

Department of Economics Bylaws

Approved: March 19, 2003

Amended: October 31, 2003

Amended: September 25, 2007

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION

A. PREAMBLE

These bylaws

1. provide for faculty participation in the operations of the Department of Economics, in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the American Association of University Professors/Wright State University Chapter (AAUP/WSU) Wright State University.
2. are subject to and consistent with the Bylaws of the Raj Soin College of Business (here after referred to as the College or College of Business);

B. MAJOR PRINCIPLES

1. The Faculty of the Department of Economics seek to promote and sustain effective teaching (undergraduate and graduate) and scholarship in the field of economics, and to participate fully in the governance of the College and University as allowed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Wright State Board of Trustees. The bylaws address standards for Promotion and Tenure, contain criteria for the annual evaluation of Bargaining Unit Faculty, and contain procedures for making recommendations.
2. Bargaining Unit Faculty rights and responsibilities are set forth within the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
3. Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty rights and responsibilities are determined by the College Dean and Administration with input from departmental faculty and relevant College of Business and University committees.
4. Faculty who are elected to represent the department on College or University committees are expected to represent the expressed will of the departmental faculty (when clearly known).

SECTION II. DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

1. The Department of Economics is made up of a Department Chair, Bargaining Unit Faculty, Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty, and Staff. This includes Bargaining Unit Faculty who may be on professional development leave, sick leave, or other temporary leave. Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty include faculty holding full-time, non-tenure track appointments in the Department, including those on sick leave or temporary leave. All members of the Department fulfill critical

roles necessary to carrying out the mission of the Department, College, and University. As such the Department of Economics faculty are in agreement that all members of the Department, regardless of classification, are to be treated with respect, dignity, and professionalism.

All full-time faculty other than the Department chair (hereafter, departmental faculty) in the Department of Economics are allowed to participate in making recommendations about the operation of the Department and have all such authority, rights, and responsibilities, as allowed by the Wright State University Board of Trustees, except in those cases specified in the Collective Bargaining Agreement that are reserved solely for Bargaining Unit Faculty members (BUFMs).

2. Regular Faculty Meetings: The Department Faculty will meet at least once during each quarter (Fall, Winter, Spring). The Chair will call these meetings, and will make every reasonable effort to schedule them at times that do not conflict with teaching schedules or other regularly scheduled meetings on campus. Faculty meetings may also be called by a majority of the departmental faculty.
3. Special Meetings of Department BUFMs: A minimum of two BUFMs may call a special Bargaining Unit Faculty meeting to address issues reserved solely for BUFMs under the Collective Bargaining Agreement. To the extent possible, special meetings will be scheduled at times that do not conflict with teaching schedules or other regularly scheduled meetings on campus.
4. Facilitation of Meetings: The Department Chair will facilitate regular Faculty meetings and any special Faculty meeting called by the Chair. Special meetings called by the BUFMs will be facilitated by one of the members calling the meeting.
5. Quorum: A simple majority of the Department Faculty members constitutes a quorum for those Faculty meetings that are intended to include all Department Faculty members. A simple majority of BUFMs constitutes a quorum for those Faculty meetings that are intended to include only BUFMs.
6. Meeting Agendas: The Department Chair or those who call the meeting will make every reasonable effort to distribute a complete agenda for all Faculty meetings at least one week in advance. Department Faculty members are to submit items to the Chair in advance of the one week cutoff. Exceptions will be allowed in cases where issues come up during the week prior to the Faculty meeting requiring input or a faculty recommendation in order to adequately respond to a College or University committee or the Administration.

Agendas for special meetings called by the BUFMs will be distributed by the BUFMs calling the meeting at the time the meeting announcement is circulated.

Whenever reasonably possible, new agenda items shall be accompanied by copies of any supporting documents or any other written information that will be presented at the meeting, so faculty members have an opportunity to review the materials prior to the meeting.

7. Meeting Minutes: Minutes of all regular Faculty meetings called by the Chair will be taken by the department secretary. These minutes will be filed and distributed to all department Faculty members. Any changes in these minutes are to be brought to the next department meeting, where the faculty will approve the minutes as written or corrected. Minutes for special meetings called by BUFMs will be taken by one of the BUFMs. The minutes for special meetings must be approved by the BUFMs before they are distributed outside the BUFMs of the Department of Economics.

8. Voting: Proxy voting and absentee voting are not allowed. All matters brought before the Faculty for consideration and voted upon shall be approved by a majority of those present and voting.
9. Meeting Procedures: In all parliamentary matters not covered in these bylaws, Roberts Rules of Order shall apply.

B. FACULTY GOVERNANCE

1. **Committees:** Within the department there shall be three standing committees:

Graduate Studies Committee (GSC)

Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC)

Promotion, Retention, and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee)

2. **Membership:** The P&T Committee consists of all tenured BUFMs in the department and the department Chairperson who is a non-voting member of the Committee. Each member of the full time faculty is required to serve *on either* the USC or the GSC. To serve on the GSC, department faculty must have full graduate faculty status. The director of the M.S. program is an ex-officio, non-voting member of the GSC. The department Chairperson is an ex-officio non-voting member of both the GSC and the USC.
3. **Election of Departmental Committee Members:** Committee members shall be elected by all full time faculty in the department subject to the membership requirements listed above. At the beginning of each Fall quarter, the department chair will propose committee memberships for the GSC and USC and the departmental faculty shall propose changes if desired before the vote.
4. **The Graduate Studies Committee (GSC):** The GSC shall be chaired by the Department's representative to the College Graduate Programs Committee unless otherwise decided by the members of the GSC. The GSC has the responsibility of making recommendations in matters regarding graduate programs. Included in GSC duties are recommendations on student petitions, scholarships and assistantships; recommendations regarding graduate student awards and curriculum changes such as proposed addition/deletion of classes from the program and/or substantive changes in course structures. The GSC should meet at least once a quarter during the academic year. At the first meeting during the academic year of the GSC, the committee Chair of the previous year shall report on unfinished business.
5. **The Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC):** The USC shall be chaired by the Department's representative to the College Undergraduate Programs Committee unless otherwise decided by the members of the USC. The USC has the responsibility of making recommendations in matters regarding undergraduate programs including general education issues. Included in USC duties are recommendations on student petitions, undergraduate awards and scholarships, and curriculum changes such as proposed addition/deletion of classes from the major and/or substantive changes in course structures. The USC should meet at least once a quarter during the academic year. At the first meeting during the academic year of the USC, the committee Chair of the previous year shall report on unfinished business.
6. **Promotion and Tenure Committee (P&T Committee):** The P&T Committee shall be chaired by the Department's representative to the College P&T Committee unless otherwise decided by the members of the P&T Committee. The P&T Committee has the responsibility of making recommendations about promotion, retention, and tenure in accordance with the

Collective Bargaining Agreement and the Department and College bylaws. The P&T Committee is also responsible for mentoring untenured faculty and conducting regular reviews as required by the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

Specifically, the P&T Committee must:

- ensure that peer evaluations of teaching are conducted yearly for untenured BUFMs and at least every three years for tenured BUFMs below the rank of Professor;
- provide all untenured BUFMs with an annual letter regarding progress toward tenure and promotion;
- provide all Assistant and Associate Professors with a letter regarding progress toward promotion in accordance with procedures contained in the CBA;
- review and make recommendations on all professional development leave proposals;
- make recommendations to Assistant and Associate Professors on areas that may require improvement;
- make recommendations on all matters concerning graduate faculty status;
- make recommendations regarding promotion and tenure;
- make recommendations regarding dismissal of probationary faculty;
- make recommendations regarding renewal of contracts for lecturers and instructors.

[For a detailed description of the policies and procedures for the P&T Committee, see Section IV]

7. Ad-hoc committees may be formed at any time by a majority vote of the Faculty, by a majority vote of the BUFMs, or by the Department Chair.

C. FACULTY APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL

1. **Faculty Appointment:** When there is an opening for a full-time faculty position, a search committee will be formed by the Dean. Faculty candidates for positions above the rank of assistant professor should have teaching and scholarship credentials comparable to those required for promotion to that rank in the Department of Economics. A majority of the search committee will be BUFMs, elected by the BUFMs in the department. The responsibilities of the Search Committee will be to: a) recommend a job description for the position, b) recommend criteria used to evaluate the applicants, c) screen applications, d) recommend candidates to be interviewed, e) assist the Chair in scheduling interviews (dates, times of presentation, individual faculty interviews, meals, etc.), f) determine a list of interview questions to be asked of all candidates, and g) compile feedback from Department members. All departmental faculty will be provided the opportunity to: a) interview, individually and/or in small groups, those candidates who are brought to campus, b) participate in presentations made by the candidates, and c) provide written feedback for each candidate to the Search Committee. After the Search Committee reviews the feedback and makes its recommendations at a department meeting, the acceptable candidates will be ranked by the departmental faculty. If the position is tenure-track, BUFM and non-BUFM rankings will be conducted separately. The Search Committee's recommendations, the Department Faculty's rankings, and the rationale for the rankings will be sent to both the Department Chair and the Dean. The Search Committee will also work with the Department Chair and the Office of Affirmative Action to ensure compliance with all university and affirmative action policies and procedures.
2. **Faculty Dismissal:** The P&T Committee shall consider any proposed dismissal of probationary faculty. After a full discussion of the case at a meeting(s), the committee will vote for or against dismissal and provide a summary of the reasons for and against dismissal

as expressed in the discussion (allowing for minority and majority opinions) to the Department Chair and the Dean of the College.

D. THE SELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON

When, for any reason, there is to be a vacancy in the position of Department Chair, a search committee will be appointed by the Dean. A majority of the search committee will be BUFMs from the Department of Economics, elected by the BUFMs in the department. The responsibilities of the Search Committee will be to: a) recommend a job description for the position, b) recommend criteria used to rank the applicants, c) screen applications, d) recommend candidates to be interviewed, e) schedule interviews (dates, times of presentation, individual faculty interviews, meals, etc.), f) determine a list of interview questions to be asked of all candidates, and g) compile feedback from Department Faculty members and other relevant College members. All members of the Department Faculty will be provided the opportunity to a) interview candidates (individually and/or in small groups), b) participate in presentations made by the candidates, and c) provide written feedback to the Search Committee for each candidate. The Search Committee will review the department Faculty's feedback and make its recommendation to the Department Faculty and the Dean. This recommendation will include the Department Faculty's ranking of acceptable candidates and the rationale for this ranking. The Search Committee will also work with the Dean and the Office of Affirmative Action to ensure compliance with all University and Affirmative Action policies and procedures.

E. SUMMER TEACHING ASSIGNMENTS:

In the event that there are insufficient classes scheduled to meet all requests made by the BUFMs for the upcoming summer, summer teaching will be rationed in the following manner:

- first priority is for all BUFMs, in order of seniority (time at WSU), to receive at least one course;
- second priority will be granted to those faculty who are within two years of retirement such that those faculty will receive two courses in at least one of the years before they retire. This two-year priority shall be granted to a BUFM only once, and only after providing the department chair with a written statement acknowledging that this prioritization will end after two consecutive years;
- third priority will be granted according to seniority (time at WSU) to BUFMs who did not teach a full load over the previous two summers (12 hours);
- once BUFMs have taught at least a full load over the previous two summers (12 hours), the rationing process will begin again.

SECTION III. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

A. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF FACULTY

1. Each year, bargaining unit faculty in the Department of Economics will submit to the Chair an annual Activity Report using the standard college format. This will include a summary of accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service for the preceding calendar year. These reports must be submitted no later than the first Friday in February of each year. Additional details regarding the materials submitted for annual evaluations are listed below.

2. **Annual Evaluation Reports:** Annually, the Chair provides a written evaluation to each BUFM that appraises the individual's performance and provides an overall rating based on evidence of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship, and service. This evaluation provides the chair's rationale for the rating in each of the three areas using this evidence. In doing so, the chair must use criteria listed in these bylaws.
- a. As determined by the collective bargaining agreement, possible ratings are: 0 = unsatisfactory; 1 = adequate; 2 = meritorious; 3 = outstanding; and 4 = extraordinary. If the faculty member agrees with the evaluation, he/she will sign a copy of the evaluation and return it to the Chair. If the faculty member disagrees with the evaluation, he/she must follow the procedures outlined in the CBA.
 - b. After the Chair has completed annual evaluations and assigned an integer value from 0 to 4 for each individual's teaching, scholarship, and service, percentages within the following ranges are assigned by an algorithm that gives each individual the maximum possible overall average:

Teaching 35% to 55%
Scholarship 20% to 45%
Service 15% to 30%

The range of percentages in each category will apply to all BUFMs in the department with the following exceptions:

The Chair assigns a different weighting to allow for:

- discipline pursuant to the CBA,
- correction of a pattern of substandard performance extending more than one year, and/or
- a non-standard work assignment.

If the Chair assigns a weighting outside the algorithm or the ranges above, he/she will notify the faculty member in writing and provide a written explanation for the different weights.

B. ANNUAL EVALUATION FOR ALL BUFMs

The department Chair is responsible for evaluating a bargaining unit faculty member's teaching performance using the criteria established herein. The Chair must explain as part of the faculty member's annual evaluation why a particular rating was awarded.

1. **Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching:** In the following description, the phrase "course load" refers to the load assigned to each individual faculty member by the university. In describing teaching, advising and related activities, the adverb "effectively" refers to both demonstrable overall success in conveying appropriate information and building appropriate skills and to demonstrable effort in attaining such success. Thus a faculty member may demonstrate the effectiveness of his or her teaching with evidence revealing classroom success (see Evidence section below) and (if needed) with evidence showing the kind and quality of effort he or she has made in meeting students' needs (e.g., a portfolio of teaching materials or a discussion of special problems in a particular class).

To receive a score of 1 (Adequate) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively and advise students effectively.

To receive a score of 2 (Meritorious) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively, and perform all three of the following effectively, or any two of the following with distinction:

- Advise students effectively
- Show significant evidence of success in teaching and advising
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested (e.g., advise honor students, supervise Master's theses, serve on theses committees, work with independent study students, etc.)

To receive a score of 3 (Outstanding) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively, and perform four of the following effectively, or any three of the following with distinction.

- Advise students effectively
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising,
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested (e.g., advise honor students, supervise Master's theses, serve on theses committees, work with independent study students, etc.)
- Develop a new course or significantly revise existing course content, pedagogy, or technology in a meaningful way
- or the equivalent

To receive a score of 4 (Extraordinary) in teaching, a faculty member must teach a course load effectively, and perform five of the following effectively, or four of the following with distinction.

- Advise students effectively
- Show clear and convincing evidence of special commitment to and outstanding success in teaching and advising,
- Perform other teaching-related functions effectively and responsibly as requested (e.g., advise honor students, supervise Master's theses, serve on theses committees, work with independent study students, etc.)
- Develop a new course or significantly revise existing course content, pedagogy, or technology in a meaningful way,
- Take a leadership role in the development and support of the teaching of other department faculty (especially, bargaining unit faculty) by giving classes on pedagogical issues, by leading the way and helping others with classroom technology, by mentoring faculty who may be struggling with their teaching;
- or the equivalent

A score of 0 (Unsatisfactory) in teaching will be given to any faculty member who does not satisfy the requirements for an Adequate evaluation. Symptoms of Unsatisfactory teaching performance may include (but are not limited to):

- missed classes (without informing the department or without adequate explanation)
- frequently shows up late for class or dismisses classes early
- missed advising appointments

- persistent and justified student complaints
- erratic classroom behavior
- failure to keep appropriate office hours and otherwise be available to students and advisees
- failure or refusal to provide the Chair with contract-related information related to teaching
- failure to communicate effectively with students
- refusal to teach assigned courses in the faculty member's field
- failure to respond appropriately to reasonable student questions or complaints
- irresponsible or unprofessional conduct with or in the presence of students in a university setting
- failure to return examinations and assignments in a timely manner

Behaviors such as those described above may result in an evaluation of Unsatisfactory if they are frequent and characteristic or a lowered evaluation (from Meritorious to Adequate, for example).

2. **Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching:** Student evaluations of teaching are required of all bargaining unit faculty.

Student evaluations: The Contract specifies what part of the student evaluations will be sent to the faculty member only and what information will be sent to the Chair. If they wish, faculty may provide additional evaluation material or may provide information explaining or responding to the student evaluations.

Other evidence: Faculty may submit additional evidence to the department Chair. Supporting evidence may include (but is not limited to) the following:

- Peer evaluations of teaching (for example, a colleague's report of a classroom visit)
- Selected syllabuses or other class materials (to demonstrate a particular classroom innovation, for example)
- A written response to any peer evaluation
- A description of a particular section or a response to the student evaluations for a particular section (if a faculty member believes the evaluations need to be contextualized, for example)
- Additional student evaluation materials, including (but not limited to) a self-administered evaluation instrument, signed letter(s) from students in a particular course, a mid-term evaluation, the numerical evaluations from the official university instrument, etc.^[1]
- Evidence showing student learning success, for example, the results of a pre- and post-evaluation

In addition, the department Chair may use departmental records such as grade rosters and syllabi to evaluate teaching. The Chair may also gather evidence to be used as part of the evaluation of teaching. In such cases, the Chair will make all written records and/or summaries of evidence available to the faculty member.

3. **Scholarship:** The Economics Faculty value research and scholarship, and fully understand that substantive scholarship often comes to fruition only after a researcher spends a considerable amount of time in its preparation. Thus, in determining the merit of scholarship, the Chair should look beyond the work of a single year to get a sense of the faculty member's overall performance as a scholar. Similarly, all faculty should provide the Chair

with materials which will help her/him to accurately judge faculty merit using a broader perspective than that of a single year. Moreover, the evaluation of scholarship should reflect both the quantity of the output and the quality of the contribution to the discipline of economics.

The Department faculty agree that peer-reviewed journal articles are the traditional method for demonstrating scholarship. In evaluating the equivalence of other activities to peer reviewed journal articles the chair should take into account the time, effort, and quality of other scholarly activities. In addition to peer reviewed journal articles other activities can be used to demonstrate scholarly performance. Some examples of these activities include:

- peer-reviewed papers as proceedings in a scholarly journal;
- a scholarly book or textbook with a recognized university or academic press;
- a chapter in a scholarly book with a recognized university or academic press;
- an invited article in a scholarly journal;
- comments in a scholarly journal;
- a book review in a scholarly journal;
- subsequent editions of a previously published book or textbook;

The Chair is responsible for evaluating a bargaining unit faculty member's scholarship performance using the criteria established herein. In evaluating scholarship, the chair must explain as part of the faculty member's annual evaluation why a particular rating was awarded. Any rating must follow the criteria set below.

A score of **0 (Unsatisfactory)** in scholarship will be given to any faculty member who cannot satisfy the requirements for Adequate evaluation. Symptoms of "unsatisfactory" scholarly performance include, but are not limited to, little or no scholarly activity, demonstrations of incompetence in matters of professional expertise, periods of four or more years without a professional publication of any kind, or refusal to respond to mentoring or to develop a research strategy (if requested).

To receive a score of **1 (Adequate)** in scholarship, a bargaining-unit faculty member must keep current as a scholar in economics and demonstrate that currency by providing evidence of the following for the current evaluation period:

- submitting an article/chapter for publication in a peer-reviewed outlet;
- presenting ongoing research at a professional conference;
- producing a working draft of ongoing research;
- or the equivalent.

To receive a score of **2 (Meritorious)** in scholarship, a bargaining-unit faculty member must keep current as a scholar in economics and demonstrate that currency by providing evidence of *at least one* of the following:

- one peer-reviewed economics publication in the evaluation year, or two such publications over three years;
- or the equivalent.

To receive a score of **3 (Outstanding)** in scholarship, a faculty member must keep current as a scholar in economics and demonstrate that currency by providing evidence of *at least one* of the following:

- two EconLit listed peer-reviewed economics publications in the evaluation year, or three such publications over three years;
- or the equivalent.

To receive a score of **4 (Extraordinary)** in scholarship, a faculty member must keep current as a scholar in economics and demonstrate that currency by providing evidence of *at least one* of the following:

- three EconLit listed peer-reviewed economics publications in the evaluation year; or five such publications over three years;
- or the equivalent.

Evidence for the Evaluation of Scholarship: In support of all claims of merit in scholarship, the faculty member must submit:

- a letter of acceptance with a copy of the manuscript; or
- a printed copy of the publication, which may be galley proofs.

In addition, all faculty may (if they wish) submit a statement describing their research program and publication plans, as a way of placing in context the performance for a given year.

Activity Reporting Times: Unless noted otherwise, scholarship should be counted in the year of acceptance date or publication/copyright date. The faculty member must clearly state which date is to be considered. Conference papers presented should be counted in the year the meeting is held.

4. **Service:** Faculty service that is most valued contributes to the overall mission of the department, the discipline, the college, the university, and/or the community. Service includes but is not limited to committee service, leadership in existing university programs, the development of new programs and initiatives, contributions to professional journals and associations, lending of expertise to state, local, regional, and/or national organizations, be they private or public, for profit or nonprofit, etc.

The evaluation of faculty service is the responsibility of the department Chair using the guidelines established herein. The evaluation of service must reflect the quantity of the effort and the significance of the output. Compensated service will only count if a faculty member meets her/his service responsibilities to the Department, College and University in such a manner as would warrant his/her receiving at least a meritorious rating.

A service rating of **Unsatisfactory (0 point)** will be assigned if the faculty member does not meet the requirements of Adequate service.

A service rating of **Adequate (1 point)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets the following requirements:

- participates on one committee at the department level;
- attends department meetings;
- attends college meetings;
- responds to requests for activity reports, workload plans, and completes other departmental and college duties in a timely fashion.

A service rating of **Meritorious (2 points)** will be assigned if the faculty member meets *at least two* different requirements from the following list *in addition* to the evidence provided to receive an Adequate service rating.

- chairs a department, college or university committee;
- chairs or actively serves on a committee for a professional organization;
- actively serves on one additional department, college or university committee;
- takes a leadership role in some aspect of university work, e.g., in evaluating required texts for a course, in leading assessment activity or other special project for the department or the university, in developing a student-centered activity, etc;
- serves as an official advisor for a student organization;
- serves as a session chair and/or discussant in a voluntary capacity at a regional or national conference;
- serves as a referee for a scholarly journal;
- serves as a peer reviewer in the evaluation of teaching;
- serves as a peer (outside) reviewer in the evaluation of scholarship for promotion and tenure;
- performs some community or professional service related to professional expertise.
- or the equivalent.

A service rating of **Outstanding (3 points)** will be assigned if the faculty member fully satisfies either six of the requirements listed under “Meritorious” (in addition to the evidence provided to receive an Adequate service rating),^[2] or one category below in addition to the evidence provided to receive a meritorious service rating.

- Leads a major aspect of the department’s academic life beyond the regular activities of teaching, advising, and service; for example, direct a departmental or interdepartmental program; lead a search; chairs an important and productive committee;
- Takes a leadership role in an important aspect of college or university governance or organization; for example, chair a committee that rewrites and implements changes in general education, or develops a new degree program; take a leadership role in faculty governance, or the equivalent.
- Takes a leadership role as an officer in a state, national, or international professional organization;
- Functions in a central capacity in the publication of a professional journal as editor, member of the editorial board;
- or the equivalent.

A service rating of **Extraordinary (4 points)** in service will be assigned if, in addition to meeting the requirements for Outstanding, a faculty member performs one additional activity listed above under “Outstanding,” or the equivalent.

Evidence for the Evaluation of Service: The faculty should submit to the Chair:

- a list of all service activities performed during the year, arranged in order from the most important to the least important
- a description of all service activities performed that represent special commitment or effort beyond the norm
- any testimonial letters received that describe a particular act of service and its effects
- any other material that may support a claim to merit in service above that of “meritorious”

SECTION IV. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE OF DEPARTMENTAL FACULTY

A. GENERAL PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE

1. The primary responsibility for securing a recommendation for Promotion and/or Tenure rests with the individual seeking promotion and/or tenure. This responsibility involves all of the following:
 - Notifying the department Chair in writing with a copy to the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee by May 1.
 - Submitting the names of six recommended external reviewers who will be able to evaluate the candidate's scholarship in a clearly unbiased manner by May 1.
 - Submitting materials to be sent to the external reviewers by June 1.
 - Compiling necessary documentation to support her/his case and submit it to the Chair of the Department Promotion and Tenure Committee by October 1.
2. The Promotion and Tenure Committee is responsible for evaluating candidates for promotion and/or tenure using the criteria established herein. Annual evaluations by the Chair provide data for the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Favorable annual evaluations by the Chair are insufficient for granting a candidate promotion and/or tenure. In any evaluation the Committee must explain the conclusions reached, referring to specific evidence in the file.
3. To receive a recommendation for promotion from assistant to associate with tenure, the candidate must be effective in teaching, research and service.

To receive a recommendation from the Department for promotion from associate professor to full professor, the candidate must be effective in the areas of teaching, research and service.

B. PROCEDURES FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION OF ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS

The Promotion and Tenure Committee and the Department Chair are responsible for providing feedback to untenured BUFMs on an annual basis and to tenured BUFMs below the rank of Professor at least every three years about their cumulative progress in teaching, scholarship, and service using the criteria defined in Section IV of these bylaws.

1. Tenured Assistant and Associate professors must provide evidence of effective teaching to the P&T Committee at least once every three years (by the first Friday of February) including:
 - syllabi for each course taught over the last three years;
 - sample exams from each course taught over the last three years;
 - examples of student papers/projects in writing-intensive or writing-across-the-curriculum courses over the last three years;
 - any other materials the individual chooses to include to demonstrate teaching effectiveness and accomplishments over the last three years (e.g., teaching philosophy, number of new preps, classroom visitation feedback, teaching workshops or seminars, etc.);

The Department Chair will provide to the Promotion and Tenure Committee the narrative portion of the student evaluations.

2. **Periodic Peer-Evaluation of Teaching:** The P&T Committee shall evaluate the submitted evidence along with other departmental records for the following:

- Consistency of syllabi with topics to be covered in individual courses;
- Whether exams reflect the topics listed in the syllabi;
- Consistency between student papers/projects and the topics covered in the course;
- Consistent indications in student teaching evaluations of positive teaching practices;
- Consistent indications in student teaching evaluations of weakness in teaching practices;
- Identify any innovative techniques used in the classroom;
- Identify any teaching-related accomplishments.

The Department Chair will provide to the Promotion and Tenure Committee the numerical and narrative portions of the student evaluations.

a. The P&T Committee will evaluate the candidate's teaching as part of their reports on cumulative progress towards P&T as specified in the CBA. This process is detailed immediately below. The criteria used in this evaluation are detailed in Section C1 below (for non-tenured BUFMs) and D1 below (for tenured BUFMs).

b. Submission of Materials for Periodic Peer-Evaluations of Teaching for both Assistant and Associate Professors:

a. Untenured BUFMs must provide evidence of effective teaching to the P&T Committee by the first Friday of February each year, including:

- syllabi for each course taught;
- sample exams from each course taught;
- examples of student papers/projects in writing-intensive or writing-across-the-curriculum courses;
- any other materials the individual chooses to include to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, accomplishments, and efforts to improve (e.g., teaching philosophy, number of new preps, classroom visitation feedback, teaching workshops or seminars, etc.);

In the event an individual appears to be having difficulty in the classroom, three members of the Bargaining Unit Faculty (one chosen by the reviewed faculty member, one chosen by the P&T Committee, and one chosen by the department Chair) will observe that individual in one or more classroom situations. Indications of serious problems which necessitate such classroom observations may be reflected in the student teaching evaluations or numerous student complaints made to the Chair regarding classroom behavior.

3. By the end of the winter quarter, the P&T Committee will provide written feedback on teaching to both the individual who is evaluated and the department Chair. The feedback should identify specific accomplishments and positive progress in teaching. It should also identify specific areas in which improvement is needed, if any. In cases where improvement is recommended, specific recommendations need to be made as to how the individual may make those improvements. In any peer evaluation of teaching the Committee must explain the conclusions reached, referring to specific evidence listed above in (B.2.a) and in annual

activity reports, along with any additional information (e.g., class visitation) used in the peer evaluation.

3. The P&T Committee will evaluate both the quantity and quality of the candidate's scholarship as part of its report on cumulative progress towards P&T. The Evaluations will be based on the candidate's annual activity reports along with additional information provided by the candidate by the first Friday of February. In any evaluation, the Committee must explain the conclusions reached, referring to specific evidence.
4. The P&T Committee will evaluate both the quality and quantity of the candidate's service as part of their reports on cumulative progress towards P&T as specified in the CBA. This process is detailed in Sections C3 (for non-tenured BUFMs) and D3 (for tenured BUFMs) below. The Chair will evaluate the candidate's service independently. The evaluations will be based on the candidate's annual activity reports along with additional information provided by the candidate by the first Friday of February. In any evaluation, the Committee must explain the conclusions reached, referring to specific evidence.

C. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE AND/OR TENURE

1. **Teaching:** Over the probationary period the candidate should have compiled a record of consistently effective or steadily improved teaching. At the end of the probationary period, the candidate must demonstrate, at a minimum:
 - evidence of teaching effectiveness, and;
 - evidence of continuous improvement in teaching over the entire period.

The candidate's teaching effectiveness and commitment to improvement will be evaluated based on at least the following documentation:

- annual progress reports from the Department's P&T Committee,
- annual progress report from the Department Chair,
- annual evaluation from the Department Chair,
- student and peer evaluation of teaching, and
- the candidate's teaching portfolio which includes:
 - syllabi for each course taught;
 - sample exams from each course taught;
 - any other materials the individual chooses to include to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, accomplishments, and efforts to improve including examples of student papers or projects.

To be judged **effective in teaching**, a candidate must have a teaching performance that meets the minimum standard necessary for promotion and tenure. Therefore, *effective* candidates must demonstrate evidence of the following:

- ability to effectively communicate the material described in the syllabus under course description;
- enthusiasm for the subject matter;
- ability to offer challenging courses;
- ability to integrate current thinking on the topics covered in the course;
- ability to supervise independent studies or internships effectively;

- availability to students outside class time for discussion.

The following activities provide a guideline for the candidate for demonstrating effective teaching. However, they are not intended to be all-inclusive and therefore, should not be used as a checklist.

- Course syllabi which include information consistent with department expectations;
- Course materials which are consistent with the course descriptions and goals of the course;
- Exams and assignments appropriate to the level of the course;
- Evidence of effective participation in teaching improvement efforts;
- Evidence of consistently good teaching evaluations from students and peers;
- Ability to communicate course material effectively;
- Evidence that independent studies and internships assigned were effectively supervised;
- Evidence of the development and successful implementation of a new or revised course that substantially contributes to the department's, college's or university's mission(s);
- Evidence of multiple department or other equivalent teaching awards at Wright State University;
- Evidence of college or university teaching award at Wright State University;
- Evidence that students are challenged to think critically and to learn in innovative ways (e.g., challenging exams and assignments).

2. **Scholarship:** Over the probationary period the candidate should have compiled a record demonstrating a continuous commitment to high quality scholarship. At the end of the probationary period, the candidate must demonstrate, at a minimum:

- evidence of published scholarship;
- evidence of an ongoing research agenda.

The candidate's effectiveness in scholarship is based on the following documentation:

- published scholarship (in print);
- unpublished scholarship together with letters of acceptance indicating the forthcoming date of publication,
- evidence that the journals are refereed;
- unpublished scholarship;
- scholar presentations at nationally recognized conferences;
- external review letters.

Emphasis will be placed on evidence demonstrating ongoing scholarly activity over the entire period at Wright State University. Scholarship published before a candidate is hired at WSU will be evaluated by the P&T Committee during the first annual review of the candidate. An assistant professor seeking promotion and tenure may count a maximum of two articles or the equivalent that were published before starting employment as a BUFM at Wright State University. Journal articles must be published in economics journals or in scholarly journals closely related to the discipline of economics. Chapters in books must be peer reviewed and must appear in scholarly books. Books must be scholarly, and authored books as opposed to edited.

To be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure a candidate must have a demonstrated record of ongoing scholarly activity and have published five refereed journal articles. A maximum of two chapters in a scholarly book(s) may be substituted for two journal articles, or an authored (as opposed to an edited) scholarly book may be substituted for two journal articles. At least two articles or equivalent substitutions (two chapters or a book) must be single authored.

3. **Service:** Over the probationary period the candidate should have compiled a record demonstrating that he/she has been a contributing participant on committees and in activities necessary for the proper functioning of the Department and College. At the end of the probationary period, the candidate must demonstrate, at a minimum:
 - effective service on at least one committee per year at either the department, college, or university level;
 - regular attendance at department and college meetings;
 - evidence that activity reports and other departmental and college duties have been met in a timely fashion;
 - evidence of effective student advising and career counseling.

The candidate's effectiveness in service is based on the following documentation:

- attendance at department meetings as reflected in the minutes;
- records of student advising and/or career counseling;
- other documentation of service performed during probationary period.

To be judged **effective in service**, a candidate must have a service record that meets the minimum standard necessary for promotion and tenure. Therefore, the effective candidate must demonstrate evidence of the following:

- regular attendance and participation at department meetings;
- quantity of effort on department, college, and/or university committees;
- quality of effort on department, college, and/or university committees;
- ability to advise students effectively.

D. CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION TO (FULL) PROFESSOR

1. **Teaching:** The candidate should have compiled a record demonstrating high quality teaching since attaining the rank of associate professor. The candidate must therefore demonstrate, at minimum:
 - evidence of teaching effectiveness, and;
 - evidence of continuous improvement in teaching since gaining the rank of associate professor.

The candidate's teaching effectiveness and commitment to improvement will be evaluated based on at least the following documentation:

- periodic progress reports from the Department's P&T Committee,
- annual evaluations from the Department Chair
- the candidate's teaching portfolio which includes:
 - syllabi for each course taught over the last five years;
 - sample exams from each course taught over the last five years;
 - the narrative portion of the student evaluations over the last five years; and

- any other materials the individual chooses to include to demonstrate teaching effectiveness, accomplishments, and efforts to improve including examples of student papers or projects.

To be judged **effective in teaching**, a candidate must demonstrate evidence of the following:

- ability to effectively communicate the material described in the syllabus under course description;
- enthusiasm for the subject matter;
- ability to offer challenging courses;
- ability to integrate current thinking on the topics covered in the course;
- ability to supervise independent studies or internships effectively;
- ability to communicate course material effectively;
- availability to students outside class time for discussion.

The following activities provide a guideline for the candidate in demonstrating effective teaching. However, they are not intended to be all-inclusive and therefore, should not be used as a checklist.

- Course syllabi which includes information consistent with department expectations;
- Course materials which are consistent with the course descriptions and goals of the course;
- Exams and assignments appropriate to the level of the course;
- Evidence of effective participation in teaching improvement efforts;
- Evidence of consistently good teaching evaluations from students and peers;
- Evidence that independent studies and internships assigned were effectively supervised
- Evidence of the development and successful implementation of a new or revised course that substantially contributes to the department's, college's or university's mission(s);
- Evidence of multiple department or other equivalent teaching awards at Wright State University;
- Evidence of college and university teaching award at Wright State University;
- Evidence that students are challenged to think critically and to learn in innovative ways (e.g., challenging exams and assignments).

2. **Scholarship:** The candidate should have compiled a record demonstrating high quality scholarship since attaining the rank of associate professor. The candidate must therefore demonstrate, at minimum:

- evidence of published scholarship;
- evidence of leadership and creativity in her/his scholarship record, and;
- evidence of an ongoing research agenda since attaining the rank of associate professor.

The candidate's effectiveness in scholarship will be evaluated based on the following documentation:

- published scholarship (in print);
- unpublished scholarship together with letters of acceptance indicating the forthcoming date of publication;
- unpublished scholarship;

- scholarly presentations at nationally recognized conferences;
- external review letters.

Emphasis will be placed on evidence demonstrating ongoing scholarly activity since the candidate's last promotion. Journal articles must be published in economics journals or in scholarly journals closely related to the discipline of economics. Chapters in books must be peer reviewed and must appear in scholarly books. Books must be scholarly, and authored books as opposed to edited.

To be judged **effective in scholarship**, a candidate for (full) professor must have 12 refereed journal articles. Up to 4 chapters in scholarly books may be substituted for 4 journal articles, and two authored (as opposed to edited) scholarly books may be substituted for 4 journal articles. However, a candidate may not provide substitutions for more than 4 articles, i.e., must have a minimum of 8 refereed journal articles. At least 4 of the articles or their equivalents must have been published since the candidate's promotion to associate professor. At least one of the publications since promotion to associate professor must be single-authored.

3. **Service:** Since attaining the rank of associate professor, the candidate should have compiled a record demonstrating that she/he has been a contributing participant on committees and in activities necessary for the proper functioning of the Department, College, and University. The candidate must therefore demonstrate, at minimum:
 - evidence of service on multiple committees each year at the department, college, and/or university levels;
 - evidence of leadership in service to the department, college, university, professional community, and external community;
 - evidence of regular attendance at department and college meetings;
 - evidence that activity reports and other departmental and college duties have been met in a timely fashion;
 - evidence of effective student advising and career counseling.

The P&T Committee will evaluate and rank the candidate's effectiveness in service based on the following documentation:

- the minutes of department, college, and/or university meetings;
- records of student advising and/or career counseling;
- other documentation of external and internal service performed during the probationary period.

To be judged **effective in service**, a candidate must demonstrate evidence of the following:

- leadership in some area of service to the department;
- regular attendance at department and college meetings;
- quantity of effort on department, college, and/or university committees;
- quality of effort on department, college, and/or university committees;
- significance of the outcome on each committee
- ability to advise students effectively.

In addition the candidate must also provide evidence of one or more of the following:

- leadership in some area of service to the college and/or university;
- leadership in some area of service to the profession of economics;
- leadership in some area of service to the external community.

E. PROCEDURES FOR THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE IN THE RECOMMENDATION TO PROMOTE AND/OR TENURE BUFMs

To determine whether a candidate is effective in all three areas the committee will vote on the candidate's effectiveness in each of the three areas. In order to receive a favorable recommendations from the Committee a candidate must be judged to be effective in teaching, research and service. If a majority of the Committee finds that a candidate is not effective in any one of the three areas, then the candidate will not receive a favorable recommendations from the Committee. In the letter written on behalf of the Committee, by the Chair of the Committee in consultation with the voting members of the Committee, the letter must explain the conclusions reached, referring to specific evidence in the promotion and tenure file.

[1] As stated in the Contract, for non-tenured bargaining-unit faculty, the numerical portions of all student teaching evaluations are sent to the department Chair along with the written portions. The Chair will consider these numerical evaluations (along with any numerical evaluations submitted voluntarily by tenured bargaining-unit faculty) as part of the overall merit evaluation of teaching for non-tenured faculty, keeping in mind the questionable validity of numerical evaluations.

[2] Note that a distinction is made between the first four bullets under "meritorious" and the remaining bullets. Multiple hits on each of the first four bullets under "meritorious" will be counted separately towards the six items necessary to obtain "outstanding." However, multiple hits on each of the remaining bullets under "meritorious" will be counted only once. For example, if someone chairs two different department committees, they will receive two credits towards the required six items. However, if someone serves as a session chair at a professional conference more than once, they will receive only one credit towards the required six items necessary to obtain "outstanding."