

Approved February 18, 1985
Amended September 12, 1988
Amended April 15, 1993
Amended September 13, 1994
Amended April 18, 1996
Amended 1 October 1996
Amended 20 November 1997
Amended 11 October 2001
Amended 6 November 2003
Amended 5 October 2004
Amended 10 June 2005
Amended 27 October 2008

OPERATIONAL CODE
Department of Economics
Colorado State University

I. THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

A. The purposes of this Operational Code are to describe the organization and administration of the Department of Economics, and to define the roles of the Faculty and the departmental Chair with respect to the activities and governance of the Department. If provisions of this Code should conflict with provisions of the *Academic Faculty and Administrative Professional Manual* (hereafter referred to as the *Faculty Manual*), the *Faculty Manual* shall prevail.

B. The mission of the Department of Economics is to contribute to the understanding of the economic dimension of social interaction. We seek this understanding at three levels:

1. basic information... we pursue and promote knowledge of the economic *facts* of life;
2. analytical methods...we offer particular paradigms and principles of analysis that are useful in *understanding* the economic life of the individual and society;
3. evaluation skills...we practice and encourage the exercise of reasoned *judgment* about what decisions, behavior, and policies are sensible from the individual and social standpoints.

We pursue this mission at all its levels, with respect to our various constituencies, through the interdependent functions of teaching, research and service, by:

1. enhancing the economic literacy of University students-at-large in a way that will increase their effectiveness as citizens; offering undergraduate economics majors a liberal education in economics as a social decision-making science; and educating graduate students to be professional economists;
2. pursuing research intended to expand basic understanding of society in its economic dimensions, and research intended to guide applied public and private decision-making;
3. providing service to the University community, the citizens of the State of Colorado, public policy-makers at all levels, the world community, and the economics profession.

The Department shall strive to provide an environment which promotes instruction and imparts knowledge in a professional, enlightened, and stimulating manner, which encourages outstanding scholarship in creative research, writing, and publication, and which fosters the pro-vision of service to the institution, to the community, and to the profession.

C. The Department of Economics shall be administered by a Chair whose duties shall be specified by this Code and by the *Faculty Manual*. The term “Department Head” in the *Faculty Manual* shall be understood to be synonymous with “Department Chair” in this Code.

D. The operation of the Department of Economics shall be guided by the basic principle that the departmental Chair executes policies determined by the Eligible Faculty, as defined below in II.A.1.

II. PARTICIPATION IN DEPARTMENTAL AFFAIRS

A. Eligible Faculty

1. The term “Eligible Faculty” covers all tenured and tenure-track faculty, including full-time regular faculty, part-time regular faculty, and transitional faculty.
2. All Eligible Faculty, starting from the date of their official appointment, may vote on all matters at all faculty meetings except when noted otherwise in this Code.

B. Non-Eligible Faculty

1. Members of the department faculty who are not eligible to vote in faculty meetings include lecturers, instructors, research associates, special and temporary instructors and professors, and faculty affiliates (see II.B.2 below). These colleagues shall have the general privileges of using University and Department facilities. They shall receive notices concerning general faculty matters. They may attend regular departmental meetings if they are invited. If they attend, they are encouraged to participate in discussion. However, they shall not have voting privileges.
2. Faculty Affiliates
 - a. Faculty Affiliates are professional economists whose work associates them directly with the Department of Economics.
 - b. Individuals shall be recommended for appointment to the title of Faculty Affiliate by action of at least a two-thirds affirmative vote of the Eligible Faculty.
 - c. Initial appointment of Faculty Affiliate status shall be for one year. Reappointments may be made for additional one-year terms.

C. Faculty Responsibilities

1. Responsibilities for each member of the faculty are defined in his/her offer letter and this Code, and are consistent with the faculty responsibilities that are summarized in the *Faculty Manual*. Faculty responsibilities cannot be changed without the mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Chair.
2. Faculty responsibilities typically include (but are not necessarily limited to) teaching and advising, research and publication, and professional service and/or outreach. The distribution of these responsibilities may change over time if the Chair and the faculty member agree to do so (see section VI).
3. The substantial and willful neglect of properly assigned duties may result in non-renewal of contract, denial of tenure, and/or other disciplinary actions for tenure-track faculty; and in revocation of tenure, termination, and/or other disciplinary actions for

tenured faculty.

III. DEPARTMENTAL ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

- A. The Chair of the Department of Economics
1. Leadership and execution of faculty-made policies are vested in the departmental Chair. The Faculty of the Department of Economics expects that, in making recommendations to other administrative officers of the University, the Chair will transmit the views and recommendations of the faculty as determined by departmental decisions and voting.
 2. The Chair shall keep the Eligible Faculty informed on all matters concerning their professional welfare, relevant College and University policies, departmental matters and problems, and actions taken with respect to departmental operations and administration. Specific duties of the Chair are contained in III.A.4 , below.
 3. Appointment of the Chair
 - a. The Chair shall be an associate professor or a full professor with tenure at Colorado State University. The term of office of the Chair is typically five years.
 - b. The appointment of the Chair is the responsibility of the Dean. The Dean initiates the nomination for the appointment of a new Chair or for the replacement of a Chair who is unable to continue performing his/her duties.
 - c. If the Chair plans to be temporarily absent from the Department, s/he shall appoint a tenured member of the faculty, with that person's consent, to be Acting Chair for the duration of his/her absence.
 4. Duties and responsibilities of the Chair.
 - a. Within the University system the Chair is the Chief Executive Officer of the Department, responsible to the faculty and to University officials, through the Dean of the College. With the advice and counsel of the Eligible Faculty, the Chair shall perform the duties specified in this section.
 - b. The Chair shall strive to create a positive working environment for the students, faculty and staff of the Department, and to help all of them achieve their individual and collective professional goals. The duties of the Chair are specified in the *Faculty Manual*. They include (but are not necessarily limited to) responsibility for the undergraduate and graduate teaching programs; budgetary and administrative oversight; facilitation of faculty research; communication with the Dean and other University officials; representation of the Department to officials and agencies within and outside of the University; evaluation of departmental faculty and staff; facilitation of the resolution of disputes and grievances; and implementation of Department, College, and University Codes and policies.
 5. Evaluation of the Chair.
 - a. The annual evaluation of the Chair and the procedures for conducting it are the responsibility of the Dean.
 - b. The Advisory Committee (see section III.E.6 below) shall be responsible for soliciting evaluations of the Chair from all faculty and staff members, for reporting these results to the Dean, and for otherwise following the directives of the Dean with respect to the evaluation of the Chair. The Advisory Committee shall prepare an annual evaluation of the Chair consistent with the procedures and criteria for the annual evaluation of faculty as described in Section VII below.
 6. By at least a three-fifths majority vote of the Eligible Faculty with at least one

year of service, an internal departmental self-study and evaluation of departmental operations may be undertaken by direct appeal to the Dean and at his/her discretion. Such self-study and evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures established in the *Faculty Manual*.

B. Associate Chair

1. The Chair may nominate a tenured faculty member to serve as Associate Chair for the Department, with that person's consent. The nominee shall be approved by a majority vote of the Eligible Faculty by a departmental absentee ballot.
2. If an Associate Chair is appointed, the term of office shall be for one (1) year beginning on the first contract day of fall semester. A person appointed to that office may be reappointed on a yearly basis.
3. If an Associate Chair is appointed, the duties of that office shall include such administrative assistance to the Chair as shall be agreed upon between the Chair and the Associate Chair. A person may hold concurrently the office of Associate Chair and the office of Coordinator of Graduate Studies or Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies.

C. The Coordinator of Graduate Studies

1. The Chair shall nominate a tenured faculty member to be Coordinator of Graduate Studies for the Department. The nominee shall be approved by a majority vote of the Eligible Faculty by a departmental absentee ballot.
2. The term of office for the Coordinator of Graduate Studies shall be for one (1) academic year beginning on the first contract day of fall semester. A person appointed to that office may be reappointed on a yearly basis.
3. The Coordinator of Graduate Studies shall have the responsibilities of administering the various activities associated with the Department's graduate program, including recruiting, admissions, assistantships and fellowships, special examinations, and evaluations of individual graduate students.

D. The Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies

1. The Chair shall nominate a tenured faculty member to be Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies in the Department. The nominee shall be approved by a majority vote of the Eligible Faculty by a departmental absentee ballot.
2. The term of office for the Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies shall be for one academic year beginning on the first contract day of the fall semester. A person appointed to that office may be reappointed on a yearly basis.
3. The Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies shall have the responsibilities of administering the various activities associated with the Department's undergraduate program, including curriculum, principles courses, majors, minors, and concentrations, and placement information. The Coordinator of Undergraduate Studies shall be the departmental representative to the College Curriculum Committee.

E. Departmental Committees

1. The departmental Chair, with the advice and consent of the Eligible Faculty, may create Standing, Ad Hoc, and Special committees to foster faculty policy making and to facilitate departmental administration. Department committees usually provide advice and recommendations to the Dean, to the Chair, and/or to the Eligible Faculty; they do not act as decision-makers unless specified otherwise.
2. A Tenure Committee shall be established consisting of all Eligible Faculty with tenure. A Chairperson shall be elected by a majority of the Tenure Committee and a

Secretary shall be appointed by the Committee Chairperson. The duties of the Tenure Committee shall be to consider and make recommendations on tenure by applying the procedures specified in section V and Appendix A of this Code.

3. A Promotion Committee shall be established consisting of all Eligible Faculty of higher rank than the faculty member under consideration. A Chairperson shall be elected by a majority of the Promotion Committee and a Secretary shall be appointed by the Committee Chairperson. The duties of the Promotion Committee shall be to consider and make recommendations on promotion by applying the procedures specified in section V and Appendix A or Appendix B of this Code.

a. In cases where decisions are made concerning both tenure and promotion, a single Tenure and Promotion Committee will be formed in the same manner as the Tenure Committee and the Promotion Committee to make recommendations on both tenure and promotion.

4. A Search Committee and Search Committee Chairperson will be appointed by the Department Chair whenever the Dean approves a faculty search. The Search Committee shall operate as follows:

a. The Search Committee's duties shall include placement of job advertisements, screening applications, overseeing the preparation of applicant information files, selection of the subset of candidates to be interviewed at the national meetings (the semi-finalists), and interviews of the semi-finalists at the national meetings. The Search Committee shall follow the policies of the College and University when it carries out its duties, including the University's Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

b. The Search Committee Chairperson shall organize Search Committee meetings and proceedings, and is responsible for ensuring that the appropriate policies are followed.

c. Only the members of the Search Committee for a particular position shall have access to the candidate files for that position. All Eligible Faculty shall have access to the files of the semi-finalists.

d. Faculty hiring decisions for a particular position are made by majority ballot of the Eligible Faculty who have participated in the interview process for that position, subject to the approval of the Dean.

5. A graduate student's Graduate Committee shall be based on the areas of interest and study indicated by that graduate student, with the approval of the Coordinator of Graduate Studies and the Chair, and subject to the provisions of the Graduate School and the policies of the Department. The faculty members and chair of the Graduate Committee must agree to serve, and can remove themselves or be removed by the student with the consent of the Chair. Graduate Committees judge the academic progress of students; the department Chair only ratifies these decisions and confirms that appropriate procedures have been followed.

6. An Advisory Committee shall be formed consisting of three Eligible Faculty members with at least one year of service. Members of the Advisory Committee shall be selected by the vote of the Eligible Faculty through a secret ballot during the first week of Fall Semester. The faculty shall vote for a maximum of three Eligible Faculty members on a ballot. The non-tenured faculty member who receives the most votes shall be elected, the tenured faculty member who receives the most votes shall be elected, and the faculty member with the next highest number of votes, irrespective of tenure status, shall be elected to the Advisory Committee. A non-tenured member is not eligible to serve more than one term on the committee unless every other non-tenured member of the Eligible Faculty has completed one term on the committee. If there are

no non-tenured faculty members on the ballot, then the three faculty members who received the most votes shall be elected. In the case of a tie vote, a run-off election shall be conducted by secret ballot, between those candidates who tied. The length of term shall be for one year and members are eligible for reelection. The Advisory Committee shall advise the Chair on the following: (1) annual merit evaluations; (2) salary increases; (3) nominations for faculty awards; (4) other personnel decisions as necessary. In addition, the Chair may ask the Advisory Committee for advice on the execution of established faculty policies. The Committee will not establish new faculty policies.

7. Qualifying Examination and Field Examination committees shall be formed as necessary by the Coordinator of Graduate Studies. The members and chairs of these committees shall be appointed by the Coordinator of Graduate Studies based upon their expertise. Committee chairs are responsible for ensuring that exam questions are written and graded in a timely fashion, for providing general information about the scope and format of the examination to students, for deciding upon student requests for reasonable accommodation to emergency situations after consultation with the examination committee, and to forward any student appeals to the Graduate Program Committee (see below). These committees judge the academic progress of students; the department Chair only ratifies these decisions and confirms that appropriate procedures have been followed.

8. A Graduate Program Committee shall be formed to advise the Chair and Eligible Faculty regarding graduate program policies, procedures; admission and funding decisions; graduate student appeals and petitions; and other operational aspects of the program when requested. Decisions about graduate student admissions and funding are made by the committee and ratified by the department Chair. Decisions about graduate student appeals and petitions are made by the department Chair in consultation with the committee. Decisions about other matters are made by the the Eligible Faculty in consultation with the committee.

a. The Coordinator of Graduate Studies will serve as the committee Chair. He or she is responsible for ensuring that department and University policies and procedures are followed.

b. The department Chair, with the advice of the Coordinator of Graduate Studies, shall appoint at least 3 additional Eligible Faculty members to the committee each academic year, seeking whenever practical to form a committee that is representative of key program areas and of ranks.

IV. FACULTY MEETINGS

A. Major department policies shall be determined by the Eligible Faculty in faculty meetings. These meetings shall be conducted according to the most recent edition of *Roberts Rules of Order*.

B. The Chair must call at least one faculty meeting each semester. These meetings shall be announced in writing at least five working days in advance of the meeting (but notice is limited to 24 hours for emergency meetings).

C. Eligible Faculty are normally expected to attend faculty meetings.

D. Faculty meetings require a quorum of at least half of the Eligible Faculty, including proxy votes and absentee ballots if such have been authorized. Decisions are made by majority vote unless otherwise specified. A secret ballot shall be utilized if any member of the Eligible Faculty requests it.

E. Proxy votes are allowed for all faculty meetings and committee meetings except for those that make personnel decisions (for example, search committees, tenure and promotion committees, and faculty meetings that decide upon candidate interviews and offers). If proxies are allowed, only one may be held by any single member of the Eligible Faculty. Absentee ballots are allowed for all meetings.

F. The Chair will distribute a draft of the minutes to the Eligible Faculty shortly after each faculty meeting. After approval of the final draft, the minutes will be entered into the departmental record.

V. TENURE AND PROMOTION

A. Tenure

1. Departmental procedures for the application and granting of tenure are consistent with those of the College and University.

2. All tenured faculty members are members of the Tenure Committee and shall have the right to vote on tenure recommendations.

a. If any member of the Tenure Committee is unable to attend the meeting, s/he shall be provided a absentee ballot for voting on the tenure recommendation as described in section 5 below. To be counted, absentee ballots must be received by the start of the Tenure Committee meeting at which a vote is scheduled.

b. Tenure decisions shall be made by secret ballot. All members of the Tenure Committee shall respect the confidentiality of the deliberations and the secrecy of the ballot.

c. 75% of the members of the Tenure Committee not on approved University leave (rounded to the lowest whole number) must be present for a quorum, including absentee ballots.

d. The Chair may request that a committee member recuse himself or herself due to a perceived and substantial lack of impartiality (for example, if the spouse of a tenure applicant is a member of the Tenure Committee). If the committee member refuses to do so, the Dean shall decide if the committee member can serve.

3. The Chair shall ensure compliance with the tenure application procedures and deadlines specified by the Dean. The Chair shall keep the applicant informed of these procedures and deadlines, and shall ensure that the Tenure Committee has access to the required documentation with sufficient time to make an informed decision.

4. The Chairperson of the Tenure Committee shall call and chair all Tenure Committee meetings and shall appoint a member of the Tenure Committee to be recording secretary for these meetings.

a. All meetings must be announced at least one week in advance to both the members of the Tenure Committee and to the applicant. The applicant shall be given sufficient time to assemble and prepare the necessary documentation.

b. Minutes will be taken at all meetings of the Tenure Committee. The

applicant shall receive a copy of these minutes.

c. The applicant will provide additional information or rewrite portions of the application if the Tenure Committee requests that s/he do so.

5. A majority vote of the Tenure Committee, via secret marked ballots shall constitute the tenure recommendation which, along with the final Tenure Report as revised by the Tenure Committee and the actual vote count, shall be forwarded to the departmental Chair. Balloting shall take place at a Tenure Committee meeting at least two (2) weeks before the tenure recommendation is due in the Dean's office. Proxy ballots are not allowed.

6. The Tenure Committee vote and report will be forwarded by the Chair to the Dean and to the candidate along with the Chair's recommendation. If the departmental Chair disagrees with the recommendation of the Tenure Committee, s/he shall do so only for compelling reasons to be stated in writing and forwarded along with the Tenure Committee's report and decision, including the vote count, to higher administrative levels.

7. For an assistant professor to receive tenure, s/he must also meet the standards for promotion to associate professor. The document "Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor" included as Appendix A to this Code, describes the standards and criteria for evaluating applications for tenure as well as for promotion.

B. Promotion to Associate Professor

1. See the document "Guidelines for Promotion to Associate Professor" in Appendix A for the standards for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor.

2. Whenever an Assistant Professor is considered for tenure, s/he will be considered for promotion to Associate Professor as well. In this instance the Tenure Committee shall also serve as the Promotion Committee, and the procedures for making recommendations for tenure set out in section V.A. shall constitute the procedures for making recommendations for promotion to Associate Professor.

C. Promotion to Professor

1. See the document "Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor" in Appendix B for the standards for promotion from associate professor to full professor.

2. All eligible faculty members with the rank of full professor are members of the Promotion Committee and shall have the right to vote on promotion recommendations.

a. If any member of the Promotion Committee is unable to attend the meeting, s/he shall be provided an absentee ballot for voting on the tenure recommendation, as described in section 5 below. To be counted, absentee ballots must be received by the start of the Promotion Committee meeting at which a vote is scheduled.

b. Promotion decisions shall be made by secret ballot. All members of the Promotion Committee shall respect the confidentiality of the deliberations and the secrecy of the ballot.

c. 75% of the members of the Promotion Committee not on approved University leave (rounded to the lowest whole number) must be present for a quorum, including absentee ballots.

d. The Chair may request that a committee member recuse himself or herself due to a perceived and substantial lack of impartiality (for example, if the spouse of a tenure applicant is a member of the Promotion Committee). If the committee member refuses to do so, the Dean shall decide if the committee

member can serve.

3. The Chair shall ensure compliance with the promotion application procedures and deadlines specified by the Dean. The Chair shall keep the applicant informed of these procedures and deadlines, and shall ensure that the Promotion Committee has access to the required documentation with sufficient time to make an informed decision.
4. The Chairperson of the Promotion Committee shall call and chair all Promotion Committee meetings and shall appoint a member of the Promotion Committee to be recording secretary for these meetings.
 - a. All meetings must be announced at least one week in advance to both the members of the Promotion Committee and to the applicant. The applicant shall be given sufficient time to assemble and prepare the necessary documentation.
 - b. Minutes will be taken at all meetings of the Promotion Committee. The applicant shall receive a copy of these minutes.
 - c. The applicant will provide additional information or rewrite portions of the application if the Promotion Committee requests that s/he do so.
5. A majority vote of the Promotion Committee, via secret marked ballots shall constitute the promotion recommendation which, along with the final Promotion Report as revised by the Promotion Committee and the actual vote count, shall be forwarded to the departmental Chair. The balloting shall take place at a Promotion Committee meeting at least two (2) weeks before the recommendation is due in the Dean's office. Proxy ballots are not allowed.
6. The Promotion Committee vote and report will be forwarded by the Chair to the Dean and to the candidate along with the Chair's recommendation. If the departmental Chair disagrees with the recommendation of the Promotion Committee, s/he shall do so only for compelling reasons to be stated in writing and forwarded along with the Promotion Committee's report and decision, including the vote count, to higher administrative levels.
7. The Promotion Committee shall conduct promotion progress reviews of all tenured associate professors no later than the fifth year after their promotion to the rank of associate professor, and otherwise whenever requested by the subject faculty member (but no more than once per year). The document "Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor" included as Appendix B to this Code, will in its original and amended forms, inform faculty members regarding Department guidelines for evaluating applications for promotion to professor.

VI. FACULTY EFFORT DISTRIBUTION

Effort distributions shall be established for every faculty member in accordance with the following provisions and consistent with the *Faculty Manual*:

- A. The departmental profile of effort distributions must make it possible for the Department to fulfill its overall institutional mission in teaching, research, and service and outreach.
- B. Effort distributions may vary among individual faculty members in ways that reflect their distinctive contributions to the institutional mission. Effort distributions for each member of the faculty will be established as part of the annual review process by mutual agreement of the faculty member and the Chair.
- C. A distribution of 50 percent effort in teaching and advising is normally associated with an academic year assignment of four 3-credit Type-A courses (40 percent of total effort) plus graduate and undergraduate advising and other Type-B activities (10 percent of total effort).

Non-tenured faculty on a tenure-track appointment will normally have such a 50 percent effort distribution in teaching and advising, as will tenured faculty whose scholarly records merit the four-course teaching load.

D. Faculty with a 50 percent effort in teaching and advising normally also will have 40 percent effort in research and 10 percent effort in service and outreach. A 40 percent effort distribution for research implies an expectation of research productivity at a level equivalent to that in comparable departments in peer institutions. Specifically the **minimum** expectation for satisfactory performance in research is one “standard” published peer-reviewed journal article (or equivalent) per year on average, plus evidence of on-going research activity such as submissions, working papers, and/or conference papers. See Appendix C for an explanation of the calculation of research output.

E. Faculty members whose teaching and advising effort differs from 50 percent, due to increased or decreased responsibilities in administration, research, or service and outreach, shall have their teaching effort adjusted by 10 percentage points for each Type-A course, and appropriate amounts for adjustments in advising and Type-B teaching. Pro rata adjustments of research productivity expectation will accompany changes in research effort percentage. In service and outreach, adjustments of effort percentage will be on the basis of specific special activity agreed in advance.

F. Faculty are encouraged to apply for grants and other forms of outside funding. Refereed publications that result from funded research will count in the research category. Other outcomes from funded research will count in the professional service category. Faculty with significant outside funding may want to increase the weight on service, either by using their grant to buy out a course (thereby reducing the weight on teaching) or by reaching an agreement with the Chair to reduce the weight on research. However, the minimum research expectations specified in Appendices A and B must still be met for the purposes of tenure and promotion.

VII. ANNUAL AND PERIODIC COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS OF THE FACULTY

A. Annual evaluations of tenured and untenured members of the Eligible Faculty are meant to provide accurate information concerning their performance levels relative to departmental standards. The guidelines for annual evaluations are provided in Appendix C to this Code.

B. Comprehensive reviews of untenured faculty

1. The Tenure Committee shall conduct a comprehensive performance review of untenured, regular faculty at the midpoint of the probationary period. The procedures and deadlines for this review will be determined by the Dean. Upon completion of the review, a written summary of the conclusions and recommendations reached by the committee shall be provided to the faculty member and the Chair. The Chair will forward the summary of the Tenure Committee’s recommendations to the Dean along with the Chair’s recommendation.

C. Comprehensive performance reviews of tenured faculty

1. In accordance with the provisions of the *Faculty Manual* and the procedures established by the Dean, the Department shall conduct periodic comprehensive reviews of all tenured faculty. The Chair shall conduct Phase I reviews. For Phase II reviews, if

any, there shall be a Review Committee appointed by the Chair which shall operate as follows:

- a. The Review Committee shall consist of all members of the Tenure Committee of equal or higher rank than the subject faculty member, excluding the subject faculty member and others excluded according to section b. below.
- b. Any member of the Review Committee may withdraw from service because of possible lack of impartiality. In addition, the subject faculty member, the department Chair, or any member of the Review Committee may challenge any member of the Review Committee as to impartiality. The remaining members of the Review Committee shall judge the challenged member's impartiality and shall decide by majority vote whether the challenged member may continue to sit on the Review Committee.
- c. The criteria for review shall be the Department's evaluation criteria established in Appendix C of this Code.
- d. The subject faculty member may submit materials in support of his or her case. In addition, the Review Committee shall obtain any other materials that it deems appropriate for a full and fair consideration of the case.
- e. The Review Committee shall make a determination of which of the outcomes stated in the *Faculty Manual* applies. For each outcome, the Review Committee shall provide the subject faculty member with a written summary of the review, and the faculty member may submit a written response within 30 days. Both the review and the response shall be forwarded to the Chair for further action as required.

VIII. EXTRA-UNIVERSITY EMPLOYMENT AND CONSULTING ACTIVITIES

- A. Extra-University employment, off-campus work, and consulting activities are permitted and encouraged when they:
 1. Contribute to a faculty member's expertise and professional development, but
 2. Do not interfere unreasonably with a faculty member's performance of departmental responsibilities for teaching, research, and service activities during the regular academic year.
- B. A faculty member in the Department of Economics is expected to file a conflict of interest form or a statement about perceived and actual conflicts of interest with the Chair at least once a year concerning consulting and other non-University employment activities.

IX. INTERNAL GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

- A. Any full-time or part-time faculty member, including instructors, has the right to question any decision which may affect his/her departmental responsibilities, professional status, or salary.
- B. Any faculty member who feels that s/he may have a complaint against the Chair, or against any other departmental faculty member, should discuss the problem with the individual(s) involved to try to resolve the problem as quickly as possible at that level.
- C. If a situation is not resolved to the satisfaction of the complainant, s/he should discuss the matter informally with the Chair (or if the Chair is the subject of the issue, with the Dean) prior to invoking the University grievance procedures as specified in the *Faculty Manual*.

X. STUDENT APPEAL POLICY AND PROCESS

A. General policy

The Department of Economics recognizes and accepts the right of a student to appeal any academic decision made at the departmental level. Academic decisions include those involving the academic evaluation of a student, either for a grade in an individual course or relative to the requirements for a program of study. Academic decisions are to be distinguished from disciplinary penalty decisions concerning academic dishonesty or other kinds of misbehavior that affect courses or programs.

B. Appeals of grading decisions

Procedures for the appeal of grade decisions other than disciplinary penalties shall be as provided in the *Faculty Manual*. The departmental appeals committee shall be appointed by the Chair, and shall be composed of two faculty members and two students from within the Department, and one outside faculty member who shall serve as the voting chair.

C. Appeals of disciplinary penalties

Procedures for appeals of disciplinary penalties are provided in the *Faculty Manual*. In accordance with that section, faculty members or instructors should report to the Office of Conflict Resolution and Student Conduct Services all cases of academic dishonesty in which a penalty is imposed.

XI. BYLAWS AND REVIEW

A. This Operational Code may be amended at a faculty meeting by a two-thirds vote of the Eligible Faculty members who meet the following criteria as specified in the *Faculty Manual*:
a) completed at least one year of service, b) in residence at the University or on sabbatical leave, and c) administratively responsible to the department Chair. Any proposed changes in the Code must be announced in advance of the faculty meeting in which they will be discussed.

B. Bylaws may be added under the amendment procedures outlined in XI.A above.

C. This Operational Code shall be reviewed by the Department at least once during each Chair's term in office.

XII. DEPARTMENTAL SELF-STUDY AND EVALUATION

The Department shall conduct an internal self-study, review and evaluation of its goals, operations, programs, and administration on a periodic basis in accordance with the University Code.

Approved: (Signed) Frank J. Vattano / 3-8-85
F. J. Vattano, Dean Date
College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Amended: (Signed) Thomas Knight / 9-12-88
Thomas Knight, Dean Date
College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Amended: (Signed) Loren Crabtree / 5/19/93
Loren Crabtree, Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Amended: (signed) Loren Crabtree / 9/16/94
Loren Crabtree, Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Amended: (signed) Loren Crabtree / 4/24/96
Loren Crabtree, Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Amended: (signed) Loren Crabtree / 12/10/96
Loren Crabtree, Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Amended: (signed) Robert R. Keller / 11/25/97
Robert Keller, Interim Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Amended: (signed) Heather Hardy / 6/10/05
Heather Hardy, Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Amended: (signed) Ann Gill / 10/27/08
Ann Gill, Dean Date
College of Liberal Arts

Appendix A

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR

It is the policy of the University that Assistant Professors recommended for tenure shall be recommended for promotion to Associate Professor as well. Promotion may be granted before tenure, but tenure shall not be granted without promotion. The application for tenure and promotion to associate professor typically occurs in the sixth year after taking service credit into account.

This statement is intended to convey a sense of the Department's expectations for successful candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor. It should not be interpreted as an attempt to set down a list of conditions that, if met (or not met), guarantee an affirmative (or negative) vote by the Tenure and/or Associate Professor Promotion Committee. Each member of the Committee is individually charged with casting an informed vote, with cognizance of the candidate's record and these guidelines.

Part One: General Guidelines

Tenure and promotion to Associate Professor in the Department of Economics shall meet or exceed the standards of the College and the University. Supplemental information is available in the *Faculty Manual*. Evidence must be submitted that a level of performance has been achieved that demonstrates the candidate's ability to make a sustained positive contribution to the Department. This ability must lie in areas that are compatible with the goals of the Department, College and University. That is, **fit** as well as **fitness** is a factor in the tenure and promotion decision.

Performance in the categories of research and scholarship, as well as teaching and advising are most important. Service to the University and profession shall also be considered. Good performance in all three categories is expected, but some trade-off is possible. For example, outstanding achievement in teaching and advising and/or in service may lessen somewhat the expected achievement in research and publication. Likewise, outstanding achievement in research and scholarship may lessen somewhat the expected achievement in teaching/advising and service.

Because the tenure and promotion decision involves an assessment of the candidate's ability to make a sustained contribution to the Department rather than a review of the candidate's output in a single year, evaluation standards for tenure and promotion decisions may differ from the performance criteria set out for the annual evaluation of faculty in Appendix C.

Part Two: Common Evidence

Research and Publication

The Department expects all faculty members to publish an average of one refereed journal per year. Accordingly, a **minimum** of five such articles or their equivalent, plus evidence of on-going research activity such as submissions, working papers, and conference papers, is expected by the candidate's sixth year of service in order to be promoted to Associate Professor with tenure. The candidate for promotion should be the sole author or the lead co-author of at least some of these publications. The attainment of (or failure to attain) the above stated minimum research expectations does not guarantee an affirmative (or negative) tenure decision.

Promotion to associate involves clear evidence that the candidate's research is in the process of achieving professional recognition among leaders in the candidate's discipline. The Committee shall also consider evidence of quality and impact of the candidate's work, including but not limited to: letters from external reviewers, reputation of the journal or book publisher; the number, source, and substance of citations; published reviews; republications; and reputation of the funding agency for externally supported research. Evidence of outstanding quality and impact may be cause for the Committee to act favorably in instances where the minimum number of publications is not met. Similarly, insufficient evidence of quality and impact may be a cause for a negative recommendation even when the minimum number has been met.

Teaching and Advising

The Department expects all faculty members to provide high quality teaching and advising. The Committee's evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance shall be made according to current methods in the Department, which may include, but is not be limited to, subjective student evaluations. The candidate is encouraged to submit additional evidence such as peer evaluations, course syllabi, and narratives describing innovative teaching methods or new course content. Advising shall be a factor in the promotion decision. The number of students advised, their degree level, and, if available, their subjective evaluations of the candidate's advising role shall be considered.

One indicator of truly outstanding teaching is the receipt of a University-wide award or its equivalent. Receipt of a College-level award should be deemed to significantly exceed the expected level of achievement.

Professionalism and Service

Faculty members are expected to support the professional activities of their colleagues and to represent the Department in the University, the community, and the profession. Evidence of various kinds is to be expected in such a wide area. The Committee's judgment concerning the candidate's willingness to undertake a fair share of the Department's and University's governance activities, and general contribution to the atmosphere of professionalism shall be an important factor. External letters of appreciation, offices held, or other indications of activities which utilize the candidate's professional expertise for the benefit of the University, the profession, or the wider society shall be considered by the Committee.

One indicator of truly outstanding service or professionalism is the receipt of a University-wide award; receipt of similar awards at the College level shall be taken into consideration.

Appendix B

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO FULL PROFESSOR

This statement is intended to convey a sense of the Department's expectation for a candidate's successful promotion to the rank of Full Professor. It should **NOT** be interpreted as an attempt to set down a list of conditions that, if met (or not met), guarantee an affirmative (or negative) vote by the Promotion Committee. Each member of the Committee is charged with casting an informed vote based upon the candidate's record and these guidelines.

Part One: General Guidelines

Promotion to Full Professor in the Department of Economics shall meet or exceed the standards of the College [refer to the College's Guidelines for Tenure/Promotion] and the University [refer to the *Faculty Manual*].

The candidate's performance must be well above that expected for promotion to Associate Professor. Promotion to full professor requires demonstration that the faculty member's scholarship has achieved recognition in the profession.

The most important categories for the evaluation of the candidate's performance are research and scholarship, and teaching and advising. Performance in the area of research and scholarship has the highest weight in the evaluation process. Professionalism and service to the University, the profession, and the community shall also be considered. Outstanding research and scholarship may lessen somewhat the expected achievement in teaching and advising, and outstanding teaching and advising may lessen somewhat the expected achievement in research and scholarship.

An individual recommended for promotion to Full Professor will have spent, typically, six years at the rank of Associate Professor; however promotion after a shorter period of time, when based on outstanding achievement, shall not be precluded.

Because the promotion decision involves an assessment of the candidate's achievements over a period of time rather than a review of the candidate's output in a single year, evaluation standards for promotion to Full Professor may differ from the performance criteria set out for the annual evaluation of faculty in Appendix C.

Part Two: Common Evidence

Research and Publication

The Department expects all faculty members to publish one substantial refereed journal article or its equivalent each year. Accordingly, a **minimum** of five such refereed journal articles are expected beyond the level required for promotion to Associate Professor. However, the publication of the minimum total number of articles may not be sufficient to justify promotion to full professor if the one-per-year standard is not achieved. The attainment of (or failure to attain) the above stated minimum research expectations does not guarantee an affirmative (or negative) promotion decision.

Promotion to full professor requires more than the publication of a certain number of articles. It requires evidence of an on-going research program that has achieved professional recognition.

Typically this means that the candidate will have completed a large project, beyond the doctoral dissertation, that may take the form of related articles or a book or monograph.

Evidence of outstanding quality and impact **may** be cause for the Promotion Committee to act favorably in instances where the minimum number of publications is not met. Similarly, insufficient evidence of quality and impact may be cause for a negative recommendation even when the minimum number has been met.

Teaching and Advising

Teaching performance shall be evaluated according to the current methods in the Department. The candidate's performance may be judged, but is not limited to, student evaluations; the candidate is encouraged to provide additional evidence such as peer evaluations, course syllabi, and narratives describing innovative teaching methods or new course content.

One indicator of truly outstanding teaching is the receipt of a University-wide award or its equivalent. Receipt of a College-wide award should be deemed to significantly exceed the expected level of achievement.

Advising shall be a factor in the promotion decision. The number of students advised and their degree level, and, if available, advisee evaluations of the candidate's advising role shall be considered.

Professionalism and Service

The candidate is expected to have supported the professional activities of his/her colleagues, and to have represented the Department favorably in the University, the profession, and the community.

Service includes, but is not limited to, University or professional association committees, boards, and offices. The Promotion Committee shall assess the quantity and quality of service, and consider external letters of appreciation, offices held, or other indications of activities which utilize the candidate's professional expertise for the benefit of the University, the profession, or the community.

The Promotion Committee's judgment concerning the candidate's willingness to undertake a fair share of the Department's, College's, and University's governance activities, and to contribute to an atmosphere of professionalism shall be an important factor in the evaluation.

One indicator of truly outstanding service or professionalism is the receipt of a University-wide award; receipt of a College level award should be deemed to significantly exceed the expected level of achievement.

January 2000
May 2001
November 2003
October 2004
June 2005

Appendix C

GUIDELINES FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY

I. THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION

It is the duty of the Chair to evaluate the performance of each faculty member. The purposes of the annual performance evaluation include: (1) serving as a basis for merit salary increases, (2) guiding the faculty member and Chair in planning professional development that will maximize the effectiveness of the faculty member's contributions, and (3) providing information to the process of periodic post-tenure review. The procedure for annual evaluations is as follows.

In January of each year each faculty member shall complete the Annual Activities Report form, which lists the previous calendar year's activities and accomplishments in teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service and outreach. Evidence of these activities and accomplishments shall also be provided, including a brief self-evaluation.

The Chair shall use the evidence submitted by the faculty member and the benchmark expectations set out in the subsequent sections of these guidelines to determine the performance category of each faculty member. The Advisory Committee will advise the Chair, but the final determination resides with the Chair.

The Chair shall use the Annual Faculty Evaluation to inform each faculty member of his or her evaluation. The evaluation summary forms will be made available for the review of all members of the Eligible Faculty. In addition, each faculty member may give permission to open the rest of the Annual Activities Report for the review of other regular faculty.

Each faculty member shall meet with the Chair to discuss the evaluation of their past performance as well as their goals and plans for the coming year and beyond. At this time the Chair and faculty member will decide upon an effort distribution for the up-coming year that will be put into writing. If the annual evaluation identifies problem areas for any member of the faculty, this discussion should help him or her develop a strategy for resolving them.

If a faculty member questions or disagrees with the Chair's evaluation, the faculty member may (a) accept the evaluation under protest and attach a written statement to that effect, or (b) request a meeting with the Chair and the Advisory Committee, who shall meet with the faculty member within one week of the request, to review the evaluation. If, after the meeting, the Chair and the faculty member still disagree over the evaluation, the faculty member may appeal to the Tenure Committee, which shall meet within one week, review all materials relevant to the evaluation, and offer a recommendation to the Chair. The Chair shall subsequently render his or her final decision. The faculty member has the right to accept the Chair's decision, to accept the decision under protest, or to appeal the decision through the University grievance procedures.

II. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The performance of a faculty member shall be classified as either unsatisfactory, below expectations, meets expectations, exceeds expectation, or superior. “Unsatisfactory” and “superior” should be rarely used categories, reserved for cases of glaring weakness on the one hand and especially meritorious performance on the other. “Below expectations” refers to performance that needs improvement. “Meets expectations” means that performance demonstrates sufficient effort, innovation and/or effectiveness to merit departmental approval. “Exceeds expectations” refers to exemplary performance that merits praise. The Chair shall assign one of these classifications as a description of each faculty member's performance level.

The overall evaluation shall be based upon the evaluations of teaching and advising, research and scholarship, and service. Each faculty member's effort distribution, as determined by agreement with the Chair (see section VI), will be used to weight the evaluation of teaching, research and service. For the purpose of applying the performance evaluation to the merit salary exercise, each evaluation area shall be assigned points as follows: unsatisfactory = 0, below expectations = 1, meets expectations = 2, exceeds expectations = 3, and superior = 4. An overall merit index shall be determined by calculating the weighted sum of the three evaluation areas. Merit salary increases will be apportioned according to the distribution of the overall scores merit indices.

A. TEACHING AND ADVISING

As an economics department with a Ph.D program, the Department is unusual in that it views teaching as being equal in importance with research. The Department strives to promote excellence in the teaching, advising, and mentoring it provides to its students. It expects faculty members to inspire their students to fulfill their intellectual potential, to become active citizens, and to engage in fulfilling and productive careers.

According to the *Faculty Manual*, “Excellent teachers are characterized by their command of subject mater; logical organization and presentation of course material; forming interrelationships among fields of knowledge; energy and enthusiasm; availability to help students outside of class; arousing curiosity, creativity and critical thought; engaging students in the learning process; providing clear grading criteria; responding respectfully to student questions and ideas... Effective advising of students, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, is a vital part of the teaching-learning process. It is characterized by being available to students, keeping appointments, providing accurate and appropriate advice, and providing knowledgeable guidance.”

1. Performance Levels

The evaluation of teaching and advising will be based on the faculty member's activity during the calendar year under review. The general classifications for teaching and advising shall be:

Superior: For performance that is significantly better than that which falls into the “exceeds expectations” category. A rating of “superior” is typically achieved by the receipt of a University or professional teaching award in combination with other evidence of teaching effort, innovation and/or effectiveness that would place the faculty member in the “exceeds expectations” category.

Exceeds Expectations: For performance that significantly exceeds the department's norm. A rating of "exceeds expectations" is typically achieved by the receipt of a College teaching award in combination with other evidence of teaching effort, innovation and/or effectiveness that would place the faculty member in the "meets expectations" category.

Meets Expectations: For high quality performance that meets Departmental norms with respect to teaching effort, innovation and/or effectiveness. All faculty members are expected to have strong student evaluations and to show evidence of ongoing course improvements.

Below Expectations: For performance that needs improvement to meet Departmental expectations.

Unsatisfactory: For the failure to hold classes or for performance that consistently fails to meet the minimum standards of the department for competent and professional conduct.

2. Evidence

Each faculty member shall submit a portfolio to document teaching and advising effort, innovation, and effectiveness.

A standard portfolio is expected to include a course syllabus for each course taught, examples of exams, problem sets, and other assignments, number results and comments from student surveys, information on undergraduate advising and mentoring, information on graduate students successfully advised, and a self-evaluation of teaching methods and student progress toward course and departmental objectives.

Teaching and advising performance will be judged "meets expectations" with the submission of standard portfolio, unless there is clear evidence of a higher or lower level of performance.

A portfolio that seeks to establish performance levels of "exceeds expectations" or "superior" in teaching and advising is expected to include additional evidence beyond what is included in the standard portfolio, such as teaching awards, advising awards, peer reviews, consistently outstanding student evaluations, on-going participation in teaching or advising workshops, active involvement with student organizations, pedagogical grants, and co-authoring scholarly articles with students.

The advising of undergraduate and graduate students is an important part of faculty teaching responsibilities. Faculty members who serve as Ph.D. committee chairs will have their teaching/advising evaluation increased by one level for every three committees that reach completion beginning in 2008. Chairing three M.A. committees is considered to be equivalent to chairing one Ph.D. committee.

B. RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

Each faculty member shall submit evidence of research and scholarship. The Chair's evaluation of a faculty member's research and scholarship shall be a fair reflection of that faculty member's contribution of knowledge and understanding to the economics profession as a whole, and to the faculty member's specific research fields in particular. The primary measure of this contribution shall be the quality and quantity of the faculty member's

published work; other measures, such as conference papers, working papers, and other unpublished work may also serve as measures of scholarly research productivity, but shall be considered work in progress. The Chair will work with faculty members to help them meet their research goals.

It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member to make a case for variations of the following standards, with supporting evidence.

Faculty members are expected to carry out research that results in the publication of at least one “standard” journal article or the equivalent per year on average. Faculty members who fall below this standard should speak with the Chair about their research goals and progress. They should consider increasing their teaching load and decreasing the evaluation weight placed upon research as a means of maintaining their overall professional contributions to the Department.

A “standard” journal article is a peer-reviewed article published in an academic journal. A book chapter published in an edited volume is considered to be equivalent to a standard journal article. Peer-reviewed books shall be counted as two to five standard journal articles, depending upon length, substance, quality and the reputation of the publisher. Articles published in “top” journals shall be counted as two to five standard journal articles depending upon the ranking of the journal and whether it is a top journal in its field or overall. (See Appendix D for journal rankings. These rankings can change over time, and faculty members may present evidence that the current ranking of a journal should be adjusted.) Collaborative work is typically evaluated in the same way as sole authored work; however, the Chair and the Advisory Committee may ask for information about the contribution of the faculty member to coauthored work, and may adjust the publication count if they believe there is a reason to do so.

Editing volumes, publishing book reviews, or contributing encyclopedia articles normally are considered forms of professional service.

Reprints and citations may also serve to measure the impact of a publication. These normally occur well after the credit for the publication has been given, and primarily play a role in assessing a candidate’s record for promotion or awards. Faculty members are encouraged to keep track of their citations and to include them in the paper record established by the evaluation process. The accumulation from 2008 onwards of twenty citations (excluding self-citations) to a single article shall be counted as an additional standard publication.

Evaluation of research performance shall be based on research output defined as the equally weighted average of two quantities: 1/ standard journal articles published in the calendar year under review, and 2/ the average number of standard journal articles published in the three previous calendar years. Scholarly research performance shall be classified according to the following criteria:

	For faculty with 40% effort on Research	For faculty with 30% effort on Research
For a rating of Superior	4 or more in the Current Year AND an annual average of 4 or more over the preceding three years AND at least one current publication in a journal rated above standard.	3 or more in the Current Year AND an annual average of 3 or more over the preceding three years AND at least one current publication in a journal rated above standard.
For a rating of Exceeds Expectations	4 > Research Output \geq 2	3 > Research Output \geq 1.5
For a rating of Meets Expectations	2 > Research Output \geq 1	1.5 > Research Output \geq 0.75
For a rating of Below Expectations	1 > Research Output > 0	0.75 > Research Output > 0
For a rating of Unsatisfactory	Failure to sustain ongoing research	Failure to sustain ongoing research

Faculty whose Ph.D. completion or appointment at Colorado State University occurred fewer than three years ago shall have quantity expectations reduced proportionately. Faculty members with unusual Research effort distribution will be evaluated relative to reasonably *pro rata* expectations on the basis of effort percentage.

C. SERVICE AND OUTREACH

Service contributions primarily include funded research, activities on department, college, and university programs and committees, and service in professional organizations. Outreach includes public talks on professional matters, testimony before governmental committees, professional efforts on behalf of community development, paid professional consulting, and contract research for external constituents. Non-refereed publications are a form of communication with the public and count as a service contribution. Faculty who devote much of their time to externally funded research not leading to publication may wish to consider increasing the weight placed upon service in their annual evaluations. Any adjustment of the service/outreach weight above the standard 10 percent should be made only for activity that is distinctly identified and significantly time-consuming, and the performance of which can be concretely ascertained by the Chair.

Service and outreach activities will only be counted if they are professional in nature. Extra-professional involvements with the community (such as volunteer work) are commendable but do not constitute service activities for the purpose of the annual evaluation.

Funded research is considered to be especially valuable to the University. Faculty members typically are not required to apply for external funding, but they are encouraged to do so. The application for external funding, even if that funding is not received, will count as a service contribution. External funding of any amount that is processed through the University shall increase the service evaluation by one level (assuming a 10% weight on service/outreach). Larger grants can increase the weight on service along with the evaluation level with course buy-outs and corresponding reductions in teaching.

Service and outreach activities should be documented in a portfolio which provides evidence of their quantity and quality. Some committees take more time than others; some

conferences are more prestigious than others; some funded research projects are larger and more influential than others; some positions in professional organizations are more important and time consuming than others; some editorial tasks are more demanding than others. It is the responsibility of each faculty member to argue and document their case as to the extent and impact of their service and outreach efforts.

It is understood that junior members of the faculty may need to restrict their service activities in order to meet the minimum research and teaching standards for tenure. Senior members of the faculty are expected to bear their fair share of the service burden. Service to the profession and public may offset university service and vice versa. The evaluation of service and outreach will be based on the faculty member's activity during the calendar year under review. The performance classification shall reflect the number of service activities, the level or extent of involvement, and, where possible, the quality of the service activity.

Superior: For quantity and/or quality of service that is significantly greater than the "exceeds expectations" standard.

Exceeds Expectations: For quantity and/or quality of service that is significantly greater than the "meets expectations" standard.

Meets Expectations: For service and outreach efforts which add up to several hours per week.

Below Expectations: For service and outreach efforts which add up to several hours per month.

Unsatisfactory: For the failure to perform the minimally acceptable amount of service and outreach.

Appendix D

RANKING OF SCHOLARLY JOURNALS

I. Top journals, A-list

Articles published in these journals shall be counted as equivalent to *five* standard journal articles

A. General journals

1. *American Economic Review*
2. *Econometrica*
3. *Journal of Economic Literature*
4. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*
5. *Journal of Political Economy*
6. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*

II. Top journals, B-list

Articles published in these journals shall be counted as equivalent to *three* standard journal articles

A. General journals

1. *Review of Economic Studies*
2. *Economic Journal*
3. *European Economic Review*
4. *International Economic Review*
5. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*
6. *Journal of Economic Theory*
7. *Review of Economics and Statistics*

B. Field journals

1. *Journal of Public Economics*
2. *Journal of Monetary Economics*
3. *Journal of Econometrics*
4. *Journal of Law and Economics*

III. Top journals, C-list

Articles published in these journals shall be counted as equivalent to *two* standard journal articles

A. General journals

1. *Economic Inquiry*
2. *Southern Economic Journal*
3. *Rand Journal of Economics*
4. *AER Papers and Proceedings*
5. *Journal of Economic Growth*
6. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*
7. *Economic Letters*

- B. Field journals
 - 1. Development economics
 - a. *Journal of Development Economics*
 - b. *World Development*
 - 2. International economics
 - a. *Journal of International Economics*
 - b. *Journal of International Money and Finance*
 - 3. Labor economics
 - a. *Journal of Labor Economics*
 - b. *Journal of Human Resources*
 - 4. Health economics
 - a. *Journal of Health Economics*
 - b. *Health Economics*
 - 5. Environmental economics
 - a. *Ecological Economics*
 - b. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*
 - 6. Macroeconomics
 - a. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*
 - b. *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control*
 - 7. Public Finance
 - a. *National Tax Journal*
 - b. *Public Finance Review*
 - 8. Political Economy
 - a. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*
 - b. *Feminist Economics*
 - 9. Personal Finance
 - a. *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty*
 - b. *Journal of Risk and Insurance*
 - 10. Econometrics
 - a. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*
 - b. *Econometric Theory*
 - 11. Regional economics
 - a. *Journal of Regional Science*
 - b. *Journal of Urban Economics*

IV. Standard journals

All other refereed economics journals