



College	W. P. Carey School of Business	
Unit	Department of Economics	
Document	Faculty Evaluation Guidelines	
Approved by the faculty		Date:
Reviewed by the dean		Date:

Provost office approval

Vice Provost for Academic Personnel	Date

Office of the University Provost

300 East University Drive
P.O. Box 877805 Tempe, AZ 85287-7805
(480) 965-4995 Fax: (480) 965-0785
<https://provost.asu.edu/>

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS FACULTY EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Adopted November 2, 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The University has requested that each academic unit develop written guidelines by which personnel petitions will be evaluated. The Department of Economics is the primary academic unit for the evaluation of its own faculty. The guidelines set forth in this document constitute a useful supplement to the School faculty evaluation document. The guidelines contained herein reflect Departmental criteria and expected levels of achievement in teaching, research, and service, which in some instances may be more rigorous and demanding than those set forth by the School for retention, promotion or tenure decisions. Information about factors to be considered in evaluating teaching, research, and service is contained in the final section of this document. Explanations of the expected levels of achievement in these three basic areas of a faculty member's performance are provided in the separate sections which focus on specific personnel actions.
2. The procedures to be followed in the processing of personnel petitions are specified in the Faculty Handbook (ACD 506, 12/02/2003) and will be followed by the Department.
3. It is intended that these Departmental guidelines will become effective with the beginning of the 2008-09 academic year. It is recognized that some implementation problems could arise because some faculty may have had little opportunity to respond to the more explicit guidelines provided in this document before submitting petitions for personnel actions. The Committee believes that sufficient flexibility exists within the document to adequately address any transitional implementation problems, but nonetheless believes this qualifying note should be explicitly stated.

II. THIRD YEAR REVIEW

1. The third year review will be conducted in the Fall Semester of the third year.
2. Effective teaching is expected of all candidates and excellent teaching will be viewed positively. A consistently substandard record of teaching may prevent positive actions on the retention petition, even if the research record is satisfactory.
3. Sufficient progress towards the establishment of a research program that will satisfy the requirements for promotion and tenure at the end of the

probationary period is expected. Published papers, papers with revision requested, papers in submission, working papers, papers presented at professional meetings and work in progress will be given some weight in evaluating whether sufficient progress is being achieved.

4. A modest record of service is expected at the time of the third year review. Candidates should demonstrate a sense of Departmental citizenship and involvement through, for example, participation in recruiting activities, seminars and general visibility within the Department. Evidence of some service outside the department will be viewed positively, but is not required.

III. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH CONCOMITANT AWARDING OF TENURE: PETITION SUBMITTED IN FINAL PROBATIONARY YEAR

1. Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor recognizes the candidate's achievements in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Granting of tenure must not only take into account the candidate's past performance, but also the likelihood that the candidate will continue to show progress towards promotion to the rank of Professor.
2. In evaluating petitions for promotion and tenure, greater emphasis will be placed on achievements in the area of research, and least emphasis will be placed on achievements in the area of service.
3. Effective teaching is expected of all candidates and excellent teaching will be viewed positively. Outstanding teaching, however, cannot compensate for inadequate achievement in the area of research. A minimum performance standard does exist in the area of teaching, and failure to meet this minimum standard will result in negative decisions on promotion and tenure petitions. No specific quantitative measure of this minimum standard has been formulated. Unwillingness or inability of the candidates to respond to concerns about teaching provided in the annual reviews of probationary faculty will be viewed negatively.
4. In evaluating achievement in the area of research, the following factors merit consideration:
 - a. Research efforts should demonstrate the capacity of the candidate to complete significant research projects.
 - b. A judgment should be formed about the quality of the candidate's publications articles in journals, scholarly monographs, chapters in books, papers presented at professional meetings and other universities, proceeding papers, research grants and proposals, research in progress, revision requested, and formal working papers,

with particular attention to their contribution to the field or to the profession. Evidence to be considered by the Committee includes the quality of the publication outlet, the views of outside reviewers, and the judgments of the individual members of the committee on the quality of the work.

- c.** A strong preference exists for publications in nationally recognized, refereed, academic journals.
 - d.** No explicit number of publications is required for promotion or tenure. While tradeoffs between the quality and the quantity of publications do exist, quantity cannot compensate for insufficient quality.
 - e.** The evaluation will emphasize the quality of publications and, while solely authored publications generally provide clearer evidence of individual achievement in the research area as compared with jointly authored work, the research evaluation normally would not discount publications proportionately to the number of authors.
 - f.** The minimum level of achievement in the research area shall not be reduced for those who accept administrative assignments.
- 5.** In evaluating achievement in service, the following factors merit consideration:
- a.** Internal service activities should be given some priority. Hence, at a minimum, good Departmental citizenship (e.g., participation in Department seminars, recruiting activities, etc.) is required of all candidates for promotion to Associate Professor. In addition, some evidence of other service activities will be viewed positively.
 - b.** In addition to the internal service activities described above, candidates for the rank of Associate Professor also are encouraged to present evidence of professional or other external service. Service as a reviewer or editor for academic journals or publishers, significant involvement in professional organizations, and conference and university presentations are examples of professional service that would strengthen a candidate's record in the area of service.
 - c.** Generally, substantially lesser amounts of time and effort are expected to be expended in service activities by Assistant Professors, compared with their teaching and research activities; this fact is clearly recognized in evaluating service contributions of candidates for Associate Professor.

- d. Outstanding achievement in service cannot compensate for inadequate achievement in either the teaching or research areas.

IV. PROMOTION FROM ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR WITH CONCOMITANT TENURE: PETITION SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FINAL PROBATIONARY YEAR

1. Years of service, per se, are not a requirement for promotion and/or tenure. Normally, however, five complete years at the rank of Assistant Professor (or equivalent experience) occurs before the promotion petition is submitted. Candidates who choose to submit petitions for promotion and tenure before the final probationary year should provide especially clear evidence that they have satisfied the teaching, research and service standards expected from the full probationary period.

V. PROMOTION FROM ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR

1. In evaluating petitions for promotion to Professor, greatest emphasis will be placed on achievements in research.
2. Years of service, per se, are not a requirement for promotion to Professor. Because of the high level of achievement required in various areas of the candidate's performance, but especially in research and service, the candidate normally will have the rank of Associate Professor for four or more complete years, or shall have demonstrated equivalent experience, before the promotion petition is submitted. Those submitting early promotion petitions should be aware that, because of the reduced time interval for the development of a record to support such petitions, especially clear evidence of achievement will be required for favorable action.
3. Effective teaching is expected of all candidates and excellent teaching will be viewed positively. Outstanding teaching cannot compensate for inadequate achievement in the research area. A minimum standard does exist in the area of teaching, and failure to meet this minimum standard may result in negative decisions on promotion petitions. No specific quantitative measure of this minimum standard has been formulated. Unwillingness or inability of the candidate to respond to concerns about inadequate teaching provided in the annual review may prevent positive action on the candidate's petition.
4. In evaluating achievement in the area of research, the following factors merit consideration:
 - a. Research efforts should demonstrate more than the candidate's ability to successfully complete a number of published research projects.

Rather, these efforts should clearly demonstrate that the candidate has developed a mature program of scholarly research. Evidence should indicate that the candidate has established a sustained record of research that has made a significant contribution to the discipline, related fields, or particular subfield of specialization or emphasis within the discipline.

- b.** A judgment should be formed about the quality of the candidate's articles in journals, scholarly monographs, chapters in books, papers presented at professional meetings and other universities, proceeding papers, research grants and proposals, research in progress, revision requested, and formal working papers, with a particular emphasis on their contribution to the discipline, related fields or subfields of specialization. Evidence to be considered includes the quality of the publication outlet, the views of outside reviewers, and judgments of individual Committee members about the quality of the work. Citations of these works in the professional literature also may be considered.
 - c.** A strong preference exists for publications in nationally recognized, refereed, academic journals. Hence, clear evidence of the high level of achievement expected would be provided by a series of articles published in nationally recognized, refereed, academic journals. Other evidence of high achievement would include substantial funded research efforts.
 - d.** The evaluation will emphasize the quality of publications and, while solely authored publications generally provide clearer evidence of individual achievement in the research area as compared with jointly authored work, the research evaluation normally would not discount publications proportionately to the number of authors.
 - e.** No explicit number of publications is required for promotion to Professor. Some trade-offs between the quality and quantity of publications are permitted. Nonetheless, the research record must clearly indicate work of a quality that constitutes a substantive contribution to the discipline, related fields, or subfields within the discipline.
- 5.** In evaluating achievement in the area of service, the following factors merit consideration:
 - a.** Candidates for promotion to Professor should provide evidence of participation in internal service activities. The extent of participation exceeds the level of effort and achievement expected of candidates for Associate Professor. Not all internal service activities are necessarily available to all faculty on an equivalent basis. Hence, no single set of

internal service activities is required of all candidates. Evidence of a candidate's capabilities in the area of internal service would be indicated by activities such as a consistent and substantial record of effective participation in department activities (e.g., participating in seminars and recruiting, including meeting with invited speakers), college and university affairs, including committee assignments, and other collegial activities within the department (e.g., good departmental and/or college "citizenship").

- b. In addition to the internal service activities described above, candidates for the rank of Professor also are expected to present evidence of professional or other external service. Service as a reviewer or editor for academic journals or publishers, significant involvement in professional, and conference and university presentations are examples of professional organizations or external service that would strengthen a candidate's record in the area of service.
- c. Outstanding achievement in service cannot compensate for inadequate achievement in either the teaching or research areas.

VI. AWARDING OF TENURE TO PROBATIONARY FACULTY AT THE RANK OF ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR PROFESSOR

1. Probationary faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor will be reviewed for tenure in the Fall Semester of their third year.
2. Expected levels of achievement in teaching, research, and service shall correspond to the performance levels expected of tenured faculty with comparable time in rank including previous academic appointments (or comparable experience) and not just time in rank at Arizona State University.
3. Effective teaching is expected of all candidates and excellent teaching will be viewed positively. Because evidence of teaching effectiveness at Arizona State University will not encompass the entire probationary period, clear evidence of acceptable levels of achievement should be presented. If teaching is inadequate during the first year of the probationary period, clear evidence of improvement should be presented for the second year of the probationary period. A substandard record of teaching during probationary years may prevent positive action on the candidate's petition.
4. Candidates will be expected to demonstrate scholarly growth and productivity appropriate to their rank. Because an appointment of faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor would have reflected the candidate's past research accomplishments, an important consideration in the tenure decision is the extent to which the candidate has continued to develop as a scholar

during the probationary period. For those at the Associate Professor rank, the research should indicate a strong likelihood that the candidate is making normal progress towards fulfilling the research requirements for the rank of Professor.

5. Candidates should present a record of service activities that reflect both the ability and the desire to contribute to the service goals of the Department. The candidate's record of service in prior academic appointments (or comparable experiences) also may be considered in evaluating actual and potential service contributions. For those at the Associate Professor rank, the service record, both in total and that developed during the probationary period, should indicate that the candidate is making normal progress towards fulfilling the service requirements for the rank of Professor.

VII. EVIDENCE OF ACHIEVEMENT: EXAMPLES AND DEFINITIONS

1. Evidence to be considered in evaluating teaching must include student evaluations and may include, but is not limited to, the following: New course development or revision, course outlines, reading assignments, examinations and other teaching aids, class sizes, number of classes taught, composition of teaching load (graduate vs. undergraduate), grade distributions, service on graduate examination or thesis committees.
2. Evidence to be considered in evaluating achievements in research may include, but is not limited to, the following: articles in journals, scholarly monographs, chapters in books, papers presented at professional meetings and other universities, proceeding papers, research grants and proposals, research in progress, revision requested, and formal working papers.
3. Service activities are classified as: (1) internal services; (2) external services; and (3) other external services.
 - a. Internal service activities are those performed at the Department, College or University level and include, but are not limited to, the following; significant committee assignments, program or curriculum development, generation of funds (through research or other activities) student counseling, guidance, and placement, meeting with seminar and recruiting speakers, organizing departmental sponsored workshops and/or conferences participation in service projects for the Department, College or University.
 - b. Professional Service activities are those performed to further the discipline of Economics or related fields through or in support of professional programs or organizations. Activities to be considered

include, but are not limited to, the following; editorial activities for academic or professional journals, serving as a referee for academic or professional journals, research organizations, government agencies, etc., serving as an officer of national, regional or local academic or professional organization, or providing leadership and assistance in program development; presenting papers at professional meetings or other forms of participation at such meetings (e.g., discussant, moderator, etc.), preparing book reviews for publication in academic or professional journals.

- c.** Other External Service activities exclude professional service activities (as defined above) and include, but are not limited to, the following: contract research with government or other nonprofit agencies; testimony before national or state legislative bodies; donated professional efforts on behalf of national, state or local governmental agencies or other nonprofit organizations; consulting activities, as defined below.
- d.** Consulting activities may be included in other external service if evidence is provided to demonstrate that a direct benefit to the institution or the profession resulted. Normally, it is incumbent on the petitioner to demonstrate such benefits if consulting activities are to be included as evidence or other external service.

VIII. SABBATICAL LEAVES

Faculty members are eligible for sabbatical leave after six years of service to the University, but should not expect to receive a sabbatical leave as a matter of course. As stated in the Faculty Handbook:

A sabbatical leave should not be considered a deferred compensation to which a faculty member is automatically entitled after six years of service, but is granted or denied on the merits of the individual case by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the University President.

The Personnel Committee will evaluate sabbatical proposals and make recommendations to the Chair of the Department consistent with the goals and mission of the Department. The criteria for evaluation are set out below.

Proposal Submissions

Faculty members seeking sabbatical leave must submit a proposal in the Fall of the academic year preceding the sabbatical year. The proposal clearly describes the work to be undertaken during the leave and the expected benefits of the project. A current vita must be attached to the proposal along with any additional forms required by the College.

Evaluation

The evaluation is based on (1) if the proposed sabbatical leave activity is worthwhile; and (2) if there is a high probability that the faculty member will successfully complete the activity. The third criterion, that the department's program of teaching and advisement not be adversely affected by the leave, will not enter into Departments deliberations, but may be considered by the Chair or the Office of the Dean.

In determining the probability that the faculty member will successfully complete the proposed activity, consideration should be given to the petitioner's past record. For applicants who have had previous sabbatical leaves, the evaluation should include a determination of whether the goals set out in the prior sabbatical proposals were met and if the final products of the sabbatical were consistent with the Department's objectives in granting the leave.