

# Department of Economics

## Evaluation and Procedures

Approved: 2024

# Economics Personnel Governance and Evaluation of Faculty Document

Approved: Spring 2024

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. TTPAC and RTAPAC membership, duties, and procedures.....	3
I.A. Membership	
I.A.1. Membership of TTPAC for evaluation of tenure-track faculty	
I.A.2. Membership of RTAPAC for evaluation of RTA faculty	
I.B. Duties	
I.B.1. TTPAC duties for evaluation of tenure-track faculty	
I.B.2. RTAPAC duties for evaluation of RTA faculty	
I.B.3. Member expectations and revocation of membership for TTPAC and RTAPAC	
I.C. Procedures	
I.C.1. Amendments	
I.C.2. Timelines	
I.C.3. Appeal Body	
I.C.4. Relationship between AUH evaluations and evaluations by the TTPAC and RTAPAC	
I.C.5. Voting Process	
I.C.6. Letter to explain TTPAC and RTAPAC evaluations	
I.C.7. Informal consultations	
I.C.8. Third-year reviews of tenure-track faculty	
I.C.9. Early promotion and early tenure	
II. TTPAC evaluation criteria for tenure and tenure-track promotion applications.....	7
II.A. Evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion applications	
II.B. Evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications for tenure and promotion applications	
II.B.1. Journal rankings, categories, and points	
II.B.2. Sufficient conditions for ratings	

II.B.3. Alternate research vehicles

II.C Evaluation of service for tenure and promotion applications

III. RTAPAC evaluation criteria for RTA promotions .....12

    III.A. Evaluation of teaching for RTA promotion

    III.B. Evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications for RTA promotion

    III.C. Evaluation of service for RTA promotion

IV. Annual Evaluation Guidelines.....15

V. College of Business Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications.....28

Appendix 1: Journal Categories for Publications

Appendix 2: Ranking Algorithm for Articles Accepted after 5/1/2019

## **I. Membership, duties, and procedures for the TTPAC and the RTAPAC**

### **I.A. Membership**

#### **I.A.1. Membership of TTPAC for evaluation of tenure-track faculty**

The Tenure-Track Economics Personnel Advisory Committee (TTPAC) will evaluate tenure-track faculty for the midpoint review, tenure applications, and applications for promotion. The TTPAC shall consist of tenured members of the department who agree to abide by the procedures detailed in this document. Non-tenured faculty members are not involved in discussions or votes regarding evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Only TTPAC members that have achieved promotion to Professor will be involved in the evaluation of faculty members seeking promotion to Professor. In a TTPAC meeting prior to the first day of Fall classes, a chair will be selected to serve in a leadership capacity for the upcoming academic year. Candidates for chair can be self-nominated or nominated by other full-time department members, and the position is decided by a majority vote of the TTPAC members. For each department in the College, the Dean and AUH select a tenured department member to serve on the College of Business PAC. Normally this is the chair of the TTPAC and RTAPAC, although the Dean and AUH can select a different department member as needed.

#### **I.A.2. Membership of RTAPAC for evaluation of RTA (Renewable Term Appointment) faculty**

The RTA Personnel Advisory Committee (RTAPAC) will evaluate RTA candidates for promotion in the areas of teaching, scholarship/professional practice, and service. RTAPAC membership will differ from that used for evaluating tenure-track faculty. The RTAPAC shall consist of tenured members of the department and all RTA faculty who are senior lecturers or principal lecturers. Assistant professors who are untenured and lecturers who have not been promoted are not involved in discussions or votes regarding RTA candidates for promotion. The TTPAC chair will also serve as the RTAPAC chair.

### **I.B. Duties**

The chair of the TTPAC and RTAPAC will be responsible for conducting meetings in a professional manner and in such a way as to facilitate wide participation by the members of the TTPAC and RTAPAC in the discussion of issues. Ideally, the chair should be a full professor. The chair must be a full professor during any academic year when there are applications for promotion to full professor. The chair is a voting member of the TTPAC and RTAPAC. Any responsibilities of the chair may be delegated at the discretion of the chair.

#### **I.B.1. TTPAC duties for evaluation of tenure-track faculty**

The TTPAC will conduct a third-year evaluation of all tenure-track faculty in the spring of the faculty member's third year at JMU. The faculty member will submit to the TTPAC (by March 1st of the third year) a report on their scholarship and service activity in addition to copies of course syllabi, examinations, student evaluations, a statement of the faculty member's teaching philosophy, and other materials related to teaching (including any materials requested by the TTPAC). The faculty member's progress toward tenure and promotion with respect to teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service will be evaluated and reported to the faculty member in the form of a letter (by April 15th). A copy of this letter will be placed in the faculty member's permanent file. Details on expectations and indicators of satisfactory progress are described in Section IV below.

The TTPAC will conduct an evaluation of teaching, scholarly achievement & professional qualifications, and service for tenure-track applicants for tenure and promotion. The TTPAC will rate the applicant as being Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory in each of these three areas. Details on criteria for ratings are described in Section II below. A letter explaining the rationale for the TTPAC's ratings will be provided to the applicant, AUH, and Dean according to the procedures and timelines indicated in the Faculty Handbook.

#### **I.B.2. RTAPAC duties for evaluation of RTA faculty**

During an RTA faculty member's third year at JMU, the RTAPAC will provide feedback for RTA faculty development purposes. For these purposes, RTA faculty will submit to the RTAPAC a dossier summarizing their activities and accomplishments in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement & professional qualifications, and service since beginning employment at JMU. This dossier should be submitted to the RTAPAC chair by February 1 and should include a curriculum vitae and supporting documentation as requested by the RTAPAC. The RTAPAC may meet with the AUH to discuss the candidate.

The RTAPAC will conduct an evaluation of teaching, scholarly achievement & professional qualifications, and service for RTA applicants for promotion to senior lecturer or principal lecturer. The RTAPAC will rate the applicant as being Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory in each of these three areas. Details on criteria for ratings are described in Section III below. A letter addressed to the dean of the College of Business, explaining the rationale for the RTAPAC's ratings, will be provided to the dean with copies to the AUH and candidate, according to the procedures and timelines indicated in the Faculty Handbook.

#### **I.B.3. Expectations for members of the TTPAC and RTAPAC and revocation of membership**

Each member of the TTPAC or RTAPAC is responsible for devoting thorough attention to materials that have been submitted for their review. The TTPAC may by majority vote of the committee as a whole remove a member of the TTPAC or a member of the RTAPAC for dereliction of this responsibility or for violation of the rules in this document. Any such action must be approved by the AUH and the dean.

### **I.C. Procedures**

#### **I.C.1. Amendments**

Any proposal to modify this document must be submitted to the full-time departmental faculty. A proposal to amend will be approved when there are affirmative votes from at least a majority of the full-time, tenure-track or tenured members of the department (excluding administrators and persons on leave). Friendly amendments to a written proposal to modify this document may be voted upon at the meeting to consider the proposal. Other amendments will be voted on no sooner than one week later. Absentee votes on written proposals will be accepted and can be emailed to the TTPAC chair prior to the meeting to consider the proposal. Amendment proposals that have been approved by a majority of full-time, tenure-track and tenured members of the department will be sent to the AUH, who can choose to accept the amendment, reject the amendment, or request that the amendment be revised. Any AUH-accepted amendment will then be sent to the Dean who can accept or reject the amendment.

#### **I.C.2. Timelines**

The TTPAC and RTAPAC will follow all timelines indicated by the Faculty Handbook. The standard timeframe for a midpoint review is a faculty member's third year, but if a faculty member has negotiated a different tenure review timeframe, then the midpoint review will be adjusted accordingly. Tenure-track midpoint review packets are due to the TTPAC by March 1 of the midpoint review year, and the TTPAC's tenure-track midpoint review letter will be provided to the faculty member and AUH by April 15. Tenure and promotion applications are due to be submitted by the Faculty Handbook deadline of October 1, and the letters from the TTPAC or RTAPAC concerning a tenure and/or promotion application will be provided to the faculty member, AUH, and Dean by November 15. RTA third-year feedback review packets are due to the RTAPAC by February 1, and the RTAPAC's letter concerning an RTA third-year review will be provided to the faculty member and AUH by April 15.

### **I.C.3. Appeal Body**

The Economics PAC (all members of the TTPAC and the RTAPAC) will be the appeals body for faculty annual evaluations. Any department member who is currently appealing their evaluation will be excluded from the appeal body for their own appeal only. As stated in the faculty handbook, one of the criteria for determining the merit of an appeal is whether the annual evaluation guidelines have been applied uniformly to similarly situated faculty. Therefore, when a faculty member appeals the annual evaluation of their teaching, the appeal body will examine the teaching materials submitted in the annual reports of all full-time instructional faculty and will also examine the teaching evaluations provided by the AUH to all full-time instructional faculty. When a faculty member appeals the annual evaluation of their service, the appeal body will examine the service sections in the annual reports and the AUH annual evaluations of all full-time instructional faculty. When a faculty member appeals the annual evaluation of their scholarly activity, the appeal body will examine the research sections in the annual reports and the AUH annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty if the appeal is submitted by a tenure track faculty member, and the appeal body will examine the research sections and the AUH annual evaluations of all RTA faculty if the appeal is submitted by an RTA faculty member.

The appeal body is bound by confidentiality regarding the annual reports and AUH evaluations used in considering an appeal. Within seven days of receiving written notice of appeal from a faculty member, the appeal body shall review and deliberate over information relevant to the appeal, during which time the faculty member and/or the AUH may be called upon to provide additional information. Within seven days of finalizing a recommendation, the appeal body shall issue a written recommendation with copies to the faculty member, AUH, and dean. Depending on the findings of the appeal body, the appeal body and the AUH will meet to discuss possible modifications to the annual evaluation. If a resolution of the appeal, signed by the faculty member, cannot be achieved within the department, then the matter must be submitted by the faculty member to the dean by October 21. An appeal to the dean must occur by October 21 (Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.4).

### **I.C.4. Relationship between AUH evaluations and evaluations by the TTPAC and RTAPAC**

As described in the Faculty Handbook, the annual evaluation process (conducted by the AUH) is separate and independent from all evaluations by the TTPAC or RTAPAC, including evaluations of applicants for promotion and tenure. A succession of satisfactory or excellent annual evaluations in teaching, scholarship or service is not, in and of itself, conclusive evidence that the faculty member's work is satisfactory or excellent for purposes of application for tenure and/or promotion. However, for all TTPAC and RTAPAC evaluations, the TTPAC/RTAPAC and AUH will engage in mutual exchange of

useful information. The AUH is invited to share input and answer questions, and the AUH is invited to ask for input, for the benefit of each party's independent evaluations. The procedures and criteria for tenure and promotion in the Department of Economics are described in sections II and III below.

#### **I.C.5. Voting Process**

To determine performance levels (Excellent/Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory) for tenure and promotion applications, each TTPAC member or RTAPAC member will cast a confidential paper ballot indicating their own individual rating of the applicant's teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and service. Ballots will be distributed at the meeting where the applicant's record is discussed. Ballots must be turned in to the departmental administrative assistant no later than the date chosen by the TTPAC/RTAPAC chair and announced at the meeting. On the ballot due date, the chair and the departmental administrative assistant will each independently tally the votes. A strict majority of votes for a particular performance level (e.g. Excellent) in a particular area (e.g. Teaching) will determine the TTPAC/RTAPAC rating for the applicant in that area.

#### **I.C.6. Letter to explain evaluations by the TTPAC and RTAPAC**

As indicated by the faculty handbook, the TTPAC and RTAPAC will justify their recommendations in writing. Each such letter will be drafted by the chair (or by the chair and delegated members of the TTPAC or RTAPAC). All members will then be given the chance to provide feedback that the chair may use to revise and write the final letter containing the recommendation.

#### **I.C.7. Informal consultations**

Any department member is welcome to schedule an informal meeting with the TTPAC/RTAPAC chair or with the entire TTPAC or RTAPAC in order to ask questions, solicit guidance, or discuss any matters related to potential promotion applications or other issues.

#### **I.C.8 Third-year reviews of tenure-track faculty**

As stated in the Faculty Handbook, the TTPAC and AUH will independently review the accomplishments of tenure track faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period, typically during the third year of candidacy. The TTPAC and AUH will rate work of the candidate in teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications and service (if part of the candidate's duties). The written evaluation should identify any aspects of the candidate's work in which improvement is needed to be on course to receive tenure and/or promotion. In order to determine whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards a Satisfactory rating in the areas of teaching and service, the TTPAC will evaluate the evidence related to the criteria defined in Section II. In order to determine whether the candidate is making satisfactory progress towards a Satisfactory rating in scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, the TTPAC will examine the publications, working papers and status of papers under review.

#### **I.C.9. Early promotion and early tenure**

Faculty may be considered for early tenure and/or early promotion to Associate Professor or Professor if their performance significantly exceeds normal expectations in all three functional areas of a faculty member's responsibilities. This does not mean that the candidate has to necessarily satisfy the regular requirements for being Excellent in all three areas. Rather, for a tenure application, it means that the

candidate has to exceed normal expectations of Excellent in at least one area, and the candidate has to exceed normal expectations of Satisfactory in two other areas.

## **II. Evaluation criteria for tenure and tenure-track promotion applications**

### **II.A. Evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion applications**

Determination that a candidate for tenure or for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor is either Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, or Excellent, will be made by members of the TTPAC on the basis of their professional judgment. Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes course design and delivery, curriculum development, and interaction with students. Therefore, the evaluation process should be characterized by multiple sources of information and a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching. [Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.2.b(1): Consideration of teaching performance must include, but need not be limited to, the following: self-evaluation, evaluation by peers or AUHs, and student evaluations. Consideration should be given to a faculty member's commitment to student advising and innovations in teaching as evidenced by development of new course work and teaching methodology.] Additional evidence of teaching performance includes (a) syllabi that are thorough, current, and reflective of the latest developments in the field of study, (b) outlines, exams, and other course materials, (c) student evaluations, both written and numerical averages, (c) grade point averages in courses taught, (d) performance of students on departmental or university assessment instruments, if available, (e) data from exit interviews or alumni reports on teaching performance, (f) support for students writing honors theses and independent studies projects.

*Satisfactory Teaching* is defined as effectively performing the following activities:

- Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level
- Stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter
- Being well-prepared for class
- Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures
- Conducting class in a well-organized manner
- Communicating the subject matter clearly
- Maintaining scheduled office hours
- Treating students with courtesy and respect
- Providing career advising to students
- Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards
- Providing timely feedback on progress
- Staying current with the subject matter
- Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum

These activities are essential to good teaching and are, therefore, necessary for an evaluation of Satisfactory in the area of teaching

*Excellent Teaching*: In general, there are multiple paths to teaching excellence. Indicators of excellent teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Fulfilling the requirements for satisfactory teaching performance in an exemplary manner



- Evidence of a strong and sustained commitment to teaching
- Refereed journal publications on teaching methods, pedagogical innovations, course content
- Development of new course or major revisions of existing courses
- Teaching awards
- Outstanding student or peer evaluations
- Supervision of independent studies and honors theses

## **II.B. Evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications for tenure and promotion applications**

### **II.B.1. Journal rankings, categories, and points**

An applicant's quality peer-reviewed publications are assigned points based on the journals in which they are published. The PAC ranks quality peer-reviewed journals into five categories:

- A-1 journals worth 11 points
- A-2 journals worth 7 points
- A-3 journals worth 4 points
- B journals worth 2 points
- C journals worth 1 point

For publications accepted after 5/1/2019, the quality peer-reviewed journals in categories A-1, A-2, and A-3 are based on 8 metrics of research impact. Five of these scores come from RePEc: simple impact factor, recursive impact factor, discounted impact factor, recursive discounted impact factor, and h-index. The remaining three scores come from Scopus: CiteScore, SJR, and SNIP. The lists of journals in categories A-1, A-2, and A-3 can be found in Appendix 1. The algorithm for aggregating these metrics into journal rankings can be found in Appendix 2. The B journal category includes any journal which is EconLit-indexed but is not ranked as A-1, A-2 or A-3. The C journal category includes any quality peer-reviewed journal which is not EconLit-indexed.

During the spring semester of any academic year, the TTPAC may designate a specific number of research points for a specific publication upon request of the author of that publication. If a faculty member has a journal publication that they believe merits more research points than the number that the TTPAC journal ranking list assigns to the journal where that article was published, then the faculty member may submit a written request to the TTPAC. This request is not to be taken lightly and the faculty member must provide documentation to support the request for classification.

If the publication is in a journal not included in the department's 8-score superlist, then the author may submit the 8 scores (from RePEc and Scopus) if those scores are available for that journal. In such a case, the faculty member can request to have their publication ranked in the same way as the journals on the department's 8-score superlist. If the publication is in a journal whose Borda score is in the range of Borda scores for the A-1 journals on the superlist, then that publication will receive 11 points. If the publication is in a journal whose Borda score is in the range of Borda scores for the A-2 journals on the superlist, then that publication will receive 7 points. If the publication is in a journal whose Borda score is in the range of Borda scores for the A-3 journals on the superlist, then that publication will receive 4 points. In cases like these, when the 8 scores are available, then points can be assigned without the TTPAC having to meet and discuss the request.

If the 8 scores (from RePEc and Scopus) are not available for the journal, then a TTPAC meeting, discussion, and vote will be held to evaluate the request. In such a case, the request may contain documentation such as citations of the publication or similar information regarding impact obtained from appropriate sources. In the written request, the faculty member should propose a number of points for their publication, and the TTPAC will either accept or decline the faculty member's proposal based on a majority vote. If the proposal is accepted, then that publication will be awarded the proposed number of research points whenever the faculty member makes their next application for tenure and/or promotion. The TTPAC will provide a written ruling on the article in question, with a copy to the AUH. Written requests should be submitted to the TTPAC chair and the AUH by March 31, and the TTPAC will provide their written ruling no later than May 1. Note that that this is done at the level of the publication and does not impact the standing of the journal in the TTPAC journal ranking list.

## **II.B.2. Sufficient Conditions for Ratings**

Faculty members must meet *College of Business Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications* (Updated February 21, 2024) to be considered for tenure and/or promotion. When a faculty member is listed as a co-author on a publication, it is expected that the faculty member has made a clear and substantial contribution to a paper. Therefore, in their promotion and tenure application, the faculty member should clearly state the contribution that they have made to a paper that has multiple authors.

### *1. Sufficient Conditions for Promotion to Associate Professor or Receipt of Tenure*

Satisfactory: A stock of research consisting of a minimum of 10 research points in total, 80% of which must be articles in quality peer-reviewed journals.

Excellent: a stock of research consisting of a minimum of 20 research points, 80% of which must be articles in quality peer-reviewed journals.

### *2. Sufficient Conditions for Promotion to Professor*

Satisfactory: a stock of research consisting of a minimum of 20 research points, 80% of which must be articles appearing in quality peer-reviewed journals.

Excellent: A stock of research consisting of a minimum of 40 research points, 80% of which must be articles appearing in quality peer-reviewed journals.

### *3. Additional Rules Regarding the Sufficiency Thresholds' Required Points*

- i) Articles in A-ranked journals (A-1, A-2, A-3) must account for at least 30% of the required total points.
- ii) For promotion to Professor, at least 40% of the required total points must have been accepted in the "base period," which is defined as the time since the date of the latest TTPAC letter recommending promotion to Associate Professor.
- iii) A comment or note in a quality peer-reviewed journal will be assigned one-half (1/2) of the points that would be assigned to an article in the same journal. In all periods, publications in journals ranked A or B which are sole authored will have their point values multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

iv) Publications that were accepted after the applicant began employment at JMU must account for at least 50% of the required total points. This means that:

- In order to reach the sufficiency point threshold for Satisfactory research for a tenure application, at least 5 points must be from publications that list the author (candidate) as a JMU faculty member. That is half of the 10 total points to achieve Satisfactory research for a tenure application.
- In order to reach the sufficiency point threshold for Excellent research for a tenure application, at least 10 points must be from publications that list the author (candidate) as a JMU faculty member. That is half of the 20 total points to achieve Excellent research for a tenure application.
- In order to reach the sufficiency point threshold for Satisfactory research for a full professor promotion application, at least 10 points must be from publications that list the author (candidate) as a JMU faculty member. That is half of the 20 total points to achieve Satisfactory research for a full professor promotion application.
- In order to reach the sufficiency point threshold for Excellent research for a full professor promotion application, at least 20 points must be from publications that list the author (candidate) as a JMU faculty member. That is half of the 40 total points to achieve Excellent research for a full professor promotion application.

Furthermore, to reach the sufficiency point threshold for Excellent research for a full professor promotion application, publications in ranked journals (A-1, A-2, or A-3) that were accepted after the applicant began employment at JMU must account for at least 6 points. That is 15% of the 40 total points to achieve Excellent research for a full professor promotion application.

To achieve a particular research rating, it is not required that the candidate reaches the corresponding point threshold. The point thresholds are sufficiency conditions. A candidate is guaranteed to receive an Excellent research rating from the PAC if they reach the Excellent point threshold, but a candidate can make the case that they are Excellent even if their points are less than the threshold. A candidate is guaranteed to receive a Satisfactory research rating from the PAC if they reach the Satisfactory point threshold, but a candidate can make the case that they are Satisfactory even if their points are less than the threshold.

### **II.B.3. Alternate research vehicles**

Monographs, chapters in books, textbooks, published proceedings papers and book reviews are legitimate alternate research vehicles. However, given the differences in goals, audiences, and quality, it is virtually impossible for the department to design a weighting scheme or specify the appropriate rates of substitution between these alternate research vehicles. Historically, scholarship appearing in these outlets have been awarded one point, and sometimes only a fraction of a point, thus it is the responsibility of the candidate to specify the points that he or she believes to be appropriate for an alternate research vehicle and to provide a written justification for that point specification.

### **II.C. Evaluation of service for tenure and tenure-track promotion applications**

Determination that a candidate for tenure or for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor is either Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, or Excellent, will be made by the members of the TTPAC on the basis of their professional judgment. Entering into that judgment should be evidence regarding the quantity and

quality of their service activities for the Department of Economics, the College of Business, James Madison University as a whole, the economics profession as a whole, the academic community as a whole, and the non-academic community at large, both locally and more widely.

The Department of Economics recognizes three levels of service, in order of increasing merit:

a) *Level 3 Service* is defined as participation in department, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or after. All faculty members are expected to participate in a variety of level 3 activities.

Examples of level 3 service include:

- Attending COB Parent's Day Open House, COB Homecoming Open House, COB awards ceremonies, etc.
- Participating in faculty recruiting (meeting with candidates and attending candidate seminars)
- Meeting with potential employers of COB students
- Meeting with prospective students or their parents

b) *Level 2 Service* is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, or the profession that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of a faculty member's service activities will fall into this category. Examples of Level 2 service include:

- Member of department, college, or university committees or of Faculty Senate
- Proceedings editor or program chair for a professional conference
- Active participation in curriculum development or program assessment
- Participation in university-sponsored programs
- Significant work refereeing for professional journals
- Significant service as a discussant at professional conferences

c) *Level 1 Service* is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility, 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the department, college, university, or professional organization, 3) distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed, 4) serving, with distinction, one's profession or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents, 5) making a difference in those areas in which one has chosen to serve, and 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level 1 service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of every indicator of excellent performance. However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an active role. Examples of level 1 service include:

- Major responsibility for a significant curriculum reform
- Speaker of Faculty Senate
- Chair of AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or of a similarly important university committee
- Faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization
- High level office in a prestigious regional, national, or international organization involving a significant time commitment

- Editorial leadership at respected journals (such as editor-in-chief, managing editor, or especially active associate editors / co-editors)
- Program assessment coordinator

### **III. Evaluation criteria for RTA promotions**

Promotion to the rank of senior lecturer is contingent upon substantial professional achievements, evidenced by an appropriate combination of teaching, scholarship/professional practice and service as established by the academic unit. An excellent rating in teaching and at least satisfactory ratings in the other two areas is required for promotion to senior lecturer. In addition to the requirements for senior lecturer, promotion at the rank of principal lecturer is contingent upon recognition of outstanding professional accomplishment, evidenced by an appropriate combination of teaching, scholarship/professional practice and service as established by the academic unit. Excellent ratings in teaching and one other area and at least a satisfactory rating in the third area are required for promotion to principal lecturer.

The Department of Economics values RTA activities that support the goals of the college and university. RTA candidates for promotion must qualify as Scholarly Academic (SA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Practice Academic (PA), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) as defined by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB).

Normally, a faculty member should have completed five years in academic rank before being reviewed for promotion. If a faculty member applies for promotion before completing five years in academic rank, they must present compelling evidence of accomplishment to be awarded early promotion. This means that to receive a rating of Excellent in a particular area, the candidate must significantly exceed the normal expectations of Excellent accomplishment in that area. Similarly, this means that to receive a rating of Satisfactory in a particular area, the candidate must significantly exceed the normal expectations of Satisfactory accomplishment in that area.

There is no requirement for a lecturer to apply for promotion to senior lecturer or principal lecturer. Otherwise, the deadlines for RTA promotion applications are identical to those defined for tenure-track applications described above and indicated by the faculty handbook. The AUH and TTPAC chair should be notified of intent to apply for RTA promotion by September 1, and the candidate's application packet must be made available to the RTAPAC and the AUH by October 1. If a candidate is applying for senior lecturer after five or more years of service at JMU, then they should provide materials from the past five years. If a candidate is applying for senior lecturer early with less than five years of service at JMU, then they should provide materials from the time they started working at JMU. If a candidate is applying for principal lecturer after ten or more years of service at JMU, then they should provide materials from the past ten years. If a candidate is applying for principal lecturer with less than ten years of service at JMU, then they should provide materials from the time they started working at JMU.

#### **III.A. Evaluation of teaching for RTA promotion**

RTA faculty teaching will be evaluated similarly to tenure-track faculty teaching. Determination that a RTA candidate for promotion to senior lecturer or principal lecturer is either Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, or Excellent will be made by members of the RTAPAC on the basis of their professional judgment.

Teaching is a multifaceted activity that includes course design and delivery, curriculum development, and interaction with students. Therefore, the evaluation process should be characterized by multiple sources of information and a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching.

Consideration of teaching performance may include but is not limited to a well-developed teaching philosophy, self-evaluation, evaluations by peers and/or AUHs, and student evaluations of the course content, assignments, learning experiences, and intellectual challenges (i.e., not on the individual style or personality of the instructor). Student evaluations may only be utilized as a formative tool or as part of a teaching portfolio. Consideration may be given to a faculty member's commitment to student advising, student mentoring, innovations in teaching, contributions to departmental curriculum improvement, efforts to improve teaching as evidenced by development of new course work and teaching methodology, and other contributions to student success. Consideration of teaching performance may include artifacts to demonstrate student progress and learning, such as edited papers, student projects, student accomplishments, testimony from students, and course portfolios (e.g., presentation material, assignments, and rubrics). Any such policy shall apply equally to all similarly situated faculty members in the academic unit. Furthermore, student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated.

*Satisfactory Teaching* is defined as effectively performing the following activities:

- Providing instruction at a rigorous and challenging level
- Stimulating learning and interest in the subject matter
- Being well-prepared for class
- Informing students of course objectives, assignments, and examination procedures
- Conducting class in a well-organized manner
- Communicating the subject matter clearly
- Maintaining scheduled office hours
- Treating students with courtesy and respect
- Providing career advising to students
- Maintaining fair and impartial grading standards
- Providing timely feedback on progress
- Staying current with the subject matter
- Participating in program activities to assess and update the curriculum

These activities are essential to good teaching and are, therefore, necessary for an evaluation of Satisfactory in the area of teaching

*Excellent Teaching*: In general, there are multiple paths to teaching excellence. Indicators of excellent teaching include, but are not limited to:

- Fulfilling the requirements for satisfactory teaching performance in an exemplary manner
- Evidence of a strong and sustained commitment to teaching
- Publications in refereed journals relating to teaching methods, pedagogical innovations, and course content
- Development of new course or major revisions of existing courses

- Teaching awards
- Outstanding student or peer evaluations
- Supervision of independent studies and honors theses

### **III.B. Evaluation of scholarly achievement and professional qualifications for RTA promotion**

#### *1. Promotion to Senior Lecturer*

Satisfactory: Scholarship/Professional Practice must satisfy the Scholarly Academic (SA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Practice Academic (PA), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) criteria as defined by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB).

Excellent: Scholarship/Professional Practice must exceed the Scholarly Academic (SA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Practice Academic (PA), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) criteria as defined by the AACSB.

#### *2. Promotion to Principal Lecturer*

Satisfactory: Scholarship/Professional Practice must satisfy the Scholarly Academic (SA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), Practice Academic (PA), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) criteria as defined by the AACSB.

Excellent: Scholarship/Professional Practice must significantly exceed the Scholarly Academic (SA), Scholarly Practitioner (SP), or Instructional Practitioner (IP) criteria as defined by the AACSB.

### **III.C. Evaluation of service for RTA promotion**

Determination that a RTA candidate for promotion to Senior Lecturer or Principal Lecturer is either Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, or Excellent will be made by the members of the RTAPAC on the basis of their professional judgment. Entering into that judgment should be evidence regarding the quantity and quality of their service activities for the Department of Economics, the College of Business, James Madison University as a whole, the economics profession as a whole, the academic community as a whole, and the non-academic community at large, both locally and more widely.

The Department of Economics recognizes three levels of service, in order of increasing merit:

- Level 3 Service* is defined as participation in department, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or after. All faculty members are expected to participate in a variety of level 3 activities.
- Level 2 Service* is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, or the profession that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of a faculty member's service activities will fall into this category.
- Level 1 Service* is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level 1 service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility, 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the department, college, university, or professional organization, 3) distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed, 4) serving, with distinction, one's profession or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional

knowledge, skills, and talents, 5) making a difference in those areas in which one has chosen to serve, and 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude towards service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level 1 service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of every indicator of excellent performance. However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an active role.

#### **IV. Annual Evaluation Guidelines**

##### **IV.A. Annual Evaluation Overview Including Relationship to Tenure and Promotion**

The University recognizes three areas of professional contribution: teaching, scholarly achievement and professional qualifications, and professional service. All full-time instructional faculty members at James Madison University are subject to an annual evaluation by the AUH of their performance in each of these three areas. The purpose of this annual evaluation is to promote professionalism, to encourage performance at the highest levels, and to indicate areas in which improvement is needed. Evaluations are also used in making personnel decisions, including allocation of merit pay increases, continuation of employment, and initiation of post-tenure review. Annual evaluations by the AUH will be conducted after the conclusion of each academic year. The procedures and criteria for annual evaluations should be applied equally to all similarly situated faculty members in the academic unit. The Department of Economics values activities that support the goals of the college and university.

The annual evaluation process is separate from the promotion and tenure evaluation process. A succession of satisfactory or excellent annual evaluations in teaching, scholarship, or service is not, in and of itself, conclusive evidence that the faculty member's work is satisfactory or excellent for purposes of tenure or promotion.

##### **IV.B. Annual Evaluation Procedures Including Appeals**

The annual evaluation must consider the performance of the faculty member both within and outside of the academic unit in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement & professional qualifications, and service. Additionally, any aspects of a faculty member's conduct that impacts performance, positive or negative, should be addressed in these evaluations. The AUH will solicit input from appropriate individuals outside of the academic unit when the faculty member has assignments outside of the academic unit. The AUH may solicit information from the TTPAC and RTAPAC.

If an instructional faculty member's primary assignment is outside of the academic unit (e.g., in a center, institute, or administrative department), the person who performs the annual evaluation must be the supervisor of the primary assignment, with input from any AUH where the faculty member teaches or has other responsibilities.

A faculty member's teaching, research, or service will each be rated as unsatisfactory, satisfactory, strong satisfactory, excellent or strong excellent by the AUH based on the AUH's professional judgment and the criteria below. In addition to an evaluation in each of the three areas of performance, the faculty member's overall performance must be evaluated, through a weighted average score of the three performance areas, with relative weights determined by a faculty member and the AUH prior to the start of the academic year.



The following scale is used by the AUH for numerical ratings in each of the three performance categories.

- |   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| 0 | Unsatisfactory      |
| 1 | Satisfactory        |
| 2 | Strong Satisfactory |
| 3 | Excellent           |
| 4 | Strong Excellent    |

Faculty will be assigned whole number ratings (no decimal point gradations).

#### **IV.B.1. Faculty Anticipated Activity Plan**

By June 1 (which is the same deadline for submitting faculty member annual reports to the AUH), each faculty member must submit a description of anticipated activities for the coming year to the AUH. The relative weights of the three performance areas of teaching, scholarly achievement & professional qualifications, and professional service for an individual faculty member must be determined by the faculty member and the AUH prior to the start of the academic year. The relative weights remain unchanged unless the faculty member and AUH have agreed to change them. If the faculty member and AUH have agreed to change the relative weights, then the agreement should be shared with the TTPAC or RTAPAC. The agreement on weights may be renegotiated during the year under appropriate circumstances.

#### **IV.B.2. Summary of Activities**

By June 1, each faculty member must submit a summary of activities and accomplishments during the previous 12 months in the areas of teaching, scholarly achievement & professional qualifications, and professional service to the AUH for review and evaluation purposes. The AUH will determine the format for submission of evaluation materials. Specifically, each faculty member is responsible for submitting:

- Annual written self-assessment.
- Teaching dossier for each separate course taught in the year. The dossier should include the syllabus, all tests and assignments, and the final exam/project and any additional materials that demonstrate the content, organization, and rigor of the course.
- Student evaluations for all courses taught from June 1 of the previous year to May 31 of the current year.

Faculty may also provide additional supporting evidence relevant to their self-assessment. Examples of this include, but are not limited to:

- Feedback from peer classroom visitations.
- Links to Canvas course webpages.
- Other relevant evidence that supports the dimensions of teaching listed above.

For the responsibilities of faculty members returning from educational leave, see Faculty Handbook, Section III.J.1.a.

#### **IV.B.3. Preliminary Evaluation**

A preliminary written evaluation is to be given to each faculty member by the AUH prior to the regular annual evaluation conference. The preliminary evaluation must be given to the faculty member at least one day prior to the scheduled conference.

#### **IV.B.4. Conference**

The evaluation conference must provide an opportunity to discuss the faculty member's performance, professional contributions, and needs as perceived by both the faculty member and the AUH. The conference may be cancelled by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the AUH, if both agree on the terms of the preliminary evaluation. The official written evaluation must not be finalized until after the evaluation conference, unless the faculty member and AUH determine that no conference is required. The AUH must provide the official written evaluation to the faculty member by Oct. 1. Any failure to meet this deadline will extend the appeal process by the number of days the written evaluation is late.

#### **IV.B.5. Appeal**

Before the AUH submits the official written evaluation to the dean, there must be an opportunity for the faculty member to review and appeal the evaluation to the appeal body described above in I.C.3. The faculty member has a maximum of seven days following the receipt of the official written evaluation to make the appeal in writing. Failure to file a timely written appeal will result in the evaluation being sent forward to the dean, and no further appeal rights are available. In considering an appeal, the crucial questions for the reviewing body are whether all relevant information was objectively reviewed by the AUH in accordance with evaluation criteria established by the academic unit and whether the AUH evaluated similar achievements among similarly situated academic unit members using the same standard of judgment.

The recommendations of the reviewing body will be given to the AUH, with a copy to the faculty member and the dean. The reviewing body may recommend that the AUH's evaluation be upheld or modified. If the AUH agrees with the recommendations of the reviewing body, they will take the appropriate action and either confirm or modify their original evaluation. The AUH will notify the reviewing body, the faculty member, and the dean of their decision. The appeal process in the academic unit must be completed by Oct. 21.

#### **IV.B.6. Final Evaluation**

The faculty member and the AUH must sign the final evaluation, and the AUH will send a copy of it to the dean by Oct. 28. If the faculty member does not sign the final evaluation, the AUH will forward it to the dean with a notation that the faculty member declined or failed to sign. If the AUH's evaluation is not modified as recommended by the reviewing body, the dean will review the AUH's evaluation and the reviewing body's recommendations to determine whether the AUH's evaluation will be upheld or modified. The dean is not bound by the reviewing body's recommendations and may take any action on

the evaluation they deem appropriate. The decision of the dean on the evaluation is final and is not subject to appeal.

#### **IV.B.7. Unsatisfactory Evaluation of Tenured Faculty**

In those cases in which a tenured faculty member's overall annual performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory, the faculty member may appeal the evaluation to the dean within five days, by providing a written document outlining the reasons for the overall evaluation to be modified. The dean may either uphold the overall evaluation or modify it. The decision of the dean is final, and may not be appealed. If the faculty member does not appeal the overall unsatisfactory evaluation, or if the dean upholds the overall unsatisfactory evaluation, the AUH must inform the TTPAC and, in consultation with the faculty member, must immediately design a professional development plan. The university will provide funding for a focused program of activities designed to improve performance agreed upon by the AUH and the faculty member. However, if the faculty member does not agree to the program chosen by the AUH, they will receive no financial support from the university to improve their performance, but the faculty member will still have the responsibility to bring their performance up to acceptable levels in the next annual performance appraisal. While scheduling flexibility is appropriate, the development plan will be initiated at the earliest opportunity to effect positive change in the next annual performance appraisal. For details on post-tenure review, see Faculty Handbook, Section III.E.8.

#### **IV.B.8. Retention of Annual Evaluations**

The department will retain copies of all faculty annual evaluations from the previous five years. In those cases in which a faculty member's overall annual performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory, the academic unit will retain, for at least two years, copies of the materials considered in conducting the annual evaluation.

#### **IV.B.9. Initial Evaluation**

An initial evaluation shall be conducted at the beginning of the faculty member's second full semester of full-time employment at JMU by the AUH. In the initial evaluation, the AUH will provide the faculty member with information concerning *College of Business Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications*. Unacceptable performance as determined in the initial evaluation will normally result in nonrenewal of an appointment of an untenured first-year faculty member. The AUPAC review of the faculty member's performance is required as specified in Faculty Handbook, Section III.F.3 if the AUH finds that the faculty member's performance is unacceptable.

#### **IV.B.10. Merit Pay**

Merit-based salary increases are to be based on the annual evaluations spanning the last three years or the period since the last merit raises were granted, whichever is longer. Faculty members are evaluated based on their respective assignment weights, the annual rating as Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory, and the materials submitted and used each annual period to assign such rating. The AUH will assign points based on materials submitted and used in annual evaluations according to this point system: 3 or 4 points for Excellent, 1 or 2 points for Satisfactory, and 0 points for Unsatisfactory. Once points are assigned for each annual period, these points are weighted by the annual period's assignment weights. This is repeated for each year since the last merit raise to arrive at the weighted

average points for the year. The weighted average for each year is then averaged across the relevant years to produce a final average score. Once the final cumulative score is calculated for each faculty member, more merit pay will be distributed to higher ranking faculty according to the faculty average rank score as determined by the AUH. Appeals of merit-based salary increases shall follow the same procedure as annual evaluation appeals.

#### **IV.C. Annual Evaluation Criteria**

##### **IV.C.1. Teaching (Tenure-track, tenured, and RTA faculty)**

When evaluating a faculty member's performance in teaching, the AUH considers the entire portfolio of a faculty member's teaching activities. Teaching is a multifaceted activity including, among other factors, course design and delivery, curriculum development, currency in the subject matter taught, and interaction with students. The annual evaluation is to consider as many criteria and sources of information as practical and is to take a broad view of the activities that constitute effective teaching. Evaluation of teaching will generally be based on the current year's performance; however, in cases such as the development of a new course where the effort is over multiple years, such activity may be considered in multiple evaluation periods.

##### **IV.C.1.a. Categories of Teaching Evaluation**

**Unsatisfactory Teaching (rating of 0)** – consists of any combination of teaching activities that do not meet the standards for satisfactory or excellent teaching delineated below. There must be clear and substantial evidence that these standards are not being met.

**Satisfactory (rating of 1)** – Satisfactory teaching is defined as effectively meeting the following standards:

- Course syllabi meet University standards for clearly stating learning objectives, course requirements, content and course policies, and demonstrates appropriate rigor and coverage of topics for the given course.
- Course material reflects that the faculty is teaching topics that align with the updates in that field of inquiry and also match course catalog description.
- Assignments, exams, and other assessments show appropriate rigor for the level of the course.
- Assignments, exams, and other assessments are appropriate for the class size. Courses 300-level or above should not completely rely on multiple choice exams.
- Course is well organized; the faculty member provides timely communication and feedback to students and the faculty member maintains scheduled office hours.

**Strong Satisfactory (rating of 2)** A rating of strong satisfactory in teaching requires that the faculty member has met the conditions for satisfactory. In addition, a strong satisfactory may include, but is not limited to, the following dimensions:

- Syllabi, course material and assignments reflect strong commitment toward teaching. Exams and assignments are rigorous and reflect substantial input from the faculty member.
- Lecture materials are carefully curated by the instructor. These materials may be in addition to publisher provided content, are appropriate for the course, and are designed to enhance student learning.

- Revisions to course materials that keep the content current such as updated examples, data, exam questions, or readings.
- Writing recommendation letters for students.

To be considered for a rating of satisfactory or strong satisfactory in the area of teaching, it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide evidence (i.e., supporting documentation) demonstrating how the faculty member has provided satisfactory or strong satisfactory teaching, as defined above.

### **Excellent (rating of 3)**

A rating of excellent in teaching necessarily requires that the faculty member has met the conditions for strong satisfactory. Going beyond Strong Satisfactory to achieve an Excellent rating requires a subset of at least two examples of additional effort that include but are not limited to the following:

- Development of courses new to the catalog (during past 3 years)
- Major revisions of existing courses
- Thoughtful pedagogic experimentation in order to increase classroom effectiveness
- Provision of ample learning opportunities outside the classroom such as practice problems or quizzes, extra office hours, review sessions
- Exams and assignments that are thoughtfully constructed to provide accurate assessments of student learning; feedback to students is substantial.
- Strong enthusiasm in the classroom
- Outstanding student evaluations (see additional considerations below)
- Supervision of independent studies and honors theses
- Coordination of curriculum coverage with other economics and/or non-economics courses so as to enhance the integration of student learning within the major and across disciplines.
- Nominations for teaching awards

### **Strong Excellent (rating of 4)**

A rating of strong excellence in teaching necessarily requires that the faculty member has met the conditions for excellent in teaching (3). Going beyond Excellent to achieve a Strong Excellent rating requires additional effort that includes but is not limited to any of the following:

- Teaching awards, internal or external to JMU (during past 3 years)
- Contributions to teaching practices and methods through published work (during past 3 years)
- Teaching-focused presentations at conferences
- Forms of student membership that go beyond what is considered normal by department standards. This may include, for example, student research facilitation through co-authorships or opportunities to present at regional or national academic conferences.

In order to be considered for an excellent or strong excellent rating in teaching, the faculty member must provide evidence (i.e., supporting documentation) demonstrating how the faculty

member has gone above and beyond departmental expectations for a strong satisfactory rating and demonstrated excellence or strong excellence, as defined above.

#### **IV.C.1.b. Additional Considerations**

- The AUH is expected to examine all submitted materials as listed above.
- The AUH shall not consider grade distributions to assess the quality of teaching.
- The AUH shall not consider the speed at which a course populates at registration as an indicator of teaching effectiveness. Early morning and evening classes are less desirable for the average student.
- Teaching performance in a course can be impacted by class size, course requirements, time of day, and the abilities and motivations of students. Faculty have little control over these factors. Thus, caution must be taken when comparing teaching performance across faculty.
- The AUH has access to student evaluations and shall review both the written and numerical evaluations in full. These evaluations must be interpreted with necessary caution and the awareness of inherent biases. Numerical averages and response rates provide information that can inform the AUH and the instructor of strengths and weaknesses. However, these evaluations are known to show biases based on instructor characteristics of gender and race, class time of day, class size, core course vs elective course, response rates, among other factors. Furthermore, an undue emphasis on student evaluations creates an incentive for faculty to “teach to the evaluation” as well as to inflate grades. For these reasons, the AUH shall not use numerical thresholds to delineate excellent, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory teaching. As stated in the JMU faculty Handbook, “student evaluation scores may not be the primary method by which teaching performance is evaluated.”
- Student evaluations may be considered “outstanding” only after taking into consideration the limitations listed above.

#### **IV.C.2. Scholarly Achievement & Professional Qualifications (Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty)**

When evaluating tenure-track faculty member’s performance in this area, the AUH considers the entire portfolio of a faculty member’s scholarly activities. The following elements will be taken into consideration when evaluating a tenure-track or tenured faculty member’s performance in the area of scholarship.

The annual evaluation of scholarship will consider the faculty member’s work for the year ended and the previous two years. The sufficient conditions listed below provide one avenue to a particular rating, but a faculty member can achieve a particular rating with different combinations of publication and other ongoing scholarly effort. Examples of this effort include, but are not limited to, unpublished manuscripts, working papers, referee activity, serving as an editor, serving as a discussant, short notes, encyclopedia entries, book chapters, conference presentations, external seminar presentations, internal seminar presentations, external/internal grant receipt, publication in a trade journal, monograph, or business case study.

Reasonable progress must be made on a manuscript from year to year to continue to receive credit for the same project. The same type of activity can count as two instances of ongoing effort, such as presenting at two conferences or writing drafts for two working papers. Writing referee reports and serving as an editor appear under the evaluation criteria for both research and service. A faculty member may choose which category each activity will count toward in a given evaluation year but cannot use the same act of refereeing or editing in different categories in different evaluation years.

Faculty members will be rated on a scale from 0-4, where “0” is unsatisfactory, “1” is satisfactory, “2” is strong satisfactory, “3” is excellent, and “4” is strong excellent. For all faculty that have been at James Madison University for at least three years, the above ratings will be assigned according to the following criteria:

- o 0, unsatisfactory: the faculty member does not meet AACSB qualifications (as defined in the *College of Business Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications*) for three consecutive years and conducts no scholarly activity in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 1, satisfactory:
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND displays at least two activities indicative of scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 2, strong satisfactory:
  - Necessary condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window.
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window AND has at least five publication points in the three-year evaluation window AND displays at least three activities indicative of ongoing scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window. Note: for this sufficient condition and all others that follow, the publications that are used to meet AACSB qualifications count toward the point total if they are within the three-year window. Note: throughout this document, publication points are defined in the same way as in the Economic Department’s tenure and promotion criteria.
- o 3, excellent:
  - Necessary condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years.
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window AND has at least seven publication points in the three-year evaluation window (a non-zero number of these points must come from A-level journals) AND displays at least three activities indicative of ongoing scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 4, strong excellent:
  - Necessary condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years.

- Sufficient conditions: the faculty member
  - The faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window.
  - AND has at least ten publication points in the three-year evaluation window (a non-zero number of these points must come from A1 or A2 journals)
  - AND Displays at least three activities indicative of ongoing scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window.

For faculty members with less than three years of experience at James Madison University, the following modifications are made to the 0-4 rating system above.

- o 0, unsatisfactory: no change
- o 1, satisfactory:
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of their time at James Madison University AND displays at least one activity indicative of scholarly effort.
- o 2, strong satisfactory:
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of their time at James Madison University AND has at least five publication points in the three-year evaluation window AND displays at least two activities indicative of ongoing scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 3, excellent:
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of their time at James Madison University AND has at least seven publication points in the three-year evaluation window (a non-zero number of these points must come from A-level journals) AND displays at least three activities indicative of ongoing scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 4, strong excellent:
  - Sufficient conditions: the faculty member
    - The faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of their time at James Madison University.
    - AND has at least ten publication points in the three-year evaluation window (a non-zero number of these points must come from A1 or A2 journals)
    - AND Displays at least three activities indicative of ongoing scholarly effort in the three-year evaluation window.

#### **IV.C.3. Scholarly Achievement & Professional Qualifications (RTA Faculty)**

When evaluating an RTA faculty member's performance in this area, the AUH considers the entire portfolio of a faculty member's scholarly activities. For RTA faculty members, the following modifications are made to the 0-4 rating system above. Like with tenure track faculty, the sufficient conditions listed below provide one path to earning a particular rating, but a faculty member can achieve that rating with different combinations of publications, other ongoing scholarly activity, and



alternative activities relevant to their AACSB classification. Other ongoing scholarly activity and alternative activities may include but are not limited to a referee report, a conference or seminar presentation, discussant at a conference, a book review, ancillary work for textbooks, reviewing textbooks, a case study, a non-peer-reviewed article, or monograph published on JMU Scholarly Commons, and taking a course related to one's field.

- o 0, unsatisfactory: The faculty member does not meet AACSB qualifications for three consecutive years and conducts neither scholarly activity nor any alternative activities relevant to their AACSB classification.
- o 1, satisfactory:
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years OR shows significant progress toward meeting AACSB standards by actively pursuing publication in peer-reviewed journals OR engages in a scholarly or alternative activity that aligns with their AACSB classification within the three-year evaluation window.
- o 2, strong satisfactory:
  - Necessary condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window.
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND has at least one C-level journal article (or any peer reviewed journal article) accepted for publication in the three-year evaluation window.
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND displays at least one ongoing scholarly activity OR completes alternative activity relevant to their AACSB classification in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 3, excellent:
  - Necessary condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window.
  - ii. Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND has one B-level journal article (or any peer reviewed journal article) accepted for publication in the three-year evaluation window.
  - iii. Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND has one C-level journal article (or any peer reviewed journal article) accepted for publication AND and displays at least one scholarly activity OR completes alternative activity relevant to their AACSB classification in the three-year evaluation window.
- o 4, strong excellent:
  - Necessary condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years in the three-year evaluation window.
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND one A-level article (or comparable peer reviewed article) in the three-year evaluation window
  - Sufficient condition: the faculty member meets AACSB qualifications for some portion of the previous three years AND one B-level journal article (or comparable peer reviewed article) AND displays at least one ongoing scholarly activity OR completes alternative activity relevant to their AACSB classification in the three-year evaluation window.

#### **IV.C.4. Service Activities (Tenure-Track, Tenured and RTA Faculty)**

Although service might carry less weight than either research or teaching, it is nevertheless an important aspect of a faculty member's duties. The AUH will evaluate service by considering the quality and quantity of a faculty member's service activities for the Department of Economics, the College of Business, and James Madison University. In addition, service activities for the economics profession as a whole, the academic community as a whole, and the non-academic community at large, both locally and more widely should also be considered. The annual evaluation of service will consider the faculty member's service for the past academic year. If the service activity is over multiple years, such activity may be considered in multiple evaluation periods. Non-tenured, tenure track faculty are to be assigned a lower service load. Writing referee reports, discussing a paper at a conference, and serving as an editor appear under the evaluation criteria for both research and service. A faculty member may choose which category each activity will count toward in a given evaluation year but cannot use the same act of refereeing or editing in different categories in different evaluation years.

The Department of Economics recognizes three levels of service, in order of decreasing merit.

*Level A Service* is defined primarily as activities that involve a very significant time commitment. Secondary indicators of Level A service are 1) a high level of personal responsibility, 2) involvement in activities that are critical to the mission of the department, college, university, or professional organization, 3) distinguishing oneself in a leadership role, whether elected or appointed, 4) serving, with distinction, one's profession or the external community in a role that exploits one's professional knowledge, skills, and talents, 5) making a difference in those areas in which one has chosen to serve, and 6) being widely recognized as one who has an exemplary attitude toward service commitments and who serves as a role model for other faculty. Level A service should not be interpreted as requiring the presence of every indicator of excellent performance. However, in all cases there should be evidence of a substantial contribution and an active role. Department, college, and university service are weighted equally. Examples of Level A service include, but are not limited to:

- Chair of search committee
- Major responsibility for a significant curriculum reform
- Speaker of Faculty Senate
- Chair of AACSB or SACS re-accreditation efforts or of a similarly important university committee
- Faculty advisor to an active, successful student organization
- High-level office in a prestigious regional, national, or international organization involving a significant time
- Editorial leadership (such as editor-in-chief, managing editor, associate editor, or co-editor)
- Program assessment coordinator
- PAC Chair
- Study abroad program director

- Teaching an overload course in cases where a faculty member unexpectedly goes on leave or resigns

*Level B Service* is defined as important activities in support of one's program, the college, the university, or the profession that involve a moderate to significant time commitment. It is anticipated that the bulk of a faculty member's service activities will fall into this category. Department, college, and university service are weighted equally. Examples of Level B service include, but are not limited to:

- Member of department, college, or university committees: (IRB, C&I, COB and departmental scholarships etc.)
- Member of search committee
- Member of Faculty Senate
- Coordinator of macro workshop
- Coordinator of micro workshop
- Coordinator of seminar series
- Proceedings editor or program chair/organizer for a professional conference
- Discussing a paper at a conference
- Writing a referee report
- Active participation in curriculum development or program assessment
- Participation in university-sponsored programs.

*Level C Service* is defined as participation in department, college, and university events for which faculty visibility is important. Generally, such participation does not require additional efforts either before or after. All faculty members are expected to participate in a variety of Level C activities. Examples of Level C service include, but are not limited to:

- Attending faculty meetings and job candidate presentations
- Meeting with job candidates
- Attending College of Business events, such as open houses, award ceremonies etc.
- Meeting with potential employers of COB students
- Meeting with prospective COB students and/or their parents
- Attending university sponsored events (such as opening convocation and commencement)

#### Evaluation Criteria

When evaluating a tenure-track, tenured, or RTA faculty member's performance in the service area, the AUH considers the entire portfolio of a faculty member's service activities. Within each level of service, the AUH will evaluate department, college, and university activities, considering the time spent, the outcomes, and the importance of the activity to the department, college, university, and profession. For service activities not listed above, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to demonstrate

whether these activities are Level A, B or C in their annual report. The faculty member will have the responsibility to make an argument regarding the level of their service. If the AUH disagrees with the faculty member's judgment, then the faculty member can discuss with the AUH during the preliminary evaluation conference. Service for which a faculty member receives an extra stipend may be partially discounted.

In general, excellent service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming "significantly more than one's fair share" (relative to others in the Economics department) of service activities that support the mission of the Economics department, the COB, and the university, and that significantly contribute to one's profession and/or external community.

In general, satisfactory service is defined as professionally, effectively, and reliably assuming "one's fair share" of service activities that support the mission of the Economics department, the COB, and the university, and that significantly contribute to one's profession and/or external community. Satisfactory service is participation in activities that are basic to the responsibilities of a faculty member.

#### 0 - Unsatisfactory

Unsatisfactory service evaluation requires a faculty member failing to perform a reasonable amount of assigned service activity. This does not include voluntary or nomination-based service roles that may arise during the academic year.

#### 1 - Satisfactory

To receive a satisfactory rating the faculty member has fulfilled their duties assigned by the AUH at the start of the year, and participated in at least two service activities from any level of service.

#### 2 – Strong Satisfactory

To receive a satisfactory rating the faculty member has met the criterion for a satisfactory rating, and participated in at least one Level B service activity.

#### 3 - Excellent

To receive an excellent rating the faculty member has met the criterion for a strong satisfactory rating, and participated in one Level A service activity **or** a number of Level B service activities amounting to a significant time commitment.

#### 4. Strong Excellent

To receive a strong excellent rating the faculty member has met the criterion for a strong satisfactory rating and participated in at least two Level A service activities **or** at least one Level A service **and** a number of Level B service activities amounting to a significant time commitment.

## **V. College of Business Guidelines for Faculty Qualifications**

The COB policies concerning faculty qualifications (Scholarly Academic, Practice Academic, Scholarly Practitioner, and Instructional Practitioner status) are available from the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs of the College of Business or at <https://www.jmu.edu/cob/faculty-staff-resources.shtml>.

### **APPENDIX 1:**

Journal Categories for Publications

#### **A-1 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/1995 and 7/1/2006**

American Economic Review  
Economic Journal  
Econometrica  
International Economic Review  
Journal of Economic Literature  
Journal of Economic Theory  
Journal of Finance  
Journal of Financial Economics  
Journal of Monetary Economics  
Journal of Political Economy  
Quarterly Journal of Economics  
Rand Journal of Economics  
Review of Economics and Statistics  
Review of Economic Studies

#### **A-2 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/1995 and 7/1/2006**

Brookings Papers on Economic Activity  
Canadian Journal of Economics  
Economic Inquiry  
Economics Letters  
Economica  
Economic Record  
International Journal of Industrial Organization  
Industrial and Labor Relations Review  
Journal of Accounting Research  
Journal of Banking and Finance  
Journal of Business  
Journal of the American Statistical Association  
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics

Journal of Econometrics  
Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control  
Journal of Economic Education  
Journal of Economic History  
Journal of Economic Perspectives  
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis  
Journal of Human Resources  
Journal of Industrial Economics  
Journal of International Economics  
Journal of Labor Economics  
Journal of Law and Economics  
Journal of Legal Studies  
Journal of Mathematical Economics  
Journal of Money Credit and Banking  
Journal of Public Economics  
Journal of Regional Science  
Journal of Urban Economics  
Kyklos  
Land Economics  
Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies  
National Tax Journal  
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics  
Oxford Economic Papers  
Public Choice  
Public Finance  
Scandinavian Journal of Economics  
Social Choice and Welfare  
Southern Economic Journal  
Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv

**A-3 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/1995 and 7/1/2006**

American Journal of Agricultural Economics  
American Journal of Economics and Sociology  
Applied Economics  
British Journal of Industrial Relations  
Cambridge Journal of Economics  
Carnegie-Rochester Series on Public Policy  
Cato Journal  
Demography  
Eastern Economic Journal  
Econometric Theory  
Economic Development and Cultural Change  
Economic Geography  
Economic History Review

Economic Record  
European Economic Review  
Explorations in Economic History  
History of Political Economy  
Industrial Relations Inquiry  
International Monetary Fund Staff Papers  
Journal of Comparative Economics  
Journal of Consumer Research  
Journal of Developing Areas  
Journal of Development Economics  
Journal of Development Studies  
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization  
Regional Science and Urban Economics  
Journal of Economic Issues  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management  
Journal of Financial Research  
Journal of Forecasting  
Journal of Health Economics  
Journal of International Business Studies  
Journal of International Money and Finance  
Journal of Labor Research  
Journal of Macroeconomics  
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics  
Journal of Risk and Insurance  
Journal of Royal Statistical Society Association A & B  
Monthly Labor Review  
Population and Development Review  
Public Finance Quarterly  
Quarterly Review of Economics and Business  
Review of Income and Wealth  
Review of Social Economy  
Science and Society  
Scottish Journal of Political Economy  
Sloan Management Review  
Urban Studies  
World Economy  
Yale Law Journal

**A-1 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/2006 and 7/1/2014**

American Economic Review  
Econometrica  
Economic Journal  
International Economic Review

Journal of Econometrics  
Journal of Economic Literature  
Journal of Economic Perspectives  
Journal of Economic Theory  
Journal of Financial Economics  
Journal of Monetary Economics  
Journal of Political Economy  
Quarterly Journal of Economics  
RAND Journal of Economics  
Review of Economics and Statistics  
Review of Economic Studies

**A-2 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/2006 and 7/1/2014**

Brookings Papers on Economic Activity  
Canadian Journal of Economics  
Econometric Theory  
Economic Inquiry  
Economic Theory  
Economica  
Economics Letters  
European Economic Review  
Games and Economic Behavior  
International Journal of Industrial Organization  
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics  
Journal of Development Economics  
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization  
Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control  
Journal of Economic Education Journal of  
Economic Growth  
Journal of Economic History  
Journal of Finance  
Journal of Human Resources  
Journal of Industrial Economics  
Journal of International Economics  
Journal of International Money and Finance  
Journal of Labor Economics  
Journal of Law and Economics  
Journal of Mathematical Economics  
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking  
Journal of Public Economics  
Journal of Urban Economics  
Land Economics  
Macroeconomic Dynamics  
National Tax Journal



NBER Macroeconomics Annual  
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics  
Oxford Economic Papers  
Public Choice  
Review of Economic Dynamics  
Review of Financial Studies  
Scandinavian Journal of Economics  
Social Choice and Welfare  
Southern Economic Journal  
Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv

**A-3 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/2006 and 7/1/2014**

American Journal of Agricultural Economics  
American Journal of Economics and Sociology  
Applied Economics  
British Journal of Industrial Relations  
Cambridge Journal of Economics  
Cato Journal  
Eastern Economic Journal  
Ecological Economics  
Economic Development and Cultural Change  
Economic Geography  
Economic History Review  
Economic Policy  
Economic Record  
Economics of Education Review  
Environmental and Resource Economics  
Explorations in Economic History  
Health Economics  
History of Political Economy Industrial and Labor Relations Review  
Industrial Relations Inquiry  
International Journal of Game Theory  
International Monetary Fund Staff Papers  
International Tax and Public Finance  
Journal of Accounting and Economics  
Journal of Banking and Finance  
Journal of Business  
Journal of Comparative Economics  
Journal of Development Studies  
Journal of Economic Issues  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Economics and Management Strategy  
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management

Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis  
Journal of Forecasting  
Journal of Health Economics  
Journal of Japanese and International Economics  
Journal of Labor Research  
Journal of Macroeconomics  
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management  
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics  
Journal of Regional Science  
Journal of Risk and Uncertainty  
Journal of the American Statistical Association  
Kyklos  
Labour Economics  
Manchester School  
Monthly Labor Review  
Oxford Review of Economic Policy  
Population and Development Review  
Public Finance Quarterly  
Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance  
Regional Science and Urban Economics  
Review of Income and Wealth  
Review of Industrial Organization  
Review of Social Economy  
Science and Society  
Scottish Journal of Political Economy  
World Bank Economic Review  
World Development  
World Economy

**A-1 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/2014 and 5/1/2019**

American Economic Review  
Econometrica  
International Economic Review  
Journal of Econometrics  
Journal of Economic Theory  
Journal of Finance  
Journal of Financial Economics  
Journal of Monetary Economics  
Journal of Political Economy  
Quarterly Journal of Economics  
Rand Journal of Economics  
Review of Economic Studies  
Review of Economics and Statistics  
The Economic Journal

**A-2 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/2014 and 5/1/2019**

Brookings Papers on Economic Activity  
Canadian Journal of Economics  
Econometric Theory  
Economic Inquiry  
Economics Letters  
Economic Theory  
European Economic Review  
Games and Economic Behavior  
Health Economics  
International Journal of Industrial Organization  
Journal of Accounting and Economics  
Journal of Applied Econometrics  
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics  
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization  
Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control  
Journal of Economic Growth  
Journal of Economic History  
Journal of Economic Literature  
Journal of Economic Perspectives  
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management  
Journal of Human Resources  
Journal of Industrial Economics  
Journal of International Economics  
Journal of International Money and Finance  
Journal of Labor Economics  
Journal of Law and Economics  
Journal of Mathematical Economics  
Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking  
Journal of Public Economics  
Journal of Urban Economics  
Journal of the European Economic Association  
Journal of Health Economics  
Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization  
Land Economics  
Macroeconomic Dynamics  
National Tax Journal  
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics  
Oxford Economic Papers  
Public Choice

Review of Economic Dynamics  
Review of Financial Studies  
Scandinavian Journal of Economics  
Social Choice and Welfare  
Southern Economic Journal  
World Development

**A-3 Journals for publications accepted between 7/1/2014 and 5/1/2019**

American Economic Journal: Applied  
American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics  
American Economic Journal: Microeconomics  
American Economic Journal: Policy  
American Journal of Agricultural Economics  
American Journal of Economics and Sociology  
American Political Science Review  
Applied Economics  
British Journal of Industrial Relations  
Cambridge Journal of Economics  
Eastern Economic Journal  
Ecological Economics  
Econometric Reviews  
Economic Development and Cultural Change  
Economic Geography  
Economic History Review  
Economic Policy  
Economic Record  
Economics of Education Review  
Energy Economics  
Environmental and Resource Economics  
Experimental Economics  
Explorations in Economic History  
History of Political Economy  
Industrial and Corporate Change  
Industrial and Labor Relations Review  
Industrial Relations  
Inquiry  
Insurance: Mathematics and Economics  
International Journal of Game Theory  
International Monetary Fund Staff Papers  
International Tax and Public Economics  
Journal of Banking and Finance  
Journal of Business  
Journal of Common Market Strategies  
Journal of Comparative Economics

Journal of Development Economics  
Journal of Economic Education  
Journal of Economic Geography  
Journal of Economic Issues  
Journal of Economic Psychology  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Economics and Management Strategy  
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis  
Journal of Financial Intermediation  
Journal of Forecasting  
Journal of Japanese and International Economics  
Journal of Labor Research  
Journal of Legal Studies  
Journal of Macroeconomics  
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management Journal of Population Economics  
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics  
Journal of Productivity Analysis  
Journal of Real Estate Economics and Finance  
Journal of Regional Science  
Journal of Regulatory Economics  
Journal of Risk and Insurance  
Journal of Risk and Uncertainty  
Journal of the American Statistical Association  
Kyklos  
Labour Economics  
Mathematical Finance  
Manchester School (formerly Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies)  
NBER Macroeconomics Annual  
Oxford Review of Economic Policy  
Population and Development Review  
Public Finance Quarterly  
Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance  
Regional Science and Urban Economics  
Resource and Energy Economics  
Review of Income and Wealth  
Review of Industrial Organization  
Review of World Economics (formerly Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv)  
Scottish Journal of Political Economy  
World Economy  
Water Resources Research  
World Bank Economic Review

**A-1 Journals for publications accepted from 5/1/2019 to 1/1/2024**

American Economic Journal: Applied Economics  
American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics  
American Economic Review  
Econometrica  
Economic Journal  
Journal of Economic Growth  
Journal of Economic Literature  
Journal of Economic Perspectives  
Journal of Finance  
Journal of Financial Economics  
Journal of Human Resources  
Journal of International Economics  
Journal of Labor Economics  
Journal of Monetary Economics  
Journal of Political Economy  
Journal of the European Economic Association  
Quarterly Journal of Economics  
Review of Economic Studies  
Review of Economics and Statistics  
Review of Financial Studies

**A-2 Journals for publications accepted from 5/1/2019 to 1/1/2024**

American Economic Journal: Economic Policy  
American Economic Journal: Microeconomics  
Annual Review of Economics  
Annual Review of Financial Economics  
Brookings Papers on Economic Activity  
Demography  
Econometric Reviews  
Econometric Theory  
Econometrics Journal  
Economic Inquiry  
Economic Policy  
Economic Theory  
Economica  
Energy Economics  
European Economic Review  
European Journal of Political Economy  
Experimental Economics  
Finance and Stochastics  
Games and Economic Behavior  
ILR Review  
Industrial and Corporate Change  
International Economic Review

International Journal of Central Banking  
International Journal of Industrial Organization  
Journal of Accounting and Economics  
Journal of Applied Econometrics  
Journal of Banking and Finance  
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics  
Journal of Consumer Research  
Journal of Development of Economics  
Journal of Econometrics  
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization  
Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control  
Journal of Economic Geography  
Journal of Economic Surveys  
Journal of Economic Theory  
Journal of Economics and Management Strategy  
Journal of Empirical Finance  
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management  
Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis  
Journal of Financial Econometrics  
Journal of Financial Intermediation  
Journal of Financial Markets  
Journal of Financial Stability  
Journal of Health Economics  
Journal of Industrial Economics  
Journal of International Money and Finance  
Journal of Law and Economics  
Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization  
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking  
Journal of Population Economics  
Journal of Public Economics  
Journal of Risk and Uncertainty  
Journal of the American Statistical Association  
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology  
Journal of Urban Economics  
Labour Economics  
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics  
Oxford Economic Papers  
Quantitative Economics  
Quantitative Marketing and Economics  
RAND Journal of Economics  
Regional Science and Urban Economics  
Resources and Energy Economics  
Review of Economic Dynamics  
Review of Finance

Scandinavian Journal of Economics  
Small Business Economics  
Theoretical Economics  
World Bank Economic Review  
World Development

**A-3 Journals for publications accepted from 5/1/2019 to 1/1/2024**

Agricultural Economics (United Kingdom)  
American Journal of Agricultural Economics  
American Law and Economics Review  
Annals of Economics and Finance  
Annual Review of Resource Economics  
Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy  
B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy  
B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics  
British Journal of Industrial Relations  
Cambridge Journal of Economics  
Canadian Journal of Economics  
CESifo Economic Studies  
China Economic Review  
Contemporary Economic Policy  
Ecological Economics  
Economic Development and Cultural Change  
Economic Geography  
Economic Modelling  
Economic Systems  
Economic Systems Research  
Economics and Human Biology  
Economics and Politics  
Economics Letters  
Economics of Education Review  
Economics of Energy and Environmental Policy  
Economics of Governance  
Economics of Innovation and New Technology World  
Economy  
Economics of Transition  
Economics of Transportation  
Education Finance and Policy  
Emerging Markets Review  
Empirical Economics  
Energy Journal  
Environment and Development Economics  
Environmental and Resource Economics  
European Financial Management



European Review of Economic History  
Explorations in Economic History  
Feminist Economics  
Fiscal Studies  
German Economic Review  
Health Economics  
IMF Economic Review  
Industry and Innovation  
Information Economics and Policy  
International Finance  
International Journal of Finance and Economics  
International Journal of Forecasting  
International Journal of Game Theory  
International Organization  
International Review of Economics and Finance  
International Review of Environmental and Resource Economics  
International Tax and Public Finance  
Journal of African Economies  
Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics  
Journal of Agricultural Economics  
Journal of Applied Economics  
Journal of Comparative Economics  
Journal of Cultural Economics  
Journal of Demographic Economics  
Journal of Development Studies  
Journal of Economic History  
Journal of Economic Inequality  
Journal of Economic Psychology  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Evolutionary Economics  
Journal of Forecasting  
Journal of Housing Economics  
Journal of Human Capital  
Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and  
Journal of Macroeconomics  
Journal of Mathematical Economics  
Journal of Pension Economics and Finance  
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management  
Journal of Policy Modeling  
Journal of Productivity Analysis  
Journal of Public Economic Theory  
Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics  
Journal of Regulatory Economics  
Journal of Risk and Insurance

Journal of the Japanese and International Economies  
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A: Statistics in  
Journal of Transport Economics and Policy  
Kyklos  
Land Economics  
Macroeconomic Dynamics  
Money  
National Tax Journal  
North American Journal of Economics and Finance  
Open Economies Review  
Oxford Review of Economic Policy  
Population and Development Review  
Public Choice  
Quantitative Finance  
Real Estate Economics  
Research in Economics  
Review of Economics of the Household  
Review of Environmental Economics and Policy  
Review of Income and Wealth  
Review of Industrial Organization  
Review of International Economics  
Review of International Organizations  
Review of Network Economics  
Review of World Economics  
Social Choice and Welfare  
Society  
Southern Economic Journal  
Spatial Economic Analysis  
Structural Change and Economic Dynamics  
Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics

For applications for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor submitted after May 31, 2024, all faculty members who held the rank of assistant professor as of May 31, 2024 will be able to choose between either using the point thresholds defined in 2023 with the A1-A2-A3 journal ranking tiers in force in 2023 or using the point thresholds defined in 2024 with the A1-A2-A3 journal ranking tiers promulgated by the TTPAC in January 2024.

For applications for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor submitted after May 31, 2024, all faculty members whose employment at JMU begins after May 31, 2024 will use the point thresholds defined in 2024 with the A1-A2-A3 journal ranking tiers promulgated by the TTPAC in January 2024.

For applications for the rank of professor submitted after May 31, 2024, all individuals holding the rank of associate professor as of January 1, 2024 will be able to choose between either using the point thresholds defined in 2023 with the A1-A2-A3 journal ranking tiers in force in 2023, or using the point

thresholds defined in 2024 with the A1-A2-A3 journal ranking tiers promulgated by the TTPAC in January 2024.

For applications for promotion to the rank of professor submitted after May 31, 2024, all faculty members who had not yet reached the rank of associate professor as of January 1, 2024 will use the point thresholds defined in 2024 with the A1-A2-A3 journal ranking tiers promulgated by the TTPAC in January 2024.

Approximately every five years, the identities of which journals are contained in each A1-A2-A3 tiers will be updated using the most recent impact factors. This updating goes into effect immediately upon its announcement by the TTPAC to the department faculty and does not require signatures by the AUH, Dean, and Provost for each update.

#### **A-1 Journals for publications accepted after 1/1/2024**

American Economic Journal: Applied Economics  
American Economic Journal: Economic Policy  
American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics  
American Economic Journal: Microeconomics  
American Economic Review  
Annual Review of Economics  
Annual Review of Resource Economics  
Brookings Papers on Economic Activity  
Econometrica  
Economic Journal  
European Economic Review  
Experimental Economics  
Journal of Accounting and Economics  
Journal of Applied Econometrics  
Journal of Business and Economic Statistics  
Journal of Development Economics  
Journal of Econometrics  
Journal of Economic Geography  
Journal of Economic Growth  
Journal of Economic Literature  
Journal of Economic Perspectives  
Journal of Environmental Economics and Management  
Journal of Finance  
Journal of Financial Economics  
Journal of Health Economics  
Journal of Human Resources  
Journal of International Economics  
Journal of Labor Economics  
Journal of Political Economy  
Journal of Population Economics  
Journal of Public Economics  
Journal of Risk and Uncertainty  
Journal of the European Economic Association  
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B: Statistical Methodology

Journal of Urban Economics  
Quarterly Journal of Economics  
RAND Journal of Economics  
Review of Economic Studies  
Review of Economics and Statistics  
Review of Financial Studies

**A-2 Journals for publications accepted after 1/1/2024**

American Journal of Health Economics  
Annual Review of Financial Economics  
China Economic Review  
Ecological Economics  
Econometric Reviews  
Econometric Theory  
Econometrics Journal  
Economic Development and Cultural Change  
Economic Geography  
Economic Inquiry  
Economic Policy  
Economic Systems Research  
Economic Theory  
Economica  
Economics and Politics  
Economics of Education Review  
Economics of Innovation and New Technology  
Emerging Markets Review  
Energy Economics  
Energy Journal  
Environmental and Resource Economics  
European Journal of Political Economy  
European Review of Economic History  
Explorations in Economic History  
Fiscal Studies  
Games and Economic Behavior  
Health Economics (United Kingdom)  
ILR Review  
IMF Economic Review  
Industrial and Corporate Change  
Industry and Innovation  
International Economic Review  
International Journal of Forecasting  
International Journal of Industrial Organization  
International Organization  
Journal of Agricultural Economics  
Journal of Banking and Finance  
Journal of Business Ethics  
Journal of Comparative Economics  
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization

Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control  
Journal of Economic Inequality  
Journal of Economic Psychology  
Journal of Economic Surveys  
Journal of Economic Theory  
Journal of Economics and Management Strategy  
Journal of Empirical Finance  
Journal of Financial Econometrics  
Journal of Financial Markets  
Journal of Housing Economics  
Journal of Human Capital  
Journal of Industrial Economics  
Journal of Law and Economics  
Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization  
Journal of Money, Credit and Banking  
Journal of Policy Analysis and Management  
Journal of Productivity Analysis  
Journal of Real Estate Finance and Economics  
Journal of Risk and Insurance  
Journal of the American Statistical Association  
Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists  
Journal of the Japanese and International Economies  
Journal of World Business  
Labour Economics  
National Tax Journal  
Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics  
Quantitative Economics  
Real Estate Economics  
Regional Science and Urban Economics  
Resources and Energy Economics  
Review of Economic Dynamics  
Review of Economics of the Household  
Review of Environmental Economics and Policy  
Review of Income and Wealth  
Review of International Organizations  
Scandinavian Journal of Economics  
Small Business Economics  
Theoretical Economics  
World Bank Economic Review  
World Development

**A-3 Journals for publications accepted after 1/1/2024**

Agribusiness  
Agricultural and Food Economics  
Agricultural and Resource Economics Review  
American Law and Economics Review  
American Statistician  
Annals of Economics and Finance

Annals of Economics and Statistics  
Applied Economic Analysis  
Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy  
Applied Economics  
Applied Economics Letters  
Asian Economic Journal  
Asian Economic Papers  
Asian Economic Policy Review  
Australian Economic Papers  
Australian Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics  
B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis and Policy  
B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics  
B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics  
Borsa Istanbul Review  
British Journal of Industrial Relations  
Business and Politics  
Business Economics  
Business Ethics Quarterly  
Cambridge Journal of Economics  
Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics  
Canadian Journal of Economics  
Central Bank Review  
CESifo Economic Studies  
China Agricultural Economic Review  
Climate Change Economics  
Cliometrica  
Computational Economics  
Conflict Management and Peace Science  
Contemporary Economic Policy  
De Economist  
Defence and Peace Economics  
Developing Economies  
Dynamic Games and Applications  
Eastern Economic Journal  
Econometrics  
Economic Analysis and Policy  
Economic Change and Restructuring  
Economic History of Developing Regions  
Economic History Review  
Economic Modelling  
Economic Systems  
Economics and Human Biology  
Economics and Philosophy  
Economics Letters  
Economics of Energy and Environmental Policy  
Economics of Governance  
Economics of Transportation  
Education Economics

Emerging Markets Finance and Trade  
Empirica  
Empirical Economics  
Environment and Development Economics  
Eurasian Economic Review  
European Journal of Comparative Economics  
European Journal of Health Economics  
European Journal of Operational Research  
European Review of Agricultural Economics  
Feminist Economics  
Forum for Health Economics and Policy  
German Economic Review  
Information Economics and Policy  
Insurance: Mathematics and Economics  
International Economic Journal  
International Economics  
International Economics and Economic Policy  
International Finance  
International Journal of Central Banking  
International Journal of Finance and Economics  
International Journal of Game Theory  
International Journal of Health Economics and Management  
International Journal of Production Economics  
International Journal of the Economics of Business  
International Review of Economics and Finance  
International Review of Environmental and Resource Economics  
International Review of Law and Economics  
IZA Journal of Development and Migration  
IZA Journal of Labor Economics  
IZA Journal of Labor Policy  
Japanese Economic Review  
Journal of African Economies  
Journal of Agricultural and Food Industrial Organization  
Journal of Agricultural and Resource Economics  
Journal of Applied Economics  
Journal of Asian Economics  
Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics  
Journal of Behavioral Finance  
Journal of Business Economics  
Journal of Commodity Markets  
Journal of Common Market Studies  
Journal of Consumer Affairs  
Journal of Contemporary Accounting and Economics  
Journal of Cultural Economics  
Journal of Demographic Economics  
Journal of Econometric Methods  
Journal of Economic Asymmetries  
Journal of Economic Education

Journal of Economic History  
Journal of Economic Integration  
Journal of Economic Interaction and Coordination  
Journal of Economic Methodology  
Journal of Economic Policy Reform  
Journal of Economic Structures  
Journal of Economic Studies  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Evolutionary Economics  
Journal of Family and Economic Issues  
Journal of Forecasting  
Journal of Geographical Systems  
Journal of Global Economic Analysis  
Journal of Globalization and Development  
Journal of Institutional Economics  
Journal of International Economic Law  
Journal of International Trade and Economic Development  
Journal of Labor Research  
Journal of Macroeconomics  
Journal of Mathematical Economics  
Journal of Pension Economics and Finance  
Journal of Policy Modeling  
Journal of Post Keynesian Economics  
Journal of Public Economic Theory  
Journal of Real Estate Research  
Journal of Regulatory Economics  
Journal of Sports Economics  
Journal of the Economics of Ageing  
Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A: Statistics in Society  
Journal of Time Series Analysis  
Journal of Transport Economics and Policy  
Journal of Wine Economics  
Kyklos  
Labour  
Land Economics  
Latin American Economic Review  
Macroeconomic Dynamics  
Management and Organization Review  
Manchester School  
Marine Resource Economics  
Maritime Economics and Logistics  
Metroeconomica  
North American Actuarial Journal  
North American Journal of Economics and Finance  
Open Economies Review  
Operations Research  
Oxford Economic Papers  
Oxford Review of Economic Policy



Pacific Economic Review  
Portuguese Economic Journal  
Post-Communist Economies  
Public Choice  
Quantitative Finance  
Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance  
Research in Economics  
Research in Transportation Economics  
Resources Policy  
Review of Economic Design  
Review of Financial Economics  
Review of Industrial Organization  
Review of International Political Economy  
Review of Keynesian Economics  
Review of Network Economics  
Review of World Economics  
Scottish Journal of Political Economy  
Social Choice and Welfare  
Socio-Economic Planning Sciences  
Southern Economic Journal  
Spatial Economic Analysis  
Structural Change and Economic Dynamics  
Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics  
Swiss Journal of Economics and Statistics  
Telecommunications Policy  
Theory and Decision  
Tourism Economics  
Venture Capital  
World Economy  
World Trade Review

## APPENDIX 2: Ranking Algorithm for Articles Accepted After 5/1/2019

The ranking algorithm is implemented in R and is based on the following 8 metrics of research impact:

- a. **From RePEc:** Simple impact factor, recursive impact factor, discounted impact factor, recursive discounted impact factor, and h-index.
- b. **From Scopus:** CiteScore, SJR, and SNIP

**Step 1.** We begin by downloading the top 500 journals according to the recursive discounted factor provided by RePEc. This is our **master list**.

**Step 2.** We download the rankings from RePEc for simple discount factor, recursive impact factor, discounted impact factor, and h-index, including the top 1000 journals for each respective list. These 4 are then matched with our **master list** from step 1 above giving us all 5 metrics from RePEc in the master list.

**Step 3:** Next for each journal in our master list we get its unique ISSN number. This allows us to match these journals with the Scopus database that already provides ISSN for their journals.

**Step 4.** The RePEc master list from the previous step is then merged with the entire Scopus database using ISSN numbers. We now have raw scores for each of the eight metrics listed above.

**Step 5.** We delete journals from the master list using the deleted journal list previously shared with the PAC.

**Step 6.** We adjust the citation counts for each of the 22 survey and/or commission-invitation only journal and recompute their impact factors following Combes and Linnemer (2010)<sup>1</sup>. Note that this adjustment will only affect 5 impact metrics in our data: simple, recursive, discounted, recursive discounted, and CiteScore. This is because for only these metrics we have raw data on citations and number of documents.

**Step 7.** We compute the ranking for each of the 8 metrics listed above, giving us 8 different rankings for each journal in our sample. We do not break ties in any ranking but instead assign the minimum rank to all ties. For example, if there is a tie between rank 2 and 3, both journals get awarded a rank of 2.

**Step 8.** To aggregate our 8 individual rankings into a final ranking we use a consensus-based framework that is based on the Borda score. The formula of the Borda score for a journal  $i$  can be expressed by the following equation:

$$\text{Borda Score } (i) = N_1 \times (N_2 + 1) - \sum_{s=1}^8 r_s^i$$

Here  $i$  indexes a journal, and  $s$  indexes a particular ranking in our sample.  $r_s^i$  is the rank of journal  $i$  in a ranking  $s$ .  $N_1$  is the number of rankings we use and  $N_2$  is the number of journals in our sample.

**Step 9.** We finally rank journals in the descending order of the Borda Score to obtain the final ranking.