Economics

Department

Arts and Sciences

College

Policy Statement Concerning:

Personnel Review and Evaluation Standards/Procedures

- **Performance Evaluation Criteria**
- **Annual Evaluation**
- **Reappointment Evaluation for:**
  - **Annual Reappointment Reviews**
  - **Mid-Tenure Review**
- **Tenure**
- **Promotion**
- **Professorial Performance Award**
- **Chronic Low Achievement**
- **Post-Tenure Review**
- **Non-Tenure Track Faculty Titles**

Approved by Faculty Vote on (5/16/2019)

NEXT REVIEW DATE: May 2024

Philip Gayle — 8/29/2019

Department Head's Signature — Date

Amit Chakrabarti — 8/29/2019

Dean's Signature — Date

9/4/2019

Provost's Signature — Date

As of 1/9/2016

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The Department of Economics at Kansas State University values and is committed to its humanities and social sciences traditions that constitute the foundation of the economics discipline. Faculty in Economics strive to advance theory, research, and practice through their research, scholarship, creative activities, and discovery; to enhance critical thinking and knowledge of the roles and influence of economics individually, relationally, organizationally, and communally; and to engage with others in our department, university, professional, and community through service. Moreover, reflecting the university's land-grant mission in our own desire to engage with and contribute to communities (civic, organizational, and others), Economics values community-engaged research, teaching, and service.

This document outlines policies and procedures related to annual evaluation, collegiality, reappointment, mid-tenure review, tenure and promotion, chronic low achievement, professorial performance awards, and post-tenure review.

II. Faculty Identity

The Economics Department consists of tenured/tenure-track faculty member(s), regular assistant professor(s) and term non-tenure track instructor(s).

III. Performance Evaluations

The Economics Department conducts several types of evaluations, including annual merit, reappointment, mid-tenure, tenure and promotion, and professional performance award. These evaluations have both formative and summative aspects. The focus is more summative in that various performance metrics of the faculty are recorded and evaluated; however, they do have formative aspects in that they guide faculty for improving their professional output. This developmental input is particularly important to faculty on probationary periods of a tenure track line as it provides feedback on how performance can be improved to achieve tenure.

IV. Annual Evaluation Process

a. The weights and merit system

For tenured and tenure-track faculty without extra responsibilities (e.g., administration, above-normal teaching loads) the normal weights assigned are:

- Research 40 percent
- Teaching 40 percent
- Service 20 percent

In research a numerical score will be generated as discussed below in “4.b.ii Evaluation of Research and Scholarly Activity.” An overall numerical score will be generated as 100 times the following:

.4*teaching/(mean teaching)+.4*research/(mean research)+.2*service /(mean service).

The mean scores above are calculated using the scores of all faculty with responsibility in the area. For service, it excludes the Director of Graduate Studies and the Director of Undergraduate Studies. This normalization means that individual scores can go down even if individual performance stays the same or improves. This is particularly true as the quality of our teaching and research improves and as our service load rises.

Faculty should be notified not only of their score, but also of the mean score and the range of scores (for research, teaching, service, and total) of the department. These numerical evaluations should be supplemented with written comments by the Department Head in order to provide useful feedback, discuss individual situations with the faculty member, and so forth. Accompanying these comments should be an overall assessment of the faculty member’s performance according to the categories: "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity." The "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" category corresponds with that described in section VIII of this document.

b. Evaluation of faculty

As part of the evaluation process, each year every faculty member is expected to complete the Faculty Reporting and Evaluating Form (see Appendix A), including the statement regarding one-year and longer-term goals. The form should be accompanied by teaching evaluations, copies of publications, copies of papers out for review, copies of referee reports rendered by faculty, copies of editors’ letters requesting revision and re-submission of articles, letters indicating acceptances of articles for publication, and other appropriate documentation.

The goal statement is not intended to be a contractually binding statement, but rather one that will serve as the basis for a dialogue between the faculty member and the Department Head with regard to the consistency of the faculty member's goals and the evaluation criteria set forth in this document. This is consistent with Section C45.1 of the *University Handbook*, which states "It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process."

In evaluation of all aspects of faculty performance – teaching, research, and service – the performance in the most recent two years shall have the greatest weight. However, the quantity of resources available for raises differs from year to year. Evidence of performance may not flow at a constant rate over time. For these reasons, the Department Head shall take into account performance over the past five years in making evaluations. In effect, the evaluation score for teaching, research, and service in a particular year shall be a weighted moving average of performance over the past five years using the weights: 0.25 for the most recent year (year one); 0.25 for the year preceding the most recent year (year two), 0.20 for the year preceding year two (year three); 0.20 for the year preceding year three (year four); and 0.1 for the year preceding year four (year five). For faculty with fewer than five years in the department, the weights on the moving average will be at the discretion of the Department Head.

As indicated in Section C46.2 of the University Handbook, the department head will recommend a salary adjustment for each person evaluated. The recommended percentage increases based on the annual evaluation for persons with higher levels of accomplishment shall exceed those for persons with lower levels of accomplishment. Since the yearly evaluation score is a moving average of the past five years, this score alone will be the basis for recommended salary adjustments.

i. Evaluation of teaching

The department has the mission of teaching a wide variety of up-to-date economics courses, ranging from introductory courses offered in large classes constituted predominantly by non-majors to advanced courses with small enrollment constituted predominantly by students specializing in economics. These courses require a variety of faculty teaching styles, skills and approaches. Evaluation will take account of the faculty member’s contribution to the department’s teaching mission. The Department Head should consider the following in evaluation of teaching performance (no order of ranking implied):

1. Course content including currency of material presented, syllabi, appropriateness of course structure, and amount of student work required, activities that promote active learning, level of presentation, examinations, course improvements, use of social media, relating the lecture material to current events, and so forth. Particularly in upper-level undergraduate and graduate courses, evidence of challenging students through the use of homework, term papers, essay examinations, and other measures should be considered. If appropriate to the class, the Department Head will consider attempts to get students involved in research and to teach them how to analyze economic datasets.
2. Contributions to our K-State 2025 goals related to undergraduate and graduate education.
3. The number of course preparations a faculty member is responsible for during a given semester (and over time) and new course preparations.

4. Interviews with both undergraduate and graduate students at K-State. Such interviews may have additional functions and benefits for the department besides providing general feedback to the Department Head regarding the classroom experiences of students.
5. The particular courses taught. The Department Head will consider the extent to which a faculty member's teaching load consists of courses considered of particular service to the department. The set of courses warranting special attention will be left to the discretion of the Department Head and based on staffing needs.
6. The standardized student-evaluation results and other instruments of evaluation including peer review.

To facilitate interpretation of teaching evaluation forms, the department should use the same form in all multi-section courses. Currently, the department uses the TEVAL form. All evaluations should be administered by a representative of the Department Head, normally a GTA or departmental secretary, and should normally be administered in the last month of the semester. The proportion of enrolled students filling out the evaluation form should be taken into consideration. The teacher is not to see the results until the grades are submitted at the end of the semester. As a substitute, faculty may use the online TEVAL evaluation forms.

Although the computerized evaluation form should normally be used in all multi-section classes, it may be appropriate, especially in small graduate-level courses, for instructors to use a different instrument involving more extensive written comments by the students. Such instructors may develop and utilize an instrument of their own choice if they desire. Whatever the instrument chosen, it should be administered by a representative of the Department Head.

Some discretion for interpreting and potentially adjusting the standardized evaluation scores will be left with the Department Head. Adjustments will take two forms. First, all courses fundamentally should focus on the attainment of student learning outcomes. Adjustments to the standardized evaluation scores can be made should the Department Head feel that a faculty member has not provided adequate instruction for such attainment. Second, adjustments for teaching large principles (and other large lecture) classes, in which it is relatively difficult to achieve high evaluation scores, can also be made. In both cases, decisions by the Department Head can be reviewed by the Tenure and Promotion Committee at the request of a faculty member whose score has been adjusted. Should a review be requested, the adjustment suggested by the Tenure and Promotion Committee will be used.

Even though university policy does not mandate that faculty members must share their student evaluations with the Department Head, this is the normal procedure. In the event that the faculty member does not wish to share these evaluations with the head, the burden of proof is on the faculty member to provide compelling, alternative evidence of teaching performance to the head. For example, in lieu of using student evaluations, the instructor may ask the head to sit in on lectures and may provide other evidence of teaching effectiveness. Such alternatives should be discussed with the Department Head prior to submission.

Tenured faculty are to be held to the same standards of submitting evidence of teaching performance annually as are non-tenured faculty.

ii. Evaluation of research and scholarly activity

Publications in top journals, especially those used to rank economics departments, do more to enhance the prestige and reputation of the department than publications in lesser journals. Because research often requires years to complete and its impact, e.g., as measured by citations and other indicators of recognition and quality, may not be felt for years, and because legislated pay increases differ from year to year, it is especially important that evaluation of research performance be based on a weighted moving average over the past five years.

There will be two numerical components to the research score. The total research score will be the sum of these two components.

1. A measure of research activity beyond peer reviewed publications. The maximum score achievable is 1. This score can be achieved by demonstrating research activity through a combination of refereeing in journals, presenting at conferences, serving as an outside reviewer for tenure cases, editing journals, writing book reviews, non-refereed publications, working papers, citations, and so forth. Considerable discretion should be given to the Department Head in determining whether the faculty member warrants the maximum achievable score or a lower score. In general, however, faculty who are fully engaged in the profession can expect full credit in this area.
2. A numerical score based on the contributions of the individual to achieving the goals of K-State 2025 with respect to research. The Department Head will make available to the faculty a listing of the point values for all journals based on the impact of publications in those journals to the professional reputation of the department. The point values for journals can be changed, and new journals not currently on the list can be added, by the evaluation committee. This committee is discussed below in “c. Other Items”.

In calculating the point value of research contributions, articles with one coauthor will receive a weight of 0.7, articles with two coauthors will receive a weight of 0.5, and articles with three or more coauthors will receive a weight of 0.3. To encourage co-authorship with our graduate students and to reflect relative contributions, individuals will not be considered in the coauthor count if they were graduate or undergraduate students at K-State when the research for the paper substantially progressed.

Indicators of exceptional research accomplishments can result in an upward adjustment of this second numerical component. Examples include receipt of the most prestigious external grants and contracts as principal investigator (i.e. National Science Foundation grants), being elected a Fellow of the Econometric Society or taking a post as the editor of a top 40 journal.

Faculty should be notified of respective scores for the two components of research.

iii. Evaluation of service

Service is highly important to the department. It is expected that all tenured faculty will make similar contributions in the area of service. Service contributions of assistant professors may differ from those of tenured professors but should be similar within this rank. As such it is expected through time that service scores will be similar across faculty. The Department Head will assign a score of zero to tenured faculty members whose service contributions are considerably and persistently below that of other tenured faculty. The Department Head will work with faculty members to provide them with the opportunity to do the expected service. The Department Head will, if opportunities exist, allow faculty members to substitute other activities such as teaching additional classes to make up for a deficiency in service. The Department Head may ask faculty members to do a disproportionate share of service, in return for a reduction in teaching load or other arrangements. Disproportional service compensated by a teaching load reduction or other arrangement will not be additionally compensated through a higher service score. Additional service not compensated by a reduction in teaching load or other arrangement will result in a higher service score.

1. Priority 1: Departmental service. Departmental service may take many forms. The Department Head will annually provide a list of committees and related service items important for achieving the current goals of the department. A reasonable measure of departmental service is the amount of time and effort devoted to such activities, together with the benefits provided to the department. It is expected that faculty will be participating with undergraduate or graduate research advising. A baseline of one or two graduate dissertations will be considered normal, where dissertation is interpreted broadly to include Master's reports, Master's thesis or Ph.D. thesis. Faculty members advising less than that amount are expected to make a greater contribution in other areas of service.
2. Priority 2: University service. University service may take the form of serving on Faculty Senate, college and university-wide committees, Ph.D. committees outside the department, and other forms of university service.
3. Priority 3: Community service. Giving talks, writing articles for the newspaper, giving media interviews, and performing other service that helps provide recognition to the department and university.

Exceptions

1. The Department Head will decide which activities are classified as service based on whether or not they substantially benefit the department. Activities that were classified as service in previous years will normally continue to be classified as service. Affected faculty will be notified in advance of deviations from that policy.
2. The responsibilities, compensation, and evaluation for the director of graduate studies and director of undergraduate studies positions will be determined by agreement with the Department Head. As such, this section does not refer to their responsibilities and their service score will not be included in calculating the average service score using the equation in Section 4.a.

iv. Adjustment

In line with item C46.1 of the University Handbook, the Department Head, after consultation with the evaluation committee (see Section c.i below), may make an adjustment of up to 10 points in favor or against the evaluation score of a faculty member based on departmental citizenship, other personal conduct affecting the workplace, and overall contribution or detriment to the department. Faculty and other unclassified employees are expected to have cooperative interactions with colleagues, show civility and respect to others with whom they work and interact, show respect for the opinions of others in the exchange of ideas and demonstrate a willingness to follow appropriate directives from supervisors.

In general, such adjustments should be rare. In particular, deviations from normal citizenship should be large in order to induce an adjustment in either a positive or negative fashion. This interpretation, in part, is due to the fact that the evaluation document already covers what might be called ordinary deviations.

The process for imposing an adjustment will have several steps. First, the Department Head, as part of the annual evaluation process, should discuss the possibility of an adjustment with the faculty member. Next, the case will be referred to the evaluation committee, who will gather relevant information from all available sources regarding the adjustment. The evaluation committee will then deliberate and make a recommendation to the Department Head.

In some cases, negative adjustments may avoid being referred to the evaluation committee, if confidentiality is requested by the faculty member and he or she agrees to the adjustment suggested by the head.

v. Evaluation of faculty in their first years.

The Department Head will have discretion in deviating from items 1.b.i through 1.b.iii in assigning research, teaching, and service scores to faculty through their first three evaluation periods.

c. Other items

i. Evaluation committee

The Department Head will appoint an evaluation committee. This committee will consist of three members, each serving a three-year term. Appointments will be staggered so that one new member is added each year, as an old member rotates off. In general, assistant professors are exempt from this committee but may be consulted by the committee. The committee will have several roles.

1. This committee will respond to requests by faculty to change the score assigned to specific journals or add scores for unranked journals for purposes of evaluation. The committee will collect information provided by a requesting faculty, their web searches, and any other interested parties. This information will be compiled into a report

submitted to the Department Head and tenured faculty and may include a ranking recommendation if the committee can agree on one. If necessary, a meeting of the tenured faculty will be called to discuss the situation. After deliberation, tenured faculty who are not partial to the outcome will submit their recommendation for the rank of the journal. Of these scores, the highest and lowest will be discarded, and the ultimate rank will be the average of the remaining recommendations. This vote will be binding for a period of two years, at which point the process can repeat, if initiated by a faculty member.

2. The committee will act as a mediator when a faculty member and the Department Head disagree over any aspect of the faculty member's annual evaluation. This will include disagreements regarding acceptable service loads. In each case, the faculty member can approach the committee in advance of discussions with the Department Head regarding the issue or after failing to resolve the issue with the Department Head. This decision should be based on minimizing misunderstandings and confrontation. The committee will serve in an advisory capacity only.
3. The Department Head may consult with the committee for opinions regarding ad hoc decisions related to evaluation.
4. The committee will be responsible for reviewing the Department of Economics Guidelines, Standards, and Procedures for Reappointment, Promotion, Tenure, Mid-Tenure Review, Professorial Performance Award and Annual Merit Evaluation. It will suggest changes in policy when appropriate. It will also suggest changes in interpretation and implementation of guidelines when appropriate. Such suggestions may originate outside the committee.

ii. Policy for going to a 10% research weight

Faculty with low research productivity over an extended time, or a forecast of low research going forward, should discuss with the Department Head the possibility of going to a 10% research weight. The Department Head may accept this arrangement, if it is seen to benefit the aggregate research output and teaching performance of the department. A faculty member with a 10% research weight will be exempt from the above evaluation of research and will instead agree on standards with the Department Head. It is expected that the faculty member will be awarded the average research score if these standards are met. However, the overall ranking of the faculty member cannot exceed the average of the department. The default teaching load for a faculty member with a 10% research weight is a 4-4 course load equivalent. This equivalence may be met through a 4-4 teaching load or a 3-3 teaching load with compensating service, course size, or course selection. A faculty member under this arrangement will be making important contributions to the goals of the department by allowing increased specialization across faculty members. The initial revised set of area weights should provide a faculty member with a reasonable opportunity to return to the standard 40-40-20 weights for teaching, research, and service, respectively.

V. Reappointment, tenure, promotion, & mid-tenure review

a. Description

This section has two purposes. First, it summarizes many of the reappointment, tenure, and promotion details discussed in the *University Handbook*, Section C. The *University Handbook* can be found at www.k-state/provost/unversityhb. Items in this document taken from the *University Handbook* are placed in quotations and referenced. Faculty are encouraged to consult the *University Handbook*, Section C, for additional detail on university procedures and protocol. Second, as noted in Section C31.1, “The possibility does not exist at the university or college levels to establish detailed criteria and standards for annual merit salary adjustments, reappointment, promotion, and tenure” " In addition, the same Section of the *University Handbook* indicates that these criteria should be established by the faculty of each academic department or unit." This document also describes the current departmental standards and criteria for reappointment, tenure, and promotion and outlines methods used to evaluate teaching, research and service in Section 4.b above.

b. Calendar of procedures

The Department of Economics follows the calendar for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as set forth annually by the Dean or provost; the document is available from the Department Head.

c. Reappointment of non-tenured faculty: general procedures

1. The Department Head announces a meeting of tenured faculty to consider reappointment of non-tenured faculty. The head makes available to faculty members all materials provided by the candidate and may supplement it with other material the head considers relevant for the reappointment decision, such as comments solicited from students and faculty.
2. "The candidate compiles and submits documentation of his or her professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department." (*University Handbook*, Section C62.)
3. Tenured faculty and the Department Head meet to consider candidates for reappointment. Faculty vote formally with a secret ballot for each candidate.
4. The head conveys the faculty vote and comments to the Dean, along with the head's own recommendations.
5. The head also conveys his/her comments and suggestions to each candidate and, for tenure-track candidates, the faculty's comments regarding the candidate's progress toward tenure. The letter to the candidate should make reference to the department’s tenure and promotion document.

6. "A faculty member may request an early tenure review. Ordinarily, this is done after consultation with the Department Head and the tenured faculty members in the department." (*University Handbook*, Section C110.)

d. First-year faculty

1. Consideration for reappointment of instructors will emphasize teaching and service, and for new assistant professors will emphasize the ability to handle the teaching, research, and service responsibilities necessary to get tenure.
2. Individuals with substantial professional experience may, in addition, be evaluated with regard to other activities, e.g., administration and research. Such would be the case for a person hired at the level of associate or full professor.

e. Second-year faculty (evaluated twice during the academic year)

1. The evaluation of second-year faculty will generally have a broader focus than evaluation of first-year faculty.
2. For tenure track faculty, evaluation will consider outcomes in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

f. Third-year faculty and mid-probationary review

1. *University Handbook*, Section C92.1, states in part:
   "A formal review of probationary faculty members is conducted midway through the probationary period. Unless otherwise stated in the candidate's contract, the mid-probationary review shall take place during the third year of appointment. This review provides the faculty member with substantive feedback from faculty colleagues and administrators regarding his or her accomplishments relative to departmental tenure criteria. A positive review does not ensure that tenure will be granted in the future; nor does a negative review necessarily mean that tenure will be denied." [The procedure is essentially the same as that used in the final review for tenure except that outside reviews are not mandatory: the candidate provides statements of accomplishments, of future goals, and of contributions to instruction, research, and service. The candidate's file is examined by the Dean and the Dean's advisory committee.]
2. *University Handbook*, Section C92.2, states in part: "The Department Head may discuss the review and assessment of the tenured faculty members in the department with the Dean, and shall provide a letter of assessment to the candidate, including a summary of faculty comments and suggestions. (See C35 regarding confidentiality of peer evaluations). This letter of assessment and the faculty report will become a part of the candidate's reappointment and mid-probationary review file. The Department Head/Chair will discuss the review and assessment with the candidate. After receiving the assessment, the candidate has the right to submit a written response for the file."

3. *University Handbook*, Section C92.3, states in part: "Comments also may be solicited from students, and other relevant faculty members in the college or university, and from outside reviewers."

g. Fourth-year and fifth-year faculty

1. Evaluation of faculty in the fourth and fifth years will focus on their progress toward achieving a performance level that warrants tenure.
2. The Department Head will convey in writing to candidates their progress toward achieving a favorable departmental recommendation for tenure. The letter to the candidate should make reference to the department's tenure and promotion document. To protect the university from the substantial cost of evaluating the tenure application of an assistant professor that has performed at a level far below expectations, and is therefore unlikely to get tenure, the failure to meet at least one of the following requirements is expected to lead to a non-renewal vote at the fifth-year review:
    1. At least four refereed publications in journals indexed in the SSCI, with at least one in a top 40 journal (see Appendix B).
    2. At least two publications in top 40 journals.
    3. At least one publication in a top 40 journal plus an invitation to revise and resubmit a paper at a top 40 journal.
3. The Department Head, together with the department's tenure and promotion committee, will determine which journals meet the "top 40" classification. The tenure and promotion committee will consist of two to three tenured faculty members chosen by the Department Head. Meeting one of these requirements in no way implies that the department believes the candidate should be given tenure or should be granted a renewal at the fifth-year review. The department expects assistant professors to have a publication record that is considerably better than the minimum necessary to meet this requirement.

VI. Tenure and promotion

a. Tenure

1. "Faculty members in the final year of probation will be automatically reviewed for tenure unless the faculty member resigns." (*University Handbook*, Section C110.)
2. "Tenure is not granted below the rank of associate professor, except in special circumstances approved by the provost." For faculty hired at the assistant professor level, recommendation for tenure is generally concurrent with the recommendation to promote to associate professor. (*University Handbook*, Section C13.)
3. Early in the fall semester of the sixth year, the Department Head will consult with probationary faculty regarding the preparation of a file to support recommendation for tenure and promotion.
4. As part of that file, the candidate provides statements of accomplishments, of future goals, and of contributions to instruction, research, and service. The Department Head provides the candidate's file ("Promotion and Tenure Documentation") to tenured economics faculty and to the Dean for his/her review and review by the Dean's advisory committee.
5. The College of Arts and Sciences requires an outside review of the candidate's research and publication for tenure and for promotion to associate and full professor. Probationary faculty will be asked to supply names of at least five potential outside reviewers, who are recognized for excellence in the candidate's discipline and who can provide an unbiased evaluation. The Department Head seeks peer review from at least two persons on the candidate's list and adds two or more of the head's choosing. The head formally requests reviews from these individuals. An example of the head's letter to outside reviewers is on file for inspection by faculty.
6. Tenured faculty members review the candidate's file and make recommendations to the head; this consists of a secret ballot and written comments. The results of the faculty vote and the faculty's unedited, written comments regarding tenure and promotion are forwarded to the Dean by the Department Head.
7. The Department Head forwards his/her own recommendation to the Dean accompanied by an explanation of her or his judgment. (*University Handbook*, Section C112.5.) The head shall discuss with the voting faculty the content of the recommendation letter that he/she intends to transmit to the Dean. This discussion may take place at the same meeting in which the ballots are cast or, at the discretion of the head, a subsequent meeting. Any voting faculty member may subsequently elect to write a separate letter to the Dean, either concurring or dissenting with the head’s articulated position. The head provides a letter of assessment to the candidate. This letter summarizes the head’s assessment of the candidate as articulated in the head’s recommendation letter to the Dean. The rest of the process follows the protocols outlined in the University Handbook, Sections C 110 through C 120.

b. Promotion

1. Consideration for promotion is not automatic. "A faculty member, after consultation with the Department Chair/Head or appropriate departmental faculty, may request a review for promotion. The candidate compiles and submits a file that documents his or her professional accomplishments in accordance with the criteria, standards, and guidelines established by the department." (*University Handbook*, Section C151.) This procedure normally begins early in September.
2. Associate professors may request feedback from the head concerning their progress toward satisfying the requirements for promotion during the annual evaluation process.
3. The procedure for promoting tenured faculty is, in general, identical to the procedure for recommendation of tenure. However, faculty who evaluate the candidate are limited to those of higher rank than the candidate.

VII. Professorial performance award

The Professorial Performance Award rewards strong performance at the highest rank with a base salary increase in addition to that provided for by the annual evaluation process (*University Handbook*, Sections C49.1 & C49.12). The award is not a promotion but a salary performance award. The Professorial Performance Award is part of the annual evaluation process and is based on the Department Head's recommendation to the Dean. Consistent with Sec. C49.2 of the *University Handbook*, the department's criteria are based on the following guidelines quoted from the University Handbook:

1. The candidate must be a full-time professor and have been in the highest rank at Kansas State at least six years since the last promotion or Professorial Performance Award;
2. The candidate must show evidence of sustained productivity in at least the last six years before the performance review, and
3. The candidate's productivity and performance must be of a quality comparable to that which would merit promotion to professor according to current approved departmental standards (see Section VI. b.) The standards must be met in service, teaching, and research. Note in particular from that document: "Appointment to full professor requires a demonstration of leadership in service. Solid service scores in the annual evaluation are not sufficient to meet this expectation." As such this will be expected for the professorial performance award.

Candidates eligible for performance review must compile and submit a file that documents their professional accomplishments for at least the previous six years to the Department Head. The Department Head will prepare a written evaluation of the candidate's materials in terms of the criteria, standards, and guidelines established, along with a recommendation for or against the award. A copy of the Department Head's written recommendation will be forwarded to the candidate.

Each candidate for the award will have the opportunity to discuss the written evaluation and recommendation with the Department Head, and each candidate will sign a statement acknowledging the opportunity to review the evaluation. Within seven working days after the review and discussion, each candidate will have the opportunity to submit written statements of unresolved differences regarding his or her evaluation to the Department Head and to the Dean.

The Department Head submits the following items to the Dean:

1. A copy of the evaluation document used to determine qualification for the award,
2. Documentation establishing that there was an opportunity for the candidate to examine the written evaluation and recommendation,
3. Any written statements of unresolved differences concerning the evaluation,
4. The candidate's supporting materials that served as the basis of adjudicating eligibility for the award.

As in annual evaluation, a candidate could appeal to the Dean for a resolution. For details, see Sec. 49.8 through Sec. 49.11 of the *University Handbook*.

The Professorial Performance Award document must be approved by a majority vote of the tenured faculty in the department, by the department's head, by the Dean, and by the Provost. Provision must be made for a review of the document at least every five years as a part of the review of the procedures for annual merit evaluation or whenever standards for promotion to full professor change.

VIII. Chronic Low Achievement

Following Section C31.5 of the *University Handbook*, the Department Head will determine when a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level. The research and teaching guidelines proposed herein shall guide the Department Head's decision in this regard.

The process described in this document is not likely to result in a best outcome for the faculty member or the department. As such, it should be avoided. One way to avoid this is for a faculty member with low recent or forecast research productivity is to discuss with the Department Head the possibility of going to a 10% research weight. The Department Head may accept this arrangement if it is seen to benefit the aggregate research output and teaching performance of the department. A faculty member with a 10% teaching weight will be exempt from the minimum research standards expressed in this document and will instead agree on standards with the Department Head. It is expected that the faculty member will be awarded the average research score if these standards are met. However, the overall ranking of the faculty member cannot exceed the average of the department. The default teaching load for a faculty member with a 10% research weight is a 4-4 course load equivalent. This equivalence may be met through a 4-4 teaching load or a 3-3 teaching load with compensating service, course size, or course selection. A faculty member under this arrangement will be making important contributions to the goals of the department by allowing increased specialization across faculty members. The faculty member should not be considered to be in violation of minimum standards but rather contributing differently.

a. Minimum acceptable levels for research

It is expected that faculty members provide evidence of scholarship on a regular basis. A faculty member in the Department of Economics will have met the minimum acceptable level of productivity with regard to research when he or she has documented the requisite degree of both effort and performance in conducting economic research. At a minimum, this requires that the individual has submitted or re-submitted a research paper for publication, or presented a paper at a professional conference, or submitted a major grant proposal in the last two years; and has satisfied at least one of the following:

1. The individual has published or has had accepted for publication one refereed article (or substantive note or communication) in a quality general interest or field journal in the last three years, or two such papers in the last five years. The default criterion is that the journal be listed in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI). Unless the journal is listed in the SSCI, the faculty member bears the responsibility for demonstrating that the journal is viewed highly in the economics profession or that it is a respected outlet for teaching scholarship. [See the Statement of Terms and Conditions below.]
2. The individual has published or had accepted for publication a scholarly book or research monograph in the last three years. (Acceptable publications include first edition textbooks, book chapters, and edited volumes.)

3. The individual has secured an external contract or extramural funding in the last three years that contributes to scholarship and the financial well-being of the university in a manner of some significance.

Faculty members may be granted a one-year extension at the discretion of the Department Head for any of the three items under certain conditions. These conditions include, but are not strictly limited to, at least one of the following:

1. The faculty member develops a new course or substantially restructures an existing course that is equivalent to a new course. This may include, for example, development of a distance-learning course, an online course, or a course that involves extensive computer laboratory time. In addition, faculty members who teach a disproportionately large number of graduate classes and/or who teach graduate classes in place of faculty members who are on leave and/or who are teaching a graduate class for the first time may qualify for this extension.
2. The faculty member is engaged in some other scholarly pursuit that is expected to enhance the overall reputation of the department, the college, or the university.
3. The faculty member has supervised a relatively large number of doctoral dissertations in the past three years.

The committee recommends the following exceptions/qualifications to the above-stated requirements:

1. Faculty members may be granted extensions and/or exceptions from the above specific requirements upon a showing that the faculty member is submitting papers to top-tier general interest and field journals with particularly long notification lags; or the faculty member has compiled evidence of exemplary research performance in the past. Evidence of such exemplary research performance may be documented by extensive citations to the author's work in the economics literature, or by his/her appointment to the editorial board of a quality general interest or field journal. [The default criterion is that the journal be listed in the SSCI.] These activities, though important in their own right, should not serve to substitute indefinitely for a consistent record of quality research performance.
2. The minimum research requirements listed above should be changed proportionately for faculty members with a reduced research weight. A faculty member with a 10% research weight will be exempt from these minimum acceptable research standards and will instead agree on research standards with the Department Head. Minimum standards for teaching and service will still be in effect. The default teaching load for a faculty member with a 10% research weight is a 4-4 course load equivalent. This equivalence may be met through a 4-4 teaching load or a 3-3 teaching load with compensating service, course size, or course selection.
3. The Department Head should consider reducing the default teaching load for a faculty member that teaches course sections with an inordinately large enrollment, has multiple course preparations, is teaching courses that are difficult to cover in another way or

otherwise makes an extraordinary contribution to the teaching and/or advising mission of the department.

4. As a general guideline, a faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load should be able to return to a 2-2 teaching load upon having accepted for publication two papers within four years - with the clock starting the first semester in which the faculty member begins a 3-3 teaching load. (Cross reference point 3 under "Statement of Terms and Conditions.")
5. A faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load that receives formal notification (and so informs the Department Head) of the second paper being accepted for publication shall be returned to a standard 2-2 teaching load within a reasonable time period. As a general guideline, a faculty member should be returned to a standard 2-2 teaching in the next semester if formal notification of the second paper being accepted for publication is received at least four months in advance of the start of the next semester.
6. A faculty member with a 3-3 teaching load shall be given a "grace period" of no less than one year prior to receiving a second unacceptable rating due to a failure to satisfy the minimum acceptable levels for research. The clock for the "grace period" starts in the first semester in which the faculty member begins a 3-3 teaching load.

b. Minimum acceptable levels for teaching

Students have a right to expect:

- courses that contain current material.
- comprehensible and accurate presentation of material.
- objective and accurate evaluation of their performance.
- reasonable access to faculty for help and consultation.
- respectful treatment.

Faculty are also expected to:

- conduct classes in a competent and professional manner
- assess student performance with thoughtfully prepared examinations, assignments, and other relevant criteria
- hold students accountable to reasonable standards of performance
- foster student learning
- hold regular office hours
- meet classes at their scheduled times

The Department Head should consider course materials, evidence that classes demonstrate the appropriate level of rigor, and student feedback before concluding that a faculty member has failed to meet minimal acceptable productivity in teaching.

c. Minimum acceptable levels for service

A faculty member in the Department of Economics will have met the minimum acceptable level with regard to service if he or she satisfactorily performs all committee assignments.

d. Minimum overall acceptable levels of productivity

A faculty member will have failed to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity overall, if the faculty member fails to meet minimum acceptable productivity in a major area of responsibility. A major area of responsibility is defined as an area of teaching, research, or service in which the faculty member has a weight of 20 percent or more. As indicated in Section C31.7 of the *University Handbook*, the Department Head and the faculty member may agree to a reallocation of the faculty member's time so that he/she has a reduced weight in the area of deficient performance and increased weight(s) in other areas. For example, a faculty member deficient in research may increase his/her teaching load and/or service responsibilities. The initial revised set of area weights should provide a faculty member with a reasonable opportunity to return to the standard 40-40-20 weights for teaching, research, and service, respectively.

e. Appeals

The Department Head will determine when a faculty member's overall performance has failed to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity. The head will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member, and the head and faculty member will meet together with the goal of agreeing on an appropriate course of action to improve performance to an acceptable level. While this document does not preclude any particular way that the head and faculty member may come to an agreement, one way of reaching an agreement may be for the faculty member to accept a revised set of area weights.

It is recommended that a faculty member not meeting the minimum level of performance in research be assigned a 4-4 teaching load equivalent. This equivalence may be met through a 4-4 teaching load or a 3-3 teaching load with compensating service, course size, or course selection.

In subsequent evaluations the faculty member will report in writing on activities aimed at improving performance and provide any evidence of improvement, and this will become part of the documentation for subsequent evaluations. If the Department Head determines that the faculty member has fallen below minimum acceptable levels of productivity in the subsequent year's evaluation or in the third such evaluation within a five year period, then, unless the faculty member does not wish it, a meeting of the department's tenured faculty will be held to review the Department Head's decision.

Before the tenured faculty vote, the head will present documentation supporting the findings of the failure of the faculty member to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity, and the faculty member being considered will also be able to present an oral and/or written appeal to the tenured faculty. At a subsequent meeting, the Department Head's evaluation will be validated if approved by a majority vote of the appeals committee (tenured faculty excluding the Department Head and the individual faculty member in question).

Voting will be by secret ballot. If validated, the name of the faculty member who is determined to have failed to meet minimum acceptable levels of productivity will be forwarded to the Dean. If the Department Head rejects the tenured faculty vote, so that the head proposes to forward to the Dean the name of the faculty member as not having met minimum acceptable levels of productivity, the head, before forwarding the name, will submit in writing to the individual in question and the tenured faculty his/her reasons for rejecting the tenured faculty decision. Also, the head, in transmitting his/her recommendation to the Dean, will report the vote count by the tenured faculty. In addition, the faculty member being considered will have the right to transmit his/her appeal to the Dean, in writing. The faculty member has the right to forward the assessment of the appeals committee to the Dean.

f. Statement of terms and conditions for minimum overall acceptable levels of productivity

1. The appeals committee for violations of Minimum Overall Acceptable Levels of Productivity is comprised of all tenured faculty members excluding those faculty members filing appeals. In addition, the Department Head will recuse himself or herself from any vote of the appeals committee that involves an appeal of the Department Head's decision. A tie vote of the appeals committee shall be decided in favor of the faculty member filing the appeal.
2. The appeals committee should determine the minimum requirements necessary for a faculty member to be re-instated at the default weightings subject to the following two guidelines: The faculty member must demonstrate a commitment to research that exceeds the minimum acceptable levels of productivity outlined above; and there should be no more than one change in any faculty member's percentage weightings in any given academic year.
3. Evidence that a publication appears in quality research outlet may include, but is not strictly limited to the following: The editorial board is comprised of scholars with established reputations in the economics discipline; The publication is refereed; The publication is cited with some frequency in the reference sections of articles that appear in publications listed in the SSCI; and Economists at top twenty universities or with significant name recognition in the field have published in this journal within the last five years.
4. Sabbaticals are irrelevant to the process of administering these guidelines for the purpose of satisfying the minimum research requirements. The teaching and service requirements are not applicable. Faculty leaves without pay and/or medical leaves of one semester or more should be treated as grace periods for a time period not to exceed the length of the leave. For example, a one year unpaid leave would provide the faculty member with a maximum additional year to satisfy the specific requirements.
5. For the purposes of administering the guidelines in this document, sole-authored articles will be counted the same as multiple-authored articles, and the order in which the authors' names appear on the article will be of no consequence.
6. The faculty member may satisfy the first item in the minimum standards research requirement by demonstrating satisfactory progress on a first edition textbook. Satisfactory progress on a first edition textbook may be demonstrated by a letter of commitment or signed contract from the publisher.

7. In administering the evaluation guidelines in this document it is important to maintain an appropriate balance between fairness to faculty members and meaningful standards that enable the department to realize its full potential.
8. Amendments to this document may be proposed at any time. A majority vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty is required to pass any amendment.

j. Instructors on regular (non-temporary) appointment

Instructors on regular (non-temporary) appointment are evaluated annually. Such instructors "…must be explicitly informed in writing of a decision not to renew their appointments in accordance with the standards of notice of non-reappointment." (*University Handbook*, Section C60.)

k. Criteria and standards for reappointment, tenure, and promotion

Promotions to all ranks are based on the following standards. However, criteria for promotion to full professor include the additional standard indicated in VIII 4.k.ii.3 and VIII 4.k.iii.4 below.

i. Teaching

The department expects high quality teaching, and to that end establishes the following criteria and means of evaluation.

1. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require that faculty be evaluated via a formal evaluation instrument and/or interviews with students and classroom observation by the head. This evaluation should establish that the faculty member's teaching practices are consistent with high standards of scholarship and student learning. The Department Head considers the impact on evaluations of items such as grading standards of the instructor, course content, number of students in the class, level of the class (e.g., introductory or graduate).
2. Particularly in upper-level courses, the department expects faculty to challenge students with assignments that, in part, develop skills valued by prospective employers and/or graduate and professional schools. These assignments may entail analysis of data, term papers, group projects, class presentations, case studies, etc. Examinations and class assignments may be reviewed by tenured faculty as part of the review process.
3. Lecture presentations are expected to be modified over time to incorporate advances in the discipline.

ii. Research

The department expects high quality research, and to that end establishes the following criteria and means of evaluation.

1. Reappointment, tenure, and promotion require that faculty pursue a continuously active research program, evidenced by publications in highly regarded refereed journals. The department also considers other evidence of scholarly activities, such as publication of books, editorial board membership, citations of work in the SSCI, applications for research grants, presentations at conferences, etc.
2. The department takes special note of research activities that promote the national reputation of the department.
3. Promotion to full professor requires that a faculty member achieve a national reputation for scholarship in his/her field. This normally requires multiple publications in highly regarded journals. Other factors that can provide evidence of national reputation include a record of receipt of significant research grants, significant citation of one's work by other scholars in the field writing in highly regarded journals (as indicated, for example, by SSCI), editorships or service on editorial boards, publication of books and/or monographs, or substantial activity in refereeing articles for economics journals.

iii. Service

The department expects all members to provide significant service to the department, the university, and the community; and to that end the department establishes the following criteria and means of evaluation. [Note: The department weighs most heavily service to the department; professional and university service ranks second, and community service third.]

1. Departmental service
    1. Faculty are evaluated on the basis of their contributions to graduate students, and in particular, on their contributions to Ph.D. dissertations and Masters' theses and reports. Quality of the final product and value added are important criteria. Particularly in the case of Ph.D. dissertations, quality may be demonstrated by subsequent publication of the research.
    2. Faculty are also evaluated with respect to service to undergraduates: advising, assistance with job placement and applications to graduate school, providing research experiences, and other assistance.
    3. Other departmental service: recruiting of faculty and students, committee work, and other activities listed in the department's faculty evaluation document.
2. University and professional service
    1. The department considers service to the university through such activities as membership in faculty senate, college and university committees, etc.
    2. The department considers service to the profession through such activities as serving as officers in organizations, organizing conference sessions, etc.
3. Community service includes the following: presentation to groups, articles for newspapers, media interviews, and other service that provides recognition to the department and university.
4. Appointment to full professor requires a demonstration of leadership in service. Solid service scores in the annual evaluation are not sufficient to meet this expectation. Rather the faculty member should be seen as contributing in an exemplary way to the goals and progress of the department. There are many ways to meet this expectation. Examples include, but are not limited to:

1. Serving as director of graduate studies
2. Serving as director of undergraduate studies
3. Demonstrating initiative and leadership in program development
4. Demonstrating initiative and leadership in engagement

The faculty member should maintain communication with the Department Head and the tenure and promotion committee to assess progress toward this goal.

Section IV above provides detail on the evaluation of teaching, research, and service. In general, the candidate should anticipate that consistent ratings on the departmental annual evaluations of "exceeds expectations" increase the likelihood of a favorable recommendation from the department concerning promotion/tenure.

Conversely, the candidate should anticipate that consistent ratings on the departmental annual evaluations of "fails to meet expectations" decrease the likelihood of a favorable recommendation from the department concerning promotion/tenure.

In general, consistent ratings of "meets expectations" do not carry any informational content in this regard. In general, the candidate should anticipate that satisfaction of the standards for minimum acceptable productivity are necessary but not sufficient for a favorable recommendation from the department concerning promotion/tenure.

IX. Post tenure review

The purpose of post-tenure review at Kansas State University is to enhance the continued professional development of tenured faculty. The process is intended to encourage intellectual vitality and professional proficiency for all members of the faculty throughout their careers, so they may more effectively fulfill the mission of the university. It is also designed to enhance public trust in the University by ensuring that the faculty community undertakes regular and rigorous efforts to hold all of its members accountable for high professional standards.

Kansas State University recognizes that the granting of tenure for university faculty is a vital protection of free inquiry and open intellectual debate. It is expressly recognized that nothing in this policy alters or amends the University's policies regarding removal of tenured faculty members for cause (which are stipulated in the University Handbook). This policy and any actions taken under it are separate from and have no bearing on the chronic low achievement or annual evaluation policies and processes.

The department policy on post tenure review follows the overarching purpose, principles, objectives, and procedures in the university policy on post tenure review (see University Handbook, Appendix W), which was approved by Faculty Senate on February 5, 2019."

The faculty member shall provide the Department Head with copies of the six previous annual evaluations. The faculty member will also provide a letter summarizing activities and accomplishments over the previous six year. The document should generally not exceed one page and should address teaching, service and research.

The Department Head will review faculty materials and provide recommendations regarding contributions to teaching, research, and service. A faculty member who has met or exceeded expectations on all six annual reviews will be considered to be making appropriate contributions to the university. If the determination of the review suggests that a plan for additional professional development should be identified, a face-to-face meeting to discuss options and develop a plan is required. The Department Head will have considerable discretion in judging whether a faculty member is making appropriate contributions to the university in other cases. Items to be considered are extenuating circumstances in the year(s) when expectations were not met, progress toward meeting expectations, and overall level of accomplishment across the six-year period.

The assessment and recommendations will be provided by the department head to the faculty member under review in a letter.

Appendix A

FACULTY REPORTING AND EVALUATION
Department of Economics
Kansas State University

Evaluation Period: from January 1, 20XX, to December 31, 20XX

Name: ______________________ Rank: ______________________

Please complete the following evaluation form and return it to the departmental office. Also include the following:

1) A current vita
2) Copies of student evaluations, and representative reading lists, exams, homework assignments, and other instructional material from courses taught in the current year
3) Copies of grant proposals, research papers, and books (published in the current year, forthcoming, or under review)
4) Any other material relevant to your job responsibilities and performance

1. INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES (for current calendar year)

Classes Taught:

	Course Number	Course Name	Number of Students
Spring	______________	______________________________	______________
	______________	______________________________	______________
	______________	______________________________	______________
	______________	______________________________	______________
Fall	______________	______________________________	______________
	______________	______________________________	______________
	______________	______________________________	______________
	______________	______________________________	______________

Course Innovations or Other Contributions to Teaching:

2. **RESEARCH OUTPUT** (attach articles, manuscripts, etc.)

Articles Published (this calendar year)

Articles Accepted for Publication

Articles Under Review

2. Research Output Continued

<u>Grants</u> (Include agency, funding level, duration, title, and collaborators. Also provide a separate list of grants and contracts applied for but not funded.)

<u>Books Published</u>

<u>Papers Presented</u> (include meeting, date, and location)

2. Research Output Continued

Refereeing [List journal, funding agency, institution, or department (including our own)]

Working Papers and Research in Progress

Book Reviews

3. **SERVICE**

Departmental Service

(a) Graduate Supervising and Undergraduate Advising

Major Professor for Students who Earned M.A. or Ph.D. Degrees During the Year:

Name	Degree	Name	Degree
______________	______	______________	______
______________	______	______________	______

Major Professor for Graduate Students Still Working on an Advanced Degree:

Name	Degree	Name	Degree
______________	______	______________	______
______________	______	______________	______
______________	______	______________	______
______________	______	______________	______

Number of graduate student committees other than major professor:

M.A. ________ Ph.D.________

Number of undergraduate advisees: ____________

Undergraduate advising activities in addition to meeting with advisees (contacts with potential employers, internships directed, etc.)

(b) Other Departmental Service

3. Service Continued

Professional Service and University Service (Professional service includes such activities as service on editorial boards, serving as a discussant at professional meetings, and evaluating candidates for promotion at other universities. Examples of university service include membership on the faculty senate, college or university-wide committees, and Ph.D. committees outside the department.)

Community Service (Giving talks or media interviews and otherwise performing service that provides recognition for the department and university)

4. **STATEMENT OF ONE-YEAR GOALS**
Instructions: The faculty member is to provide a one-page statement of the individual's one-year goals with respect to teaching, research, service, and any other scholarly activity. As stated in Sec. C45.1 of the Faculty Handbook:

> Each unclassified person will meet annually with the unit head to jointly establish personal goals and objectives for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the unit's goals. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process.

5. STATEMENT OF LONG-TERM GOALS

Instructions: Please present long-term goals. Goals may be general or specific. For those seeking tenure or promotion, statement of goals can provide a plan for achieving tenure or promotion. Statement should be limited to a single page.

Appendix B

Guidance document

This document elaborates on the how publication scores are computed in the research component of the annual faculty evaluation. These details were deliberately left out of the Faculty Evaluation Document in order to keep that document concise. There are two aspects of this document that should be made clear up front. First, although this is called a guidance document, it is more than that for some types of publications as it spells out exactly how those types of publications are computed in the annual faculty evaluation. However, for other publications it only provides general guidance. This difference will be clarified below and there it will be seen why only guidance can be given. Second, this document is only for use in the research evaluation score for the annual evaluation of faculty. It is not to be used for other purposes. In particular, this is not intended to provide guidance for tenure or promotion purposes. Evaluation of research for tenure and promotion decisions will take into account one's overall body of work and standing in the profession, the field in which the work was published, and other factors. Guidance for tenure and promotion purposes should be obtained from the department head.

This document breaks the description into two sections, with the first describing how economic journal publications are scored and the second describing how noneconomic journal publications are scored. Much of the scoring is based on a paper by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) which ranks 120 economic journals. Guidance on how to score journals not included in Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) are also provided. Over time, as faculty publish in these other journals and scores are determined for them, a list including all journals from Kalaitzidakis, et al (2000) and any additional journals which score better or equal to the lowest ranked journal in Kalaitzidakis, et al (2000) will be compiled. The current draft of this list can be obtained from the department head upon request.

Publications in Economic Journals

There are two categories of publications to consider. As of this writing (September 2014), the department uses Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) as its source for journal rankings.[1] Publications in journals ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) will be described first. Publications not ranked will be described next.

Publications in Journals ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010)

The calculation for a publication score begins by establishing a journal score for the publication in question. The department has chosen to base journal scores on Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010). There were several reasons that Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) was chosen as the single source for

[1] This draft was written in September of 2014. Over time, it is possible that alternative journal ranking articles may appear that may be considered better than Kalaitzidakis et. al. (2010). The department head may switch to an alternative ranking source after consultation with the faculty. Publication scores for alternative ranking sources should be computed in as similar of a fashion as outlined here as is feasible. It is recommended that, if such a switch is likely to be long lived, this document be updated as soon as feasible to account for any computational differences.

journal rankings. Foremost is that the paper is highly regarded as careful and thorough in its evaluation of the economics field. Second, it was decided to use only a single source for rankings as this keeps the calculation of the score simple and does not impose an undue burden on the department head.

For journals ranked in Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) assigning journal scores is carried out as follows. Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) assigns index values to articles published in more than 200 economics journals. These index values for a journal are a measure of citations to articles in that journal after adjusting for the quality of the journal. Next, because rankings for Economics Departments only count the 63 top journals in their ranking, two further adjustments are made to the Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) list. Publications in the top 70 journals will be awarded points as outlined above. Publications in journals ranked below #120 will have a point value of 0.13, which is 20% of the point value of journals ranked 70. Publications in journals ranked 71-120 will have a point value given by a linear interpolation of a journal ranked 70. Publications in journals ranked 71-120 will have a point value given by linear interpolation of a journal ranked 120 (i.e. 0.13). The formula will be 0.13+(120-rank)*0.0102. Finally, all journal scores will be divided by 0.13 for scaling. Thus a low level publication receives a score of 1 and which serves as a useful numeraire. A complete list of journals ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) and their index scores can be obtained from the department head.

Next, an authorship weight is determined. For sole-authored papers, the weight is 1. For coauthored papers the weight declines with the number of coauthors as follows. The weight is 0.7 if there was one coauthor, 0.5 if there were two coauthors, and 0.3 if there were three or more coauthors. Articles coauthored with either present undergraduate or graduate students or recently finished undergraduate or graduate students in which the work was significantly carried out while the student was still at K-State, will be such that the coauthor weight is adjusted so that there is one fewer coauthor. (E.g. If there are two coauthors, but one is a recently finished undergraduate or graduate student, then the weight will be the one coauthor weight.)

A few examples are now provided to illustrate how these calculations are carried out.

Example: Only sole-authored papers.

Prof Smith had sole-authored publications in the *Journal of Economic Theory* and *Economic Inquiry* during 2012. The index value for the *Journal of Economic Theory* is 22.5. The index value for *Economic Inquiry* is 3.7. Prof Smith's research point total for 2012 is ln(22.5**)/.13** + ln(3.7**)/.13** = 34.0.

Example: Coauthored papers.

Prof Jones published a paper with two coauthors in the *Journal of Applied Econometrics* and a paper with one coauthor in *Economica* in 2012. The index value for the *Journal of Applied Econometrics* is 5.8 and the index value for *Economica* is 2.2. Prof Jones's research point total for 2012 is 0.5*ln(5.8**)/.13** + 0.7*ln(2.2**)/.13** = 11.0.

Publications in Journals not ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010)

There were several reasons that Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) was chosen as the single source for journal rankings. Foremost is that the paper is highly regarded as careful and thorough in its evaluation of the economics field. Second, it was decided to use only a single source for rankings as this keeps the calculation of the score simple and does not impose an undue burden on the department head. That said, there are many economics journals that are not ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010). This section provides guidance on how such publications should be scored.

One thing to keep in mind for this category of publications is that many, but certainly not all, of the journals that are not ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) are likely not ranked because they are of poor quality. This means that many of the journal scores in this category may receive journal scores that are lower than the minimum value of 1 for the Kalaitzidakis, et. al. (2010) ranked journals.

For the most part, the department head has significant discretion on this, but faculty who may view the score differently than the head do have several options for providing input. For journals not ranked by Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) the department head should gather information about the journal in question that is deemed relevant for establishing where the journal is ranked. This information could include, impact factors, editorial board details, or journal rankings from other reputable sources. The faculty member whose publication is being evaluated may also suggest relevant information at this stage. The department head can compare information for the journal in question with information for journals ranked in Kalaitzidakis, et al (2010) to decide on what is a reasonable numerical score for the journal and then proceed numerically as described above. The department head can, at their discretion, request that the Faculty Evaluation Committee review their thinking on such cases. Once a journal score has been established by the department head, it must be reported to the faculty member for their consideration. If a faculty member disagrees with the eventual score, they may also request a review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Faculty unhappy with the score may request a review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The department head will either accept the committee recommendation or conduct a vote among all tenured and tenure track faculty. This vote will be binding for a period of two years, at which point the process can repeat if initiated by a faculty member.

For journals that have not been in circulation for many years, in particular, new journals that will be difficult to assess, faculty can opt that the point score be reconsidered after a 5 year period. It is hoped that uncertainty about the significance of the journal can be resolved by that time. If it is found that the journal at the time of the initial evaluation was ranked below its position in 5 years, the score will be adjusted and the change added to the evaluation for the current year. (In other words, it is recognized that it is infeasible to retroactively adjust a score, so the changes will only be reflected at the 5 year evaluation.) The procedure should be carried out by the department head, who can, at their discretion, request input from the Faculty Evaluation Committee. If a faculty member disagrees with the eventual score, they may also request a review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee and their decision is final. Three points must be emphasized about this case. First, this reconsideration possibility is only for journals that have not be in circulation for many years. Second, in order to prevent undue burden on the department head, the period of time must be 5 years. Third, the faculty who requests the later review must make the request in writing at the time of the initial review and not at the 5 year point. This written request will then be stored until the 5 year period has elapsed.

Publications in Journals that are not Economic Journals

Providing an algorithm for evaluating publications in journals that are outside of economics is more challenging because there are many different possibilities to consider. For that reason, here, only guidance is provided.

Because journals outside of economics might not help the department's professional ranking, such publications can receive some credit, but may be discounted at the discretion of the department head. In particular, the department head will evaluate journals outside of economics as best they can using a small but reasonable amount of effort (e.g. 15 to 20 minutes of google searches) by looking at impact factors and other evidence to determine the journal in question's professional standing in the economics profession. The department head, at their discretion, may also request input from the Faculty Evaluation Committee. In addition, the faculty member whose publication is under consideration may also provide input. However, because impact factors are not likely to be directly comparable to those in economics journals, and because other potential evidence (e.g. editorial boards) is likely to have even greater uncertainty regarding the value of the journal, and recognizing the possibly low value of such publications to the department's ranking, the assignment of credit is likely to be discounted and in some cases may be fully discounted. Once a journal score has been established by the department head, it must be reported to the faculty member for their consideration. Faculty unhappy with the score may request a review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee whose decision will be final. Once a numerical score for a journal has been established, the procedures described above will be implemented.

Another thing to keep in mind for this category of publications is that because many, but certainly not all, of the journals outside of economics do not contribute to the department's ranking, they are likely to be discounted below the minimum value of 1 for the Kalaitzidakis, et. al. (2010) ranked journals.