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COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS

I. Membership

The Committee on Appointments and Promotions (CAP) of the Department of Economics consists of all tenured members of the teaching-and-research faculty whose primary appointment resides in the Department of Economics and Econometrics and the Chairperson of the Department, who serves as ex officio chairperson of the CAP.

II. Responsibilities

A. The CAP is responsible for deliberating and providing a recommendation on all cases that consider appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure to the teaching-and-research faculty with the exception of promotion to the rank of Professor or Endowed Chair, and on all cases that consider appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure to the special professional faculty.

B. All deliberations of the CAP are made in compliance with the University of Notre Dame’s Academic Articles, PAC recommendations, College recommendations, and departmental practices. The Chairperson participates in CAP deliberations, but does not vote with the CAP. In all cases the Chairperson is required to provide an independent recommendation in a written letter addressed to the Dean.

C. The CAP may advise the Chairperson and the Department on other departmental matters.

III. Procedures for Reappointment as Assistant Professor

A. Standards for Reappointment

The Academic Articles provide no guidance regarding the standards for reappointment. For reappointment, the Assistant Professor should have demonstrated sufficient progress in teaching ability, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence upon students, standing among colleagues, and achievement in scholarship that there is a reasonable likelihood that the standards for promotion to Associate Professor (see IV.A) will be satisfied when that decision is contractually mandated.

For reappointment achievement in scholarship is interpreted as follows. Assistant professors are expected to complete their doctoral degree before or soon after they arrive on campus, and to submit several articles by the time the renewal case is considered. Thereafter, they are expected to demonstrate substantial research activity, including: some articles published, accepted for publication, and invited to be revised and
resubmitted at leading journals; a steady stream of working papers and submissions to appropriate journals; participation and presentations of their research at appropriate general interest and specialty conferences, seminar series at other universities, and internal workshops. Other examples of achievement may include citations, external grants, and awards.

For reappointment, the Academic Articles provide no guidance regarding standards for teaching. For reappointment, sufficient progress in teaching ability is interpreted as follows. Assistant professors are expected to teach well-organized classes that challenge students at a level appropriate for the course and consistent with departmental expectations. They are expected to provide and maintain an environment within their classes that encourages students to learn. Assistant professors are expected to be available to students outside of class at least three hours per week for additional instruction, mentoring, and advice. To the extent initial deficiencies in teaching ability arise, candidates are expected to take concrete steps to remedy the deficiencies. It will be important for the candidate to document these steps.

The Academic Articles also provide no guidance regarding standards for service. For reappointment, expectations for the Assistant Professor are minimal, intended to involve a commitment of no more than five percent of their time, and restricted to those departmental and professional activities of direct benefit to the individual, such as recruiting, hosting seminar speakers, serving as discussant at conferences, and refereeing. Nevertheless, assistant professors are expected to perform reasonable service for the department when asked, to demonstrate a commitment to the construction of a healthy and vibrant department, and to maintain an appropriate level of civility and collegiality in their interactions with other faculty and staff. As with research and teaching, it is the quality and impact of service, not the quantity, which matters.

B. Timing

1. Faculty members are considered for reappointment only when contractually mandated.

2. Upon becoming a candidate for reappointment, the Chairperson meets privately with the candidate to explain the entire process, normally in May of the preceding academic year.

3. A candidate for reappointment may request that his/her case be withdrawn before a decision is reached and tender his/her resignation effective either at the end of the current academic year or the following year.

C. Materials Provided by the Candidate

1. The evaluation of the research of a candidate for reappointment is conducted internally. In exceptional circumstances an external evaluation may be approved by the Dean.
2. Candidates for reappointment are required to provide the following materials to the Chairperson by September 1 of the current academic year:

a. Curriculum vita (CV). The CV should distinguish between those publications that have appeared or that are forthcoming in refereed journals and those that are not refereed. Co-authors must be listed in the order in which they appear on the publication, and page numbers must be provided for all published articles.

b. One copy of all publications listed on the CV.

c. For publications which are listed as forthcoming, an acceptance letter from the editor.

d. A list of no more than five articles, published or unpublished, which the candidate considers to be her/his best work. The candidate should be advised that members of the CAP are expected to read all of her/his publications, but will pay special attention to the ones on this list.

e. A teaching portfolio consisting of materials from all courses taught at Notre Dame. For each course, the candidate must provide:
   i. the course syllabus.
   ii. an articulation of learning goals.
   iii. a description of teaching strategies and learning activities.
   iv. all teaching materials, assignments, and examinations.
   v. a representative sample of graded student work with names redacted reflecting the type of feedback students received including information about the full distribution of scores for each piece of work and examples of the strongest, the median, and the weakest student work.
   vi. all written course evaluations.

f. An integrative personal statement of no more than five pages describing the candidate’s research achievements and agendas, teaching goals, and how service activities may relate to his/her professional career.

g. Any other documents that the candidate believes will help the CAP to evaluate her/his research, teaching, and service contributions.

3. The Chairperson is responsible for providing the CAP with all the relevant information that is necessary to conduct a fair and objective review. The Chairperson provides feedback on the materials provided so that the candidate can improve them, if necessary. The candidate provides the Chairperson with any new information, such as articles accepted for publication, which becomes available during the process.

D. CAP Procedures and Deliberations

1. The Chairperson can call a CAP meeting at any time during regular working hours when members of the CAP do not have regularly scheduled classes. When the purpose of
the meeting is to provide a recommendation and/or vote on a case, a reasonable attempt will be made to achieve a quorum, defined as two-thirds of the membership of the CAP. Members of the CAP who are unable to attend can submit written recommendations to be included in the minutes, but cannot be counted toward a quorum, and cannot vote.

2. The Chairperson provides the time schedule for reappointment decisions to both the CAP and the candidate as soon as feasible after it is received from the Office of the Provost. The Chairperson calls a CAP meeting within the first two weeks of classes. At this meeting the CAP arranges a tentative schedule of meetings designed to complete its work at least one week in advance of the date when the file must be forwarded to the Dean, so that the Chairperson has sufficient time to prepare her/his separate recommendation.

3. Deliberations concerning reappointment require a comprehensive review of all aspects of the candidate’s research by all members of the CAP, and an equally comprehensive review of the candidate’s teaching and service. These discussions are conducted in as many meetings as necessary. Minutes are taken at each meeting and submitted to the members of CAP for their approval in a timely fashion.

4. The CAP selects one or more of its members to write the required research report on the candidate, one or more of its members to write the required teaching report, and one or more of its members to write the required service report. Each of these reports is prepared in accordance with current PAC guidelines, copies of which the Chairperson will provide to the CAP. Each report must be signed by its author(s).

5. The research report is no more than six pages and written in a way that makes the candidate’s contributions to the over-all discipline accessible to non-economists. Evaluative comments, if any, should be written in a careful and unbiased manner that identifies both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s research.

6. Evaluation of Teaching
   a. Scope of Review.
   In accord with the ACPET Guidelines, the CAP will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s teaching that will include:
   i. a detailed narrative that analyzes the candidate’s TCE Instructor History Report for all courses taught over the entire review period.
   ii. an in-depth evaluation of 3-5 representative courses taught by the candidate in the last three years.
   iii. an appraisal of additional contributions to teaching.

   The courses that will receive an in-depth evaluation will be selected by the CAP in consultation with the candidate. The selection of courses will reflect the range of courses taught by the candidate.

   b. Supplemental Sources of Information
At the request of the candidate, the report can include information from peer reviews or videotapes of the candidate’s classes from at least 4 semesters. The candidate must request that the CAP conduct or schedule such reviews early enough in the review period to allow for reviews of 3-5 representative courses. The CAP will appoint two members to conduct all the peer reviews for a candidate. For each selected course, the reviewers will evaluate at least two classes chosen by the reviewers without the prior knowledge of the candidate. The reviewers may ask the candidate for course scheduling information to avoid class meetings that are not conducive to review, e.g. exam dates. With the concurrence of the candidate, the reviewers may schedule select class meetings to be videotaped by the Kaneb Center for review at a later date. Other sources of information can also be considered given the mutual consent of the candidate and the CAP.

c. Elements of Teaching Report
For each course the CAP chooses for in-depth evaluation, the teaching report will evaluate evidence of:
i. Effective course design including meaningful and clearly articulated learning goals, course rigor, relevance to students’ needs, and relationship to the program’s curricular requirements.
ii. Effective implementation of teaching strategies including the ability to create a stimulating environment that is conducive to learning and effectively uses the students’ time, to encourage students to think analytically and creatively, and to develop knowledge, skills, and habits of mind appropriate to the discipline.
iii. Effective evaluation of student work including high expectations for student performance, helpful feedback throughout the course, and the application of appropriate standards for assessing student achievement of course learning goals.
iv. Student perceptions including student feedback on quality of instruction and student satisfaction with their learning experience.

With regard to (iii), contributions beyond classroom teaching enrich the student learning experience and advance the teaching mission of the department, College, or University. Examples include student mentoring; facilitating experiential learning opportunities, such as research, fieldwork, or scholarly or creative endeavors; directing student theses; and introducing significant innovations within the curriculum. Contributions that lead to student publications, performances, exhibitions, placements, and awards should be highlighted.

7. The service report includes a summary of the quality and quantity of the candidate’s service to the Department, College, University, and discipline.

8. At a final meeting, there is a discussion in which each member of the CAP states her/his opinion on each aspect of the case. This is followed by an open vote in which each member of the CAP must vote either in favor, against, or abstain. In the case of dissent, a minority report may be included in the CAP report on research, teaching, or service. The minutes from this meeting should provide a balanced summary of the discussion at the meeting(s), and should contain sufficient information to allow subsequent readers to understand the rationale for the votes cast. The minutes are signed
by all members of the CAP and forwarded with the CAP reports as part of the candidate’s file.

9. The Chairperson votes in a letter to the Dean, explaining his/her vote in detail. If the Chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the CAP’s recommendations, the Chairperson should meet with the CAP to discuss the disagreement prior to forwarding her or his letter to the Dean. If disagreement occurs, communication and trust are likely to be improved by open discussion of the opposing viewpoints. However, there is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the CAP or between the CAP and the Chairperson.

10. As stated in the Academic Articles (III.3.a): “If the University chooses to terminate the services of an Assistant Professor at the end of a contract period, the University will give 12 months’ notice of such termination.” If a candidate’s reappointment has not been approved, the Dean, upon request, gives the faculty member as full a report of the reasons for the decision as possible without violating the rule of confidentiality (see X below).

IV. Procedures for Tenure or Tenure and Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor

A. Standards for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The Academic Articles (III.3.a) state that the standards for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor should guide the evaluation. As stated in the Academic Articles: “The Associate Professor should have demonstrated outstanding teaching ability, growth in knowledge and maturity, salutary influence upon students, and standing among colleagues. Notable achievement in scholarship, as shown by significant publication or its equivalent or, where appropriate, by meaningful contributions to public service, will ordinarily be required for this rank.”

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, notable achievement in scholarship is interpreted as follows. Assistant professors are expected to demonstrate that their research is beginning to have an impact on both their own area of specialization and the broader discipline, as evidenced by substantial research activity, including: some articles published, accepted for publication, or invited to be revised and resubmitted at leading journals; a steady stream of working papers and submissions to appropriate journals, participation and presentations of their research at conferences, seminars at other universities, and internal workshops. Other examples of achievement may include citations, external grants, and awards. Quality, not quantity, is of primary importance in demonstrating that a candidate’s research is beginning to have an impact on the discipline. Generally, this involves publication of several articles in some of the leading journals of economics or other closely related disciplines.

For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, outstanding teaching ability is interpreted as follows. Candidates for the rank of Associate Professor with tenure are expected to consistently teach well-organized classes that challenge students at a level
appropriate for the course and consistent with departmental expectations. They are expected to provide and maintain an environment within their classes that encourages students to learn. Candidates are expected to be available to students outside of class meetings at least three hours per week for additional instruction, mentoring, and advice. At the undergraduate level, candidates should have begun to develop a record of supervising honors theses. At the graduate level, candidates are expected to teach graduate classes and serve on dissertation committees when requested.

The Academic Articles provide no guidance regarding standards for service. For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor with tenure, expectations for the Assistant Professor are minimal, intended to involve a commitment of no more than five percent of their time, and restricted to those departmental and professional activities of direct benefit to the individual, such as recruiting, hosting seminar speakers, serving as discussant at conferences, and refereeing. Nevertheless, assistant professors are expected to perform reasonable service for the department when asked, to demonstrate a commitment to the construction of a healthy and vibrant department, and to maintain an appropriate level of civility and collegiality in their interactions with other faculty and staff. As with research and teaching, it is the quality and impact of service, not the quantity, which matters.

B. Timing

1. Faculty members may be considered for tenure and promotion either by contractual mandate or by their own request. A candidate who provides a written request for early consideration for tenure and promotion has the right to receive full consideration of her/his case starting with the Department and proceeding to consideration by the President. However, if the review is not contractually mandated and the candidate has requested a review in the preceding year, then the candidate must provide a written explanation for the second request, and the CAP may decline to conduct a full review if it does not consider the candidate’s reasons to be sufficient justification for the request.

2. Faculty members who request early consideration for tenure and promotion must inform the Chairperson in writing by May 1 of the preceding academic year. The Chairperson consults with the CAP and the Dean, and then meets with the candidate to provide the feedback from these consultations.

3. Upon becoming a candidate for tenure and promotion, the Chairperson meets privately with the candidate to explain the entire process, normally in May of the preceding academic year.

4. Tenure and promotion cases that are not contractually mandated may be withdrawn at any point in the process, but only with the candidate’s approval. If a case is withdrawn after external letters have been solicited and the case is reconsidered in the following academic year, then either the CAP must use exactly the same evaluators as it did in the preceding year, or it must choose an entirely new set of evaluators.
5. In tenure and promotion cases that are contractually mandated, a candidate may request that his/her case be withdrawn before a decision is reached and tender his/her resignation effective either at the end of the current academic year or the following year.

C. Materials Provided by the Candidate

1. Candidates for tenure and promotion are required to provide the following materials to the Chairperson by June 1 of the preceding academic year:

   a. A list of three external experts whom the candidate designates as appropriate evaluators of her/his research, ranked in the order in which s/he prefers that they be contacted. These experts should hold the rank of Professor. If these experts are not at academic institutions, they should be of similar stature. The candidate should be advised that neither her/his dissertation advisor nor any faculty member at her/his Ph.D.-granting institution can serve as an evaluator, that the expectation is that these experts are at departments or institutions which are at least as prestigious as Notre Dame’s Department, and that this list is included in her/his tenure and promotion file.

   b. A list of no more than two external experts whom the candidate does not want to be selected by the CAP as evaluators of her/his research. The candidate should be advised that this list is included in her/his tenure and promotion file.

2. Candidates for tenure and promotion are required to provide the following materials to the Chairperson by September 1 of the current academic year:

   a. CV. The CV should distinguish between those publications that have appeared or that are forthcoming in refereed journals and those that are not refereed. Co-authors must be listed in the order in which they appear on the publication, and page numbers must be provided for all published articles.

   b. One copy of all publications listed on the CV.

   c. For publications which are listed as forthcoming, an acceptance letter from the editor.

   d. A list of no more than five articles, published or unpublished, which the candidate considers to be her/his best work. The candidate should be advised that members of the CAP are expected to read all of her/his publications, but will pay special attention to the ones on this list.

   e. A teaching portfolio consisting of materials from all courses taught at Notre Dame, a description of supervised honors theses, and a summary of participation on doctoral committees. For each course, the candidate must provide:
      i. the course syllabus.
      ii. an articulation of learning goals.
      iii. a description of teaching strategies and learning activities.
      iv. all teaching materials, assignments, and examinations.
v. a representative sample of graded student work with names redacted reflecting the type of feedback students received including information about the full distribution of scores for each piece of work and examples of the strongest, the median, and the weakest student work.
vi. all written course evaluations.

f. An integrative personal statement of no more than five pages describing the candidate’s research achievements and agendas, teaching goals, and how service activities may relate to his/her professional career.

g. Any other documents that the candidate believes will help the CAP to evaluate her/his research, teaching and service contributions.

3. The Chairperson is responsible for providing the CAP with all the relevant information that is necessary to conduct a fair and objective review. The Chairperson provides feedback on the materials provided so that the candidate can improve them, if necessary. The candidate provides the Chairperson with any new information, such as articles accepted for publication, which becomes available during the process.

D. CAP Procedures and Deliberations

1. The Chairperson can call a CAP meeting at any time during regular working hours when members of the CAP do not have regularly scheduled classes. When the purpose of the meeting is to provide a recommendation and/or vote on a case, a reasonable attempt will be made to achieve a quorum, defined as two-thirds of the membership of the CAP. Members of the CAP who are unable to attend can submit written recommendations to be included in the minutes, but cannot be counted toward a quorum, and cannot vote.

2. The Chairperson provides the time schedule for tenure and promotion decisions to both the CAP and the candidate as soon as feasible after it is received from the Office of the Provost. The Chairperson calls a CAP meeting within the first two weeks of classes. At this meeting the CAP arranges a tentative schedule of meetings designed to complete its work at least one week in advance of the date when the file must be forwarded to the Dean, so that the Chairperson has sufficient time to prepare his/her separate recommendation.

3. The CAP obtains at least six written external evaluations of the candidate’s research. No more than two of these external reviewers can be suggested by the candidate. The CAP will make every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting external reviewers. Reviewers who have served on the candidate’s dissertation committee, are from the candidate’s home PhD department, or who are close research collaborators will be avoided. The CAP cannot select evaluators who were prohibited by the candidate without the approval of the Dean.

4. All communication with external evaluators is conducted by the Chairperson, who begins by contacting the first two evaluators from the candidate’s list and four chosen by
the CAP to determine if they are willing to serve. The Chairperson will specifically ask each evaluator to describe any working relationship she or he has or has had with the candidate to avoid potential conflicts of interest (see D.3 above). If such a relationship becomes known after the solicitation of external letters, these letters will be included in the package, the conflict of interest will be disclosed in the description of the reviewers, and additional external letters will be sought so that the goal of six external evaluations from reviewers who have no perceived or potential conflict of interest are available to the CAP in their deliberations. This contact should be made in writing, so that the same language can be used in the requests made to all potential evaluators for all candidates. If an evaluator agrees, the Chairperson sends the candidate’s CV and a selection of publications, including the ones designated by the candidate (see IV.C.2.d), with a cover letter recommended by the Office of the Provost for this purpose. An evaluator is normally given at least six weeks to complete the review, and may be offered a modest honorarium for a timely response. If an evaluator chosen by the candidate is unable to serve, the Chairperson contacts the remaining evaluator on the candidate’s list. If an insufficient number of evaluators can be found, the Chairperson contacts the CAP to request names of other possible evaluators.

5. Deliberations concerning reappointment and tenure and promotion require a comprehensive review of all aspects of the candidate’s research by all members of the CAP, and an equally comprehensive review of the candidate’s teaching and service. These discussions are conducted in as many meetings as necessary. Minutes are taken at each meeting and submitted to the members of CAP for their approval in a timely fashion.

6. The CAP selects one or more of its members to write the required research report on the candidate, one or more of its members to write the required teaching report, and one or more of its members to write the required service report. Each of these reports is prepared in accordance with current PAC guidelines, copies of which the Chairperson will provide to the CAP. Each report must be signed by its author(s).

7. The research report is no more than six pages and written in a way that makes the candidate’s contributions to the over-all discipline accessible to non-economists. Evaluative comments, if any, should be written in a careful and unbiased manner that identifies both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s research.

8. Evaluation of Teaching
   a. Scope of Review.
   In accord with the ACPET Guidelines, the CAP will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate’s teaching that will include:
   i. a detailed narrative that analyzes the candidate’s TCE Instructor History Report for all courses taught over the entire review period.
   ii. an in-depth evaluation of 3-5 representative courses taught by the candidate in the last three years.
   iii. an appraisal of additional contributions to teaching.
The courses that will receive an in-depth evaluation will be selected by the CAP in consultation with the candidate. The selection of courses will reflect the range of courses taught by the candidate.

b. Supplemental Sources of Information
At the request of the candidate, the report can include information from peer reviews or videograpes of the candidate’s classes from at least 4 semesters. The candidate must request that the CAP conduct or schedule such reviews early enough in the review period to allow for reviews of 3-5 representative courses. The CAP will appoint two members to conduct all the peer reviews for a candidate. For each selected course, the reviewers will evaluate at least two classes chosen by the reviewers without the prior knowledge of the candidate. The reviewers may ask the candidate for course scheduling information to avoid class meetings that are not conducive to review, e.g. exam dates. With the concurrence of the candidate, the reviewers may schedule select class meetings to be videotaped by the Kaneb Center for review at a later date. Other sources of information can also be considered given the mutual consent of the candidate and the CAP.

c. Elements of Teaching Report
For each course the CAP chooses for in-depth evaluation, the teaching report will evaluate evidence of:
i. Effective course design including meaningful and clearly articulated learning goals, course rigor, relevance to students’ needs, and relationship to the program’s curricular requirements.
ii. Effective implementation of teaching strategies including the ability to create a stimulating environment that is conducive to learning and effectively uses the students’ time, to encourage students to think analytically and creatively, and to develop knowledge, skills, and habits of mind appropriate to the discipline.
iii. Effective evaluation of student work including high expectations for student performance, helpful feedback throughout the course, and the application of appropriate standards for assessing student achievement of course learning goals.
iv. Student perceptions including student feedback on quality of instruction and student satisfaction with their learning experience.

With regard to (iii), contributions beyond classroom teaching enrich the student learning experience and advance the teaching mission of the department, College, or University. Examples include student mentoring; facilitating experiential learning opportunities, such as research, fieldwork, or scholarly or creative endeavors; directing student theses; and introducing significant innovations within the curriculum. Contributions that lead to student publications, performances, exhibitions, placements, and awards should be highlighted.

9. The service report includes a summary of the quality and quantity of the candidate’s service to the Department, College, University, and discipline.

10. At a final meeting, there is a discussion in which each member of CAP states her/his opinion on each aspect of the case. This is followed by an open vote in which each
member of the CAP must vote either in favor, against, or abstain. In the case of dissent, a minority report may be included in the CAP report on research, teaching, or service. The minutes from this meeting should analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the case, provide a balanced summary of the discussion at the meeting(s), and should contain sufficient information to allow subsequent readers to understand the rationale for the votes cast. The minutes are signed by all members of the CAP and forwarded with the CAP reports as part of the candidate’s file.

11. The Chairperson votes in a letter to the Dean, explaining his/her vote in detail. If the Chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the CAP’s recommendations, the Chairperson should meet with the CAP to discuss the disagreement prior to forwarding her or his letter to the Dean. If disagreement occurs, communication and trust are likely to be improved by open discussion of the opposing viewpoints. However, there is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the CAP or between the CAP and the Chairperson.

12. As stated in the Academic Articles (III.3.a): “If the University chooses to terminate the services of an Assistant Professor [or an Associate Professor without tenure] at the end of a contract period, the University will give 12 months’ notice of such termination.” If a candidate’s reappointment has not been approved, the Dean, upon request, gives the faculty member as full a report of the reasons for the decision as possible without violating the rule of confidentiality (see X below).

**FULL PROFESSOR COMMITTEE ON PROMOTIONS (FPC)**

V. Membership

The Full Professor Committee on Promotions (FPC) of the Department of Economics consists of all members of the teaching-and-research faculty who hold the rank of Professor and the Chairperson of the Department, who serves as *ex officio* chairperson of the FPC. The FPC must contain at least three members in addition to the Chairperson. If the Department has fewer than three Professors, the Dean, after consultation with the Chairperson and Professors, appoints Professors from another department who have an appropriate understanding of the discipline of economics.

VI. Responsibilities

A. The FPC is responsible for deliberating and providing a recommendation on all cases of promotion of teaching-and-research faculty to the rank of Professor or Endowed Chair.

B. All deliberations of the FPC are made in compliance with the University of Notre Dame’s Academic Articles, PAC recommendations, College recommendations, and departmental practices. The Chairperson participates in FPC deliberations, but does not
vote with the FPC. The Chairperson is required to provide an independent recommendation in a written letter addressed to the Dean.

C. The FPC is also expected to review Associate Professors at least once every three years, although this is not obligatory. The review provides feedback and mentoring to Associate Professors on their progress toward promotion to Professor. The FPC normally meets in May to review the status of eligible Associate Professors. This review should involve consultation with the Dean.

VII. Procedures for Promotion

A. Standards

The Academic Articles (III.3.a) state that the standards for appointment to the rank of Professor should guide the evaluation. The Articles state: “The Professor should possess the qualifications required for appointment as Associate Professor, should have maintained excellence in teaching, and should have gained widespread recognition as a scholar.”

For promotion to the rank of Professor, widespread recognition as a scholar is interpreted as follows. Associate professors are expected to demonstrate that their research has had an impact on both their own area of specialization and the broader discipline. This is indicated by substantial research activity, including: a stock of publications; a continuing steady stream of working papers and articles published in appropriate journals; participation and presentations of their research at conferences, seminars at other universities, and internal workshops. Quality, not quantity, is of primary importance in demonstrating that a candidate’s research has had an impact on the discipline. Generally this involves not only publication after tenure of several articles in some of the leading journals of economics or other closely related disciplines, but also a record of substantial citations to all publications throughout the candidate’s career. Other examples of achievement may include external grants and awards.

For promotion to the rank of Full Professor, maintained excellence in teaching is interpreted as follows. Candidates for the rank of Full Professor are expected to consistently teach well-organized classes that challenge students at a level appropriate for the course and consistent with departmental expectations. They are expected to provide and maintain an environment within their classes that encourages students to learn. Candidates are expected to be available to students outside of class meetings at least three hours per week for additional instruction, mentoring, and advice. Candidates are expected to have a record of supervising undergraduate honors theses, serving on doctoral committees, and supervising doctoral students. They are also expected to encourage and mentor undergraduates capable of pursuing a Ph.D. in economics and to help such students apply to graduate programs commensurate with the student’s ability.
The Academic Articles provide no guidance regarding standards for service. For promotion to the rank of Professor, expectations for the Associate Professor are substantial, but still less than those for Professors, intended to involve a commitment of no more than ten percent of their time. Service expectations include not only departmental and professional activities beyond those of direct benefit to them, including service on various committees, but also occasional service to the college and university. In addition, associate professors are expected to perform reasonable service for the department when asked, to demonstrate a commitment to the construction of a healthy and vibrant department and to the discipline, and to maintain an appropriate level of civility and collegiality in their interactions with other faculty and staff. As with research and teaching, it is the quality and impact of service, not the quantity, which matters.

B. Timing

1. Consideration of promotion to Professor may be initiated by the candidate or the FPC. Faculty members who request consideration for promotion to Professor must inform the Chairperson in writing no later than May 1 of the preceding academic year. The Chairperson consults with the CAP and the Dean, and then meets with the candidate to provide the feedback from these consultations.

2. Upon becoming a candidate for promotion to Professor, the Chairperson meets privately with the candidate to explain the entire process, normally in May of the preceding academic year.

3. Promotion to Professor cases may be withdrawn at any point in the process, but only with the candidate’s approval. If a case is withdrawn after external letters have been solicited and the case is reconsidered in the following academic year, then either the FPC must use exactly the same evaluators as it did in the preceding year, or it must choose an entirely new set of evaluators.

C. Materials Provided by the Candidate

1. Candidates for promotion to Professor are required to provide the following materials to the Chairperson by June 1 of the preceding academic year:

   a. A list of three external experts whom the candidate designates as appropriate evaluators of her/his research, ranked in the order in which s/he prefers that they be contacted. These experts should hold the rank of Professor. If these experts are not at academic institutions, they should be of similar stature. The candidate should be advised that neither her/his dissertation advisor nor any faculty member at his/her Ph.D.-granting institution can serve as an evaluator, that the expectation is that these experts are at departments or institutions which are at least as prestigious as Notre Dame’s Department, and that this list is included in her/his promotion file.
b. A list of no more than two external experts whom the candidate does not want to be selected by the FPC as evaluators of his/her research. The candidate should be advised that this list is included in his/her promotion file.

2. Candidates are required to provide the following materials to the Chairperson by September 1 of the current academic year:

a. CV. The CV should distinguish between those publications that have appeared or that are forthcoming in refereed journals and those that are not refereed. Co-authors must be listed in the order in which they appear on the publication, and page numbers must be provided for all published articles.

b. One copy of all research listed on the CV published since the candidate was granted tenure.

c. For publications which are listed as forthcoming, an acceptance letter from the editor.

d. A list of no more than five articles, published or unpublished, which the candidate considers to be her/his best work. The candidate should be advised that members of the FPC are expected to read all of her/his publications after the granting of tenure, but will pay special attention to the ones on this list.

e. A teaching portfolio consisting of materials from all courses taught at Notre Dame, a description of supervised honors theses, a summary of mentoring activities of students seeking to pursue graduate education, and a summary of participation on doctoral committees. For each course, the candidate must provide:

i. the course syllabus.

ii. an articulation of learning goals.

iii. a description of teaching strategies and learning activities.

iv. all teaching materials, assignments, and examinations.

v. a representative sample of graded student work with names redacted reflecting the type of feedback students received including information about the full distribution of scores for each piece of work and examples of the strongest, the median, and the weakest student work.

vi. all written course evaluations.

f. An integrative personal statement of no more than five pages describing the candidate’s research achievements and agendas, teaching goals, and how service activities may relate to his/her professional career.

g. A list of graduate students whose dissertations the candidate has supervised, together with their employment placements and significant publications arising from the dissertation.

h. Any other documents that the candidate believes will help the FPC to evaluate her/his research, teaching and service contributions.
3. The Chairperson is responsible for providing the FPC with all the relevant information that is necessary to conduct a fair and objective review. The Chairperson provides feedback on the materials provided so that the candidate can improve them, if necessary. The candidate provides the Chairperson with any new information, such as articles accepted for publication, which becomes available during the process.

D. FPC Procedures and Deliberations on Promotions

1. The Chairperson can call an FPC meeting at any time during regular working hours when members of the FPC do not have regularly scheduled classes. When the purpose of the meeting is to provide a recommendation and/or vote on a case, a reasonable attempt will be made to achieve a quorum, defined as two-thirds of the membership of the FPC. Members of the FPC who are unable to attend can submit written recommendations to be included in the minutes, but cannot be counted toward a quorum, and cannot vote.

2. The Chairperson provides the time schedule for promotion decisions to both the FPC and the candidate as soon as feasible after it is received from the Office of the Provost. The Chairperson calls an FPC meeting within the first two weeks of classes. At this meeting the FPC arranges a tentative schedule of meetings designed to complete its work at least one week in advance of the date when the file must be forwarded to the Dean, so that the Chairperson has sufficient time to prepare her/his separate recommendation.

3. The FPC obtains at least six written external evaluations of the candidate’s research. No more than two of these external reviewers can be suggested by the candidate. The FPC will make every effort to avoid potential conflicts of interest in selecting external reviewers. Reviewers who have served on the candidate’s dissertation committee, are from the candidate’s home PhD department, or who are close research collaborators will be avoided. The FPC cannot select evaluators who were prohibited by the candidate without the approval of the Dean.

4. All communication with external evaluators is conducted by the Chairperson, who begins by contacting the first two evaluators from the candidate’s list and four chosen by the FPC to determine if they are willing to serve. The Chairperson will specifically ask each evaluator to describe any working relationship she or he has or has had with the candidate to avoid potential conflicts of interest (see D.3 above). If such a relationship becomes known after the solicitation of external letters, these letters will be included in the package, the conflict of interest will be disclosed in the description of the reviewers, and additional external letters will be sought so that the goal of six external evaluations from reviewers who have no perceived or potential conflict of interest are available to the FPC in their deliberations. This contact should be made in writing, so that the same language can be used in the requests made to all potential evaluators for all candidates. If an evaluator agrees, the Chairperson sends the candidate’s CV and a selection of publications, including the ones designated by the candidate (see VII.C.2.d), with the cover letter recommended by the Office of the Provost for this purpose. An evaluator is normally given at least six weeks to complete the review, and may be offered a modest
honorarium for a timely response. If an evaluator chosen by the candidate is unable to
serve, the Chairperson contacts the remaining evaluator on the candidate’s list. If an
insufficient number of evaluators can be found, the Chairperson contacts the FPC to
request names of other possible evaluators.

5. Deliberations concerning promotion to Professor require a comprehensive review of all
aspects of the candidate’s research by all members of the FPC, and an equally
comprehensive review of the candidate’s teaching and service, although greater emphasis
should be placed on the candidate’s performance in each of these areas since being
granted tenure. These discussions are conducted in as many meetings as necessary.
Minutes are taken at each meeting and submitted to the members of FPC for their
approval in a timely fashion.

6. The FPC selects one or more of its members to write the required research report on
the candidate, one or more of its members to write the required teaching report, and one
or more of its members to write the required service report. Each of these reports is
prepared in accordance with current PAC guidelines, copies of which the Chairperson
will provide to the FPC. Each report must be signed by its author(s).

7. The research report is no more than six pages and written in a way that makes the
candidate’s contributions to the over-all discipline accessible to non-economists.
Evaluative comments, if any, should be written in a careful and unbiased manner that
identifies both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate’s research.

8. Evaluation of Teaching
a. Scope of Review.
In accord with the ACPET Guidelines, the CAP will conduct a comprehensive evaluation
of the candidate’s teaching that will include:
i. a detailed narrative that analyzes the candidate’s TCE Instructor History Report for all
courses taught over the entire review period.
ii. an in-depth evaluation of 3-5 representative courses taught by the candidate in the last
three years.
iii. an appraisal of additional contributions to teaching.

The courses that will receive an in-depth evaluation will be selected by the CAP in
consultation with the candidate. The selection of courses will reflect the range of courses
taught by the candidate.

b. Supplemental Sources of Information
At the request of the candidate, the report can include information from peer reviews or
videotapes of the candidate’s classes from at least 4 semesters. The candidate must
request that the CAP conduct or schedule such reviews early enough in the review period
to allow for reviews of 3-5 representative courses. The CAP will appoint two members to
counsel all the peer reviews for a candidate. For each selected course, the reviewers will
evaluate at least two classes chosen by the reviewers without the prior knowledge of the
candidate. The reviewers may ask the candidate for course scheduling information to
avoid class meetings that are not conducive to review, e.g. exam dates. With the concurrence of the candidate, the reviewers may schedule select class meetings to be videotaped by the Kaneb Center for review at a later date. Other sources of information can also be considered given the mutual consent of the candidate and the CAP.

c. Elements of Teaching Report
For each course the CAP chooses for in-depth evaluation, the teaching report will evaluate evidence of:
i. Effective course design including meaningful and clearly articulated learning goals, course rigor, relevance to students’ needs, and relationship to the program’s curricular requirements.
ii. Effective implementation of teaching strategies including the ability to create a stimulating environment that is conducive to learning and effectively uses the students’ time, to encourage students to think analytically and creatively, and to develop knowledge, skills, and habits of mind appropriate to the discipline.
iii. Effective evaluation of student work including high expectations for student performance, helpful feedback throughout the course, and the application of appropriate standards for assessing student achievement of course learning goals.
iv. Student perceptions including student feedback on quality of instruction and student satisfaction with their learning experience.

With regard to (iii), contributions beyond classroom teaching enrich the student learning experience and advance the teaching mission of the department, College, or University. Examples include student mentoring; facilitating experiential learning opportunities, such as research, fieldwork, or scholarly or creative endeavors; directing student theses; and introducing significant innovations within the curriculum. Contributions that lead to student publications, performances, exhibitions, placements, and awards should be highlighted.

9. The service report includes a summary of the quality and quantity of the candidate’s service to the Department, College, University, and discipline.

10. At a final meeting, there is a discussion in which each member of the FPC states his/her opinion on each aspect of the case. This is followed by an open vote in which each member of the FPC must vote either in favor, against, or abstain. In the case of dissent, a minority report may be included in the FPC report on research, teaching, or service. The minutes from this meeting should analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the case, provide a balanced summary of the discussion at the meeting(s), and should contain sufficient information to allow subsequent readers to understand the rationale for the votes cast. The minutes are signed by all members of the FPC and forwarded with the FPC reports as part of the candidate’s file.

11. The Chairperson votes in a letter to the Dean, explaining her/his vote in detail. If the Chairperson anticipates disagreeing with the FPC’s recommendations, the Chairperson should meet with the FPC to discuss the disagreement prior to forwarding her or his letter to the Dean. If disagreement occurs, communication and trust are likely to be improved
by open discussion of the opposing viewpoints. However, there is no explicit or implicit preference for unanimity in making a recommendation within the FPC or between the FPC and the Chairperson.

12. If a candidate’s promotion has not been approved, the Chairperson, upon request, gives the faculty member as full a report of the reasons for the decision as possible without violating the rule of confidentiality (see X below).

CONFIDENTIALITY

VIII. The members of the CAP and FPC are bound to maintain full and complete confidentiality of the proceedings and deliberations of these committee meetings. Even if a committee member has not participated in a discussion or decision because of organizational rules or any other reasons, that member is bound to maintain silence about that decision. Moreover, although committee members can give general advice to faculty members in a personal capacity, they should use extreme caution so as not to evaluate faculty members in private in their official capacity as CAP or FPC members. All communication between the CAP or FPC and faculty members who are not on CAP or FPC should be done through the Department Chairperson, unless the CAP or FPC specifically designates other members for specific purposes. Any breach of confidentiality will be punished by removal of the faculty member from the CAP or FPC, and return to the CAP or FPC is conditional upon that faculty member’s credible assurance that no further breaches will occur.

ORGANIZATION PLAN

IX. The approval of any amendment to this organization plan may be adopted by an absolute majority of the eligible voting faculty, defined as all teaching-and-research faculty whose primary appointment resides in the Department of Economics. A vote for an amendment can be called if at least one-third of the voting faculty provides notice in writing to the Chairperson. The amendment must be included in the agenda of a faculty meeting and must be distributed to all eligible members of voting faculty at least one week in advance. Amendments which are adopted must be in accordance with the University of Notre Dame’s Faculty Handbook and are subject to the approval of the Dean of College of Arts and Letters.
Unanimously approved by the teaching-and-research faculty of the Department of Economics by a vote of 25 in favor and none opposed on November 2, 2012.

Richard A. Jensen, Chairperson

Approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Letters:

John T. McGreevy

Date
OPERATING PROCEDURES

I. Standing Committees

A. Committee on Appointment and Promotions (see p. 1).

B. Full Professor Committee on Promotions (see p. 12)

C. Search Committee (see below)

D. Chair Advisory Committee

The Chair Advisory Committee is an ad hoc committee composed of the chairperson and at least two, but no more than four, tenured members of the faculty appointed by the chairperson. The purpose of the committee is to advise the chairperson on a variety of issues that might arise and are not within the purview of other committees. This includes, but is not limited to, the mandated annual performance reviews of the faculty.

E. Undergraduate Studies Committee (see II below).

F. Graduate Studies Committee (see III below)

II. Search Procedures

A. Search Committees and Job Announcements

1. To initiate the search process the Chairperson, in consultation with the faculty, identifies priorities and programmatic needs that should be addressed in the search. The Chairperson then writes a letter to the Dean requesting authorization for the search.

2. After the Dean has authorized the Department to conduct a search, the Chairperson appoints a search committee chair (or chairs). The Chairperson, in consultation with the chair(s), then appoints additional faculty to the search committee, which typically consists of three to six members in addition to the chair(s). The search committee must have one member specifically designated as an affirmative action representative.

3. Each job announcement is written by the search committee chair(s) in consultation with the Chairperson and the search committee, and must be approved by the Associate Dean for the Social Sciences. Announcements are sent to Job Openings for Economists and other appropriate publications.

B. Interviews and Campus Visits

1. Job application packets are summarized in a database made accessible to all faculty. The chair(s) of the search committee will assign faculty members, not necessarily
restricted to members of the search committee, to evaluate applicant files, but any faculty member may request to review any file. Based on these evaluations and in consultation with the recruiting committee and the Department Chairperson, the search committee chair(s) selects the candidates who are to be interviewed at the Allied Social Sciences Association (ASSA) meetings. This interview list must be approved by the Associate Dean.

2. After receiving feedback from faculty about the interviews, the search committee chair(s), in consultation with the recruiting committee and the Department Chairperson, selects the candidates who are to be invited to campus. Candidates may be invited to campus without interviews at the ASSA meetings. All campus invitees must be approved by the Associate Dean.

3. Junior candidates who visit campus should meet with individual faculty members, the Chairperson, the Associate Dean, the Director of ISLA, and other interested members of the university community as appropriate. Senior candidates also meet with the Dean. The candidate should also present a seminar to the faculty, graduate students, and other interested members of the university community.

III. Appointment Procedures

A. Candidate’s File

1. A junior candidate’s file must include a current CV, a sample of his/her research, evidence of teaching ability when available, and three letters of recommendation.

2. A senior candidate’s file must include a current CV, samples of her/his research, teaching evaluations or other evidence of teaching ability, a list of dissertation advisees with their employment placements, any significant publications, and at least six written external evaluations of their research. The procedure for obtaining these evaluations is the same as that described in IV.D.3 and VII.D.3.

B. CAP Deliberations

1. After candidates have completed campus visits, the chair(s) of the search committee should solicit feedback from faculty. Informed by this feedback, the search committee chair, in consultation with the recruiting committee and the Department Chairperson, then makes appointment recommendations to the CAP.

2. The Chairperson can call the CAP meeting to discuss the candidate(s) at any time during regular working hours when members of the CAP do not have regularly scheduled classes. A reasonable attempt will be made to achieve a quorum, defined as one-half of the members of the CAP. Members of the CAP who are unable to attend can submit written proxies and/or recommendations to be included in the minutes, and are counted toward a quorum if they do so.
3. The CAP meets to make its recommendation, which is summarized in the minutes of that meeting. The minutes are signed by all members of the CAP and forwarded with the candidate’s file. The minutes from this meeting should provide a balanced summary of the discussion at the meeting(s), and should contain sufficient information to allow subsequent readers to understand the rationale for the votes cast. The Chairperson is required to provide an independent recommendation in a written letter addressed to the Dean.

IV. Undergraduate Studies

1. The Undergraduate Studies Committee is composed of the Director of Undergraduate Studies (DUS), who serves as its chairperson, and four other members of the faculty chosen by the Chairperson in consultation with the Director of Undergraduate Studies and the Dean.

2. The Director of Undergraduate Studies is chosen by the Chairperson in consultation with the Dean.

V. Graduate Studies

1. The Graduate Studies Committee is composed of the Director of Graduate Studies, who serves as its chairperson, and four other members of the faculty chosen by the Chairperson in consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies and the Dean.

2. The Director of Graduate Studies is chosen by the Chairperson in consultation with the Dean.

VI. Performance Reviews of Faculty

A. University policy requires that the performance of tenure-track faculty be reviewed annually and that written copies of the reviews be provided to the faculty. It is departmental policy to provide written reviews of all faculty annually.

B. Evaluations are based upon an annual activity report that each member of the faculty must submit to the chairperson by the first day of classes in the spring semester (see Appendix for template).

C. Evaluations are made by the chairperson with the assistance of the Chair Advisory Committee in the areas of teaching, research, and service. The general guidelines are outlined in an explanatory memo from the chairperson that is updated annually as needed (see Appendix for sample).
VII. Leave Policy

A. University policy is stated in Article III.11 of the Academic Articles, and College policy is stated in Section 76 of the Reference Guide for Arts & Letters Chairpersons and Faculty. Departmental policy is largely limited to prioritizing leaves. College policy urges departments to adopt their own procedures, as needed, to insure that not too many faculty request leaves in any given year, and the College reserves the right to deny leaves to guarantee there are no undue disruptions in the provision of courses.

B. Departmental policy is to strive to insure that leaves requested do not reduce the provision of undergraduate course offering by more than 20% in any given semester.

C. Medical leaves and maternity leaves are federally mandated and therefore receive first priority without reservation. University policy regarding leaves is outlined on pages 33 and 102-104 in the 2007-2008 Faculty Handbook. In part, this policy states: “As with any family and medical leave, no University duties are required during the period of the leave. In addition, a faculty member whose due date for the birth of her child falls during the semester is relieved of all teaching responsibilities during that semester. When a faculty member’s due date falls outside of a semester, she should contact the Office of the Provost regarding whether she will be relieved from teaching responsibilities.” The Department focuses upon providing an environment which allows a faculty member to maintain her research program and to remain active in the intellectual life of the department. There are, of course, a variety of approaches that would accomplish these goals, and the department is committed to flexibility in achieving these goals. For example, if a reasonable case can be made, the department is willing to support a request for a maternity leave in which one works on a half-time basis throughout the year, halving the time commitments to teaching, research, and service during this time period. In addition, the department supports equivalent work load reductions for all faculty members receiving maternity leave, regardless of the timing of the birth. Nevertheless, the Department acknowledges that, in these cases, the faculty member must negotiate with the Office of the Provost regarding the details of her leave.

D. Beyond these leaves, support of leave requests is prioritized in the following order, starting with highest and descending to lowest: assistant professor post-renewal leaves, other assistant professor leaves, post-tenure leaves, other associate professor leaves, and all other leaves. Within each category, highest priority is given to those who have a leave or have waited the longest since their most recent leave.
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 10, 2012

To: ECOE Faculty

From: Richard Jensen

Re: Faculty Review for 2008-2010

Although our annual review process is now codified in our CAP and Operating Procedures documents (on both our web site and the College’s web site), I thought I should provide another annual memo about the process for your convenience. As in the past, I will conduct the annual reviews with the assistance of the Chair Advisory Committee (Professors Evans and Mark). Again, I will provide each of you with a draft of your review, then afford you the opportunity to provide any new information that you may have omitted from your activity report, and to respond to any issues raised in the review, before I complete the final version that goes into your file, and is used as the basis for my salary recommendation to the Dean.

This memo provides the details of the procedure we have employed for the last few years, and will employ in the process again this year. Suggestions for improvement are welcome.

The “scale” in this review process has five possible evaluations: excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor. The rating “good” is the one assigned when the committee decides that one has met what the University and College administration refers to as “the normally high expectations of a major research and teaching university.” Two higher and lower categories are provided not only to reward truly remarkable performance, but also to allow the option to send signals regarding performance that does not meet expectations. An over-all evaluation is then determined by taking the weighted average of the evaluation in each area. The weights for the three-year window are an ordinary average of the annual weights.
Teaching

The annual weight for each regular course taught is 10%. This is also the maximum weight that can be placed on teaching, with one exception. Faculty who teach more than the “standard” four courses per year can, if they choose, receive 20% for each additional course taught in that year. Conversely, faculty who teach less than the standard four courses must put the weight for each course reduction in that year into research.

Explicit statements of our expectations in teaching by rank are now incorporated into our CAP document. In the evaluation of teaching, we obviously consult your TCEs and CIFs. I ask you to report the mean for Q17 of the TCEs and Q11 of the CIFs on the form because the administration continues to focus on this “over-all” question. Typically we conclude that one meets expectations in teaching unless the means for this question in your courses are in one of the two tails of the distribution. However, given the recent emphasis by the administration on curbing grade inflation and appropriately challenging our students, I also ask you to report the GPA and the mean for Q15 of the TCEs and Q14 of the CIFs for each course. The difficulties inherent in teaching large sections, required classes, new preparations, and writing-intensive classes are definitely taken into account. Nevertheless, I emphasize that in the past means on Q17 of the TCEs below 3.0 have been nearly impossible to defend to the administration as meeting expectations. I assume the same will be true for means below the equivalent 3.75 on Q11 of the CIFs. I will look at each of your CIFs for the last year in detail, and provide any other feedback about your teaching that I think is important in your review.

Involvement in teaching and/or advising at either the undergraduate or graduate level, such as chairing and serving on dissertation committees, and supervising special studies students or senior honors theses, also is considered seriously. Indeed, the Dean has especially emphasized rewarding supervision of honors theses, and I interpret this to mean that we can raise someone’s evaluation over that strictly implied by performance in courses taught if there is evidence of good work supervising honors theses. Therefore, I also now specifically report this information in my salary recommendations summary to the Dean.

Service

The College’s “typical” weight on service is 20%. This is certainly the maximum except for those who have course relief for administrative assignments (chair. DGS, DUS). Reductions in weight here below 20% must be shifted into research, and more service is expected, in general, when the weight on it is higher. However, from the perspective of the administration, this weight is supposed to be an accurate assessment of time actually spent in service. Thus, it is our policy that the service weight should be lower for both assistant professors and associate professors who need, and are given, lighter service duties in order to focus on their research. The annual review form gives you the opportunity to state what weight you think is appropriate, but your choice is not binding on the committee. We expect assistant (or untenured associate) professors to choose service weights in the 2.5% to 5% range, and associate professors to choose weights in
the 5% to 10% range. Please come to see me if you have any question about what weight is appropriate.

Explicit statements of our expectations in service by rank also are now incorporated into our CAP document. In the evaluation of service, we focus on contributions to the profession, department, College, University, and community. At a minimum, reasonable contributions to the profession and department are expected of all, although the amounts vary by rank as noted above. One could exceed expectations either through supranormal quantity of service, which is strongly discouraged at lower ranks, or through exceptional quality, such as serving on the editorial boards of leading journals.

Research

The minimum annual weight placed on research is 40%, though it can be higher when one puts less than 20% weight in service or when one’s teaching falls below four courses per year. The only way to reduce this minimum weight is to volunteer to teach additional sections, as noted above. Conversely, this weight increases for those who have reduced teaching loads due to leaves, grant buyouts, or other factors.

This department was created because the University wants an economics faculty with high visibility in research throughout the discipline, which as we all know requires an emphasis on publishing articles in the leading journals. Nevertheless, we also understand that, given the vagaries of the refereeing process, years may go by with no refereed publications. This is the main reason for adopting a three-year window. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to expect that each of us produce a steady stream of working papers that are developed, completed, submitted, and then resubmitted elsewhere, if necessary. The goal should always be to produce something for a premier or first-tier journal. Given this emphasis, one would need multiple publications in first-tier journals or a premier publication to exceed expectations.

Similarly, visibility throughout the profession also requires that each of us attend and present our research at regional, national, and international conferences of suitable stature. This is important for all of us, both individually and collectively, but this is especially important for assistant professors and associate professors who are striving to become recognized as serious researchers throughout the profession and to build a strong case for tenure and/or promotion.

cc: John T. McGreevy, I. A. O'Shaughnessy Dean of Arts and Letters
Mark Schurr, Associate Dean
Department of Economics

Name: 

Rank: 

I. Research and Scholarship.

Please provide as much bibliographic detail as possible for each publication, acceptance, or working paper. Submit any supporting material you think appropriate.

A. Articles Published:

B. Articles Accepted but Not Yet In Print:

C. Books, Reviews, Chapters in Books, and Other Publications:

D. Completed Papers Submitted to Journals (please indicate if resubmitted at request of editor):

E. Papers Completed and Submitted for the First Time in 2009:

F. Work in Progress (please be as specific as possible about the stage of development):

G. Seminar Presentations (please indicate organization and date):

H. Conference Presentations (please indicate conference and date):

I. Recognitions, Honors, Awards, or Grants:

J. Professional Development (please list any significant workshops or seminars attended and describe their relationship to your development as a researcher):

K. Other (anything else relevant to your research you want to mention):

II. Teaching and Advising.

A. Courses taught (please note below whether any were new or unusually time-consuming).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>enrollment</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>CIF #14</th>
<th>CIF #11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>enrollment</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>CIF #14</th>
<th>CIF #11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>CIF #14</td>
<td>CIF #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>CIF #14</td>
<td>CIF #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>CIF #14</td>
<td>CIF #11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>enrollment</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>TCE #15</td>
<td>TCE #17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Undergraduate Advising (please provide the name of each honors thesis student you advised, with the thesis title and completion date or expected completion date; for those completed, please indicate what they are doing now if you know that):
C. Dissertations Directed (please provide the names of students whose committees you chaired, with the title and completion date or expected completion date; for those completed, please provide initial placement and, if different, current position):

D. Dissertation Committees (please provide the names of students on whose committees you serve or have served, with completion dates when appropriate):

E. Professional Development (please list any significant workshops or seminars attended and describe their relationship to your development as a teacher or adviser):

F. Other (anything else related to your teaching or advising you want to mention):

III. Service.

Please include, by date, anything you think is relevant.

A. Profession:

B. Department:

C. College:

D. University:

E. Community:

F. Other (anything else relevant to your service you want to mention):

IV. Time Allocation.

Indicate the percentage weights you think are appropriate for each activity in this period. These should conform to our agreed guidelines. Provide an explanation below, if necessary.

Research:  Teaching:  Service:

V. Any Other Comments?