

Department of Economics
Statement on Intellectual Contributions
The Joseph M. Bryan School of Business and Economics
Approved September 14, 2006
Drafts January 1, 2007, July 6, 2007, and February 18, 2009

Preface

The purpose of this document is to improve the understanding of the considerations and criteria used for the assessment of faculty¹ intellectual contributions in the Department of Economics. Such awareness should provide for better planning of faculty development through annual goal-setting activities. The guidelines presented in this document shall be used to evaluate annual performance of individual faculty members by his/her department peers, the department Head, the school-wide evaluation committee, and the Dean.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and maintain a research agenda of discipline-based scholarship. The department expects that all tenured and tenure-track faculty and specified non-tenure track faculty members maintain their academic qualifications by on-going activities that result in intellectual contributions. The nature, quality and quantity of intellectual contributions expected will vary depending on the faculty member's teaching, research and service role and responsibilities.

Meeting the minimum expectations for maintenance of academic qualifications establishes minimal expectations for intellectual contributions. Merit salary increases and recommendations for reappointment, permanent tenure, and promotions require intellectual contributions significantly beyond these minimal standards.

Intellectual Contributions Definitions

The Department recognizes that the nature of intellectual contributions can vary widely. Intellectual contributions include: refereed published academic journal articles and proceedings, practitioner journal articles, books, book chapters and monographs (including reports to government agencies and other contracting organizations); abstracts of articles published in proceedings from scholarly meetings, papers presented at academic or professional meetings, research working papers submitted for review, papers presented at faculty research seminars, publications in trade journals, and scholarly book reviews; external research grants and contracts awards (and development and submission of major funding proposals), and external grants for curriculum development; and textbooks, mini-cases in textbooks, and unpublished instructional development contributions² such as cases with written instructions, instructional software, supplemental learning materials, materials describing the design and implementation of new curricula or courses, including distance learning courses and contributions that aid the practice or instruction of the discipline.

¹ Full-time faculty not holding administrative appointments

² Such contributions for non-tenure track faculty with Ph.D.s would include text book reviews, study guides, test banks, and other instructional material tied to textbooks and distance education course development and supporting materials.

Intellectual contributions also may be classified as contributions to the academic discipline, practice, and pedagogy. Because the portfolio of intellectual contributions should support the department's Ph.D. mission, the vast majority of intellectual contributions produced by departmental faculty should be contributions to the academic discipline.

Intellectual Contributions Assessment Criteria

Criteria for assessment of intellectual contributions include:

- 1) The intellectual contribution must be in a format allowing review by others and must be subjected to some type of peer evaluation – whether by academic colleagues or practitioners.
- 2) The judged quality of the intellectual contribution will be assessed critically in terms of: content factors such as relevance and significance to the field (perceived value-added, citations, etc.), quality of design and methodology, creativeness or innovativeness; and, the quality of the outlet based on reputation or visibility (ratings and/or rankings) of the journal, review process (peer review/blind, etc.), acceptance rates, and credentials of the editorial board and other authors who have published in the journal.
- 3) The proportional contribution of multi-authored contributions.
- 4) Whether publication credit for the intellectual contribution has been attributed in a previous year.
- 5) The faculty member's research pipeline.

Annual Faculty Intellectual Contributions Performance Reviews and Evaluations

The annual faculty intellectual contributions performance review and evaluation process will consist of two steps.

Step One: Maintenance of Academic Qualifications

Step one will be the determination of whether the faculty member's intellectual contributions over the past five years meet the school and departmental minimum standards for maintenance of academic qualifications.³ The following **guidelines** apply to the maintenance of academic qualifications:

- 1) Faculty members with a three-three or a three-two teaching load who are primarily teaching undergraduates are expected to have a profile of placing their published

³ Besides peer-reviewed journal articles, the Department values and recognizes as equivalent peer-reviewed publications book and book chapters from prestigious publishers (e.g., University Presses) and high-quality research monographs during its annual merit review of research. Therefore, for step 2, the department's annual evaluation of new intellectual contributions includes peer-reviewed journal articles and appropriate high-quality equivalent publications so that merit rating for each faculty member's research is appropriately assessed and recorded for the current year and for future promotion and tenure decisions. For step 1 of academic qualifications, the Department follows the School's requirement that a faculty member must have a minimum of two peer-reviewed journal articles (and not equivalents) or otherwise face an overall unsatisfactory merit review rating.

research in a very broad range of “quality” peer-reviewed journals.⁴ The minimal research productivity necessary to maintain academic qualifications is expected to include at least two peer-reviewed articles and three other intellectual contributions over a five year period with the annual rating of research evaluation dependent on the quality and authorship(s) of the research.

- 2) Faculty members with a three-two teaching load and with significant graduate teaching responsibility are expected to have a profile of placing their published research in a broad range of “high quality” and “quality” peer-reviewed journals. The minimal research productivity necessary to maintain academic qualifications is expected to include at least three peer-reviewed articles and a total of five intellectual contributions over a five year period with the annual rating of research evaluation dependent on the quality and authorship(s) of the research.
- 3) Faculty members with a two-two teaching load and who are likely to have a significant graduate teaching responsibility are expected to have a profile of placing their published research in a broad range of “high quality” or better journals. The minimal research productivity necessary to maintain academic qualifications is expected to include at least three peer-reviewed articles (one in a “high quality” or better journal) and a total of five intellectual contributions over a five year period with the annual rating of research evaluation dependent on the quality and authorship(s) of the research.
- 4) Senior research faculty members with a two-two teaching load with graduate teaching responsibility are expected to have a profile of placing their published research in a broad range of “high quality” or better journals. The minimal research productivity necessary to maintain academic qualifications is expected to include at least five peer-reviewed articles (predominantly “high quality” journals or better) or three peer-reviewed journals with at least one in an “elite” journal plus other intellectual contributions totally five over five years with the annual research evaluation dependent on the quality, authorship(s) and contribution to the research.

Step Two: Evaluation of “New” Contributions

Step two will be the review and evaluation of new contributions (in-print or accepted for publications and other contributions available for review) during the current year and research work in progress in the context of the prior years’ intellectual contributions. The following guidelines will be used to evaluate intellectual contributions productivity:

⁴ The Bryan School uses a common nomenclature of “elite,” “very high quality,” “high quality,” and “quality” to categorize peer-reviewed journals. As a general, objective indicator of journal quality, the Economics Department references a July 2004 ranking compiled by the French National Committee for Scientific Research. Their evaluation considered nearly 700 business and economic journals, covering 11 subdisciplines in economics and 10 subdisciplines in business. From that list, the Department considers the top eight journals overall (1%) plus the top-tier subdiscipline journals (12%) as “elite.” It considers the second tier of journals on that list (25%) to be “very high quality.” The third tier of the French listing (37%) is recognized as “high quality,” while the fourth-tier in the French rankings is recognized as “quality.” The Department notes that the French list is only a general and incomplete guide. The list is limited to journals inside economics and business, while the Department also encourages interdisciplinary research. The list is also a point-in-time ranking that does not consider new on-line and print journals, such as the four new AEA journals. The Economics Department will make a case during the annual evaluation as to the appropriate ranking for journals not covered by the list.

- 1) The highest value is usually placed on the articles published in “elite”. The highest-quality publications in related fields and disciplines are recognized and rewarded.⁵ While the leading journals in economics will vary over time, the annual evaluation process attempts to place the highest rewards on articles that provide the highest visibility for the researcher and enhances the research reputation and ranking of the Department.
- 2) Research is assessed as far above expectations, above expectations, meets expectations, *below expectations* (but sufficient to meet academic qualifications) or far below expectations (not meeting academic qualifications). Research ratings are dependent on the quality and placement of the published peer-reviewed research and the continual development of a research pipeline subject to a faculty members’ teaching profile. Submission and receipt of grants are an important part of professional research activity and contribute to the annual performance appraisal, though success in obtaining grants is not a necessary condition for an outstanding research rating. Faculty members who do not have a refereed publication or other equivalent academic research may be rated below “meets expectations” on research unless there is substantial new development in the research pipeline or research activities, e.g. the new submission of a grant and professional presentations of papers in the research pipeline.
- 3) The evaluation of the research/intellectual contributions for annual merit review will be in the context of the tenure and tenure-track faculty member’s teaching, research and service role and responsibilities. The quality of the individual publication and the outlet is always more important for the annual merit review rating than the minimum number of publications necessary to maintain academic qualification. Sole authorship also deserves extra merit since the majority of publications in most journals have multiple authors. Articles of substantial length and high quality also deserve extra merit. In a year without an acceptance, the development of the research pipeline and other activity will be evaluated to determine the research evaluation from far below expectations to meets expectations.⁶
 - For faculty on a three/three or a three/two teaching load publication in a “quality” journal is likely to be evaluated as meeting expectations. A publication in a “high quality” refereed journal (or equivalent) will normally result in either an above or far above expectations.
 - Untenured assistant professors with a two-two teaching load and significant graduate teaching responsibilities are expected to have one publication (or equivalent) per year and a developing pipeline with the quality/quantity of the publication(s) determining the rating of the research. A publication in a “quality” journal is likely to be evaluated as meets expectations, a “high quality” or “very high quality” journal is likely to be evaluated as meets or exceeds above expectations and an “elite” journal is likely to be evaluated as far above expectations.
 - Senior faculty members with a two-two teaching load based on their established research record are expected to have multiple publications (or equivalent) and/or

⁵ The department’s emphasis on health economics will mean recognizing a wider array of publications in health economics and medical journals.

⁶ The increasing length of time for each review cycle at various journals in economics means that dry years will occur.

other significant research and grant contribution(s) for a meets expectation rating. A higher evaluation will depend on the quality/quantity of the publication(s) and grant activity with the expectation that there are publications in “high quality” or better journals. New grants (and continuing large multi-year) that provide support for the Department and graduate students are included in the assessment of annual research output.