental recommendation.)

3. Evaluators will be asked to sign the departmental recommendation letter. An evaluator's signature indicates s/he has participated in the evaluation process and that the letter accurately reflects the department's deliberative process.

4. The departmental recommendation shall then be given to the evaluee for his or her review and signature. The evaluee's signature is to indicate, as required by the Faculty Code, that she or he was provided with a list of faculty members participating in the departmental recommendation (indicated by their attached signatures) and had an opportunity to review, though not necessarily endorse, the departmental recommendation which includes a summary of the substance of the letters and departmental deliberations.

5. All materials collected in the course of the departmental evaluations will be forwarded to the Advancement Committee.

Mentor Teams for Non-Tenured Faculty Members

In the first year of a non-tenured faculty member's appointment, a three-member mentor team shall be established. It is the responsibility of the mentor team to provide guidance and evaluative suggestions to the new faculty member through the tenure evaluation. It is also the responsibility of the mentor team to engage in a process of regular, on-going classroom visitation, beginning with the second semester of the first year of appointment and extending until the tenure evaluation. (Individuals who are not mentor team members are encouraged to visit classes.) The mentor team should meet with the new faculty member in the first year of his or her appointment to discuss this document and relevant portions of the Faculty Code, along with any questions of the new faculty member. It is the responsibility of the mentor team to address any questions about the faculty member's role in the department and to offer advice on achieving success as a teacher-scholar at the University of Puget Sound. At the end of each of the first two years of the faculty member's appointment, the mentor team should meet with the chair to participate in preparing an evaluation report of the new faculty member. A copy of this report, as discussed above under "Timing," is given to the individual, the Dean, and the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Note that no part of this document should be construed to supersede or prevail over any portion of the Faculty Code. In all cases, the departmental criteria, evaluation and procedures shall be subject to criteria, evaluation, and procedures as established in the Faculty Code.

https://www.whitman.edu/Documents/Offices/Provost/Economics_Scholarship_Guidelines_May_19__2011.pdf

To: Tim Kaufman-Osborn, Provost and Dean of the Faculty
From: Denise Hazlett, Chair of the Economics Department
Date: April 7, 2011
Re: Department Scholarship Guidelines

## Scholarship in the Department of Economics

The Department of Economics expects its members to stay current in their areas of study and to actively engage with the community of scholars in their fields. In addition to publication in peer-reviewed journals, forms of professional engagement could include, for example, participating in conferences and seminars and working with others on research projects. The department will evaluate scholarly work based on the sophistication of economic reasoning, insight, and empirical applications, and for originality and contribution to the field of study.

The department complies with the Whitman College Faculty Handbook guidelines and procedures for evaluating faculty members for contract renewal, tenure, and promotion. The department encourages all of its members to be familiar with the criteria in the handbook. Progress in professional activity should be consistently apparent at the point of contract renewal, tenure and promotion. For promotion to full professor, the economics scholar should show evidence of an ongoing successful program of professional activity. The following department guidelines elaborate on the handbook guidelines, establishing departmental scholarship standards consistent with handbook criteria a.-f. listed under "Excellence in Professional Activity." As the handbook notes, all of items a.-f. are valuable, and item a. is necessary.

## Department Scholarship Guidelines

a. *Research and writing that appear in peer-reviewed publications, noteworthy performances or exhibitions, or other appropriate peer-reviewed professional activities in the candidate's field(s) of study.*

Economics scholars typically publish articles in peer-reviewed journals in economics or related fields. They might also publish peer-reviewed books or chapters in books.

### Observations on the peer-reviewed publication process in economics

Most economics journals have a double-blind referee process. Referees are typically not paid. An author can submit a manuscript to only one journal at a time. It may be many months before an editor receives all of the referee reports and sends a response to the author. Outright acceptance of an article is rare. Most non-rejections come in the form of a request to revise and resubmit. In the time between an editor's acceptance of a manuscript for publication and the actual publication, the manuscript appears on the author's curriculum vitae as forthcoming. For a multi-authored article, the order of a (non-alphabetized) list of authors' names indicates their contribution to the work. An alphabetized list is ambiguous; it could indicate equal contribution by the authors.

b. *Peer-reviewed publication in related areas, including but not limited to, matters of pedagogy and curricular design:*

Examples in this category include publishing a peer-reviewed journal article, book, chapter in a book, textbook or instructor's manual.

c. *Non-peer reviewed publication and professional activity:*

Examples of non-peer reviewed publications and professional activity include publications that appear in a working papers series, reports for government or policy institutes, and book reviews.

d. *Active involvement in professional organizations:*

Examples of active involvement in professional organizations include editing a journal, refereeing journal articles, refereeing grant proposals, serving on boards, and organizing conferences.

e. *Participation in professional meetings and conferences, including presentations made with student co-authors:*

Conference presentations are generally part of the process leading to publication. Presenting at a conference or seminar can provide valuable feedback prior to submitting an article for publication.

f. *The writing and submission of proposals for external grants:*

The department encourages the writing and submission of proposals for external grants.

PACIFIC
LUTHERAN
UNIVERSITY

**Department of Economics**
Tacoma, WA 98447-0003

253-535-7595 PHONE
253-535-8305 FAX
*www.plu.edu*

*Educating for Lives of Thoughtful Inquiry, Service, Leadership and Care*

January 25, 2018

Dear Jeff, members of the Economics Department, and Linfield University Administrators,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the conditionally approved Promotion and Tenure Guidelines for the Linfield College Department of Economics dated January 22, 2018. In August 2015 I was invited to review an earlier draft and wrote at the time that I found them to be: "straightforward and helpful to the department chair, tenured members of the department, and junior members of the department in thinking about and planning for a career at Linfield College." The current version improves significantly on the original draft by (among others) expanding and clarifying the evaluation methods to be used, by dividing expected outcomes in both professional achievement and service into ordinally ranked outcomes in each of two tiers, and by providing case studies to illuminate expectations for promotion to the rank of full professor. The guidelines appear to be well-aligned with the values and goals of the department, provide sufficient guidance to both untenured and tenured professors, and both recognize and encourage a variety of professional activities that characterize a vibrant and engaged academic department. Just as importantly, they provide excellent guidance to colleagues tasked with the job of evaluating their professional peers. I offer my full approval of their final adoption by the university administration.

I congratulate the department on their excellent work and appreciate very much the opportunity to have contributed to this project.

Sincerely,

Norris A. Peterson

Norris A. Peterson, PhD
Professor of Economics
Pacific Lutheran University
(253) 535 7645
petersna@plu.edu