

## Memorandum of Faculty Governance

Department of Resource Economics  
University of Massachusetts Amherst

### *Adopted October 2017*

*Article 5 (UMass Tax School) amended May 2, 2018*

*Article 3.7 (Voting Rights) amended May 4, 2018*

*Appendix 1 (Guidelines for Faculty Annual Evaluations and Merit Scoring) added May 8, 2018*

*Article 5 (UMass Tax School) amended April 17, 2019*

*Article 15 (Governance Amendment) amended December 18, 2019*

*Article 13.1 (Selection of Department Chair) amended December 4, 2020*

*Article 4.1.3 (Means of Election), 4.2.2 (Executive Committee), 4.3 (USC), 4.5 (Willis Experimental Lab Committee), 5. (UMass Tax School), amended November 19, 2021*

*Article 4.6 (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee added November 19, 2021*

- 1. Statement of Principle:** Effective governance supports structures and practices that help to create a collegial environment and efficient procedures with which to conduct the affairs of the department.
- 2. Department name & general provisions.** In accordance with Article 12 of the UMass-MSP Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), these Bylaws have been adopted by a majority vote of the faculty of the Department of Resource Economics (the “Department”) in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (the “College”) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst (the “University” or “UMass”). Federal and state laws, UMass Trustee policies (including, but not limited to, T76-081, the Academic Personnel Policy, *aka* the “Red Book”), the CBA, and other established university policies will prevail in instances of conflict with these bylaws. These bylaws may not be construed to limit the rights of the Administration as preserved by Article 4 of the CBA. Those rights include, but are not limited to, the management of budgets, the management of curriculum delivery, the management of space and equipment, and the performance of all responsibilities related to personnel actions as prescribed by the CBA and the Red Book. As required by Article 12, these bylaws are subject to review by the Administration and MSP to ensure that the bylaws do not conflict with prevailing laws, policies, and the CBA; such review must occur before the bylaws or their amendments take effect.
- 3. Faculty membership, rights, privileges and responsibilities:** The Department’s faculty (the “Faculty”) includes all faculty in the Department without regard to bargaining-unit status, tenure status, or full-time equivalency. In general, all members of the Faculty have both the right and duty to participate in governance of the Department, including voting on matters brought before the Faculty, except as specified otherwise below and elsewhere in these Bylaws. Jointly appointed Tenure Track Faculty whose tenure home is in the Department are classified with the Tenure Track Faculty throughout, unless otherwise noted.
  - 3.1. Non-Unit Faculty.** Non-unit faculty (Department chair, associate deans, deans, and other non-unit administrators) may not participate as voting members in personnel actions governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Such non-unit faculty members may not serve on the core DPC and may not participate as members of the Faculty in promotion and tenure cases. Non-unit faculty may participate in other aspects of academic governance (such as curricular decision-making and faculty searches), provided those faculty do not have separate administrative purview over the same matters.
  - 3.2. Graduate Faculty.** Only Faculty who have been designated Graduate Faculty by the Dean of the Graduate School may deliberate and vote on graduate program and graduate curricular matter.

- 3.3. Part-Time Lecturers.** Part-time bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE less than 50% may have access to relevant information and may deliberate on all programmatic and undergraduate curricular matters but may not vote on such matters.
- 3.4. Full-Time Lecturers.** Bargaining-unit non-Graduate Faculty with an FTE of 50% or greater, without regard to tenure status, should have access to relevant information and may deliberate and vote on all programmatic and undergraduate curricular matters.
- 3.5. Duty to Participate in Governance.** Except where the composition of an individual’s assigned workload would prohibit such an obligation, all members of the Faculty have a responsibility to participate in governance of the Department and in service to the Department, the School/College, and the University.
- 3.6. Rights and Duties of Faculty on Leave.** Faculty on paid leave (including, but not limited to, parental leave and sabbatical leave) and faculty on unpaid leave maintain their rights but not their responsibilities during the leave to exercise their rights to participate in the governance of the Department. Faculty on paid sick leave maintain their rights but not their responsibilities to participate to the extent permitted by their physician. Unless the leave is taken in an emergency, faculty on leave must make prior arrangements for students who may be affected by the leave.
- 3.7. Voting rights:** The following table defines voting rights within the Department. (*Amended May 4, 2018*)

<b>Voting Issue</b>	<b>Voting Rights</b>
Who Elects Department Personnel Committee	Tenure Track Faculty and Full-Time Lecturers, excluding non-unit Faculty.
Who Elects College Personnel Committee Member	Tenure Track Faculty and Full-Time Lecturers, excluding non-unit Faculty.
Who Votes on Promotion to Full Professor	Members of Department Personnel Committee.
Who Votes on Promotion to Associate Professor/Tenure	Members of Department Personnel Committee.
Who Votes to recommend members of Department Chair Search Committee to the DPC	Tenure Track Faculty and Full-Time Lecturers
Who Votes on the Search Committee’s recommendation(s) for Department Chair	Tenure Track Faculty, Full-Time Lecturers, and Full-Time Staff
Who Votes on Graduate Curriculum and Program	Members of the Graduate Faculty, including the Department Chair
Who Votes on Undergrad Curriculum and Program	Tenure Track Faculty and Full-Time Lecturers, including the Department Chair
Who Votes on Research and Grant Policy	Tenure Track Faculty, including the Department Chair
Who Votes on Hiring Faculty Members & Lecturers	Tenure track faculty, Full Time Lecturers, and Department Chair. The vote is advisory in nature.
Who Votes on Bylaws Approval and Amendments	Tenure-Track faculty and Full-Time and Part-Time Lecturers, including the Department Chair

**4. Standing Committees:** The Department maintains the following standing committees.

#### **4.1. Department Personnel Committee (DPC):**

- 4.1.1.** All of the Department's Faculty will annually elect a core DPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA, including reviewing the Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation of every member of the Department's Faculty; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotion and tenure applications within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all reappointments of tenure-track Faculty within the Department; reviewing and making recommendations on all promotions of non-tenure-system faculty; participating in Periodic Multi-Year Review of Faculty as prescribed by the CBA; reviewing and determining Pool A allocations of merit pay among the Department's eligible Faculty as provided for by the CBA; reviewing and making recommendations for anomaly adjustments to salaries as provided for by the CBA; leading the review process for potential reappointment of the Chair/Head. The DPC may participate in departmental nominations for various awards or honors as they arise and when appropriate.
- 4.1.2.** Composition and Eligibility. The core DPC will consist of three tenured Faculty. The following process will be used to determine eligibility for election to the DPC:
  - 4.1.2.1.** All tenured faculty are eligible for election.
  - 4.1.2.2.** If a faculty member is on leave of any type during the year or during a semester (sabbatical, parental, medical), they will be excluded for the year.
  - 4.1.2.3.** If a member of the DPC must leave the committee, a special election will be held to replace that person. All eligible faculty who are not on leave at the time can be elected.
  - 4.1.2.4.** If a faculty member is themselves the subject of a major personnel action (e.g., promotion to Full Professor), in keeping with UMass policies and procedures, if they were to serve they would recuse themselves from deliberations and votes on their own case. In this situation, a special election will be held to replace this person on the DPC for this personnel action.
  - 4.1.2.5.** No faculty may serve for more than three consecutive years on the DPC, unless this is not feasible, to achieve the goal of spreading representation on the DPC as widely as possible over time among eligible faculty members.
- 4.1.3.** Means of Election. Prior to the end of the spring semester, the DPC Chair will initiate an election for DPC members to serve from September through August of the next academic year and will verify the eligibility of the Faculty members on the ballot. The secret ranked-choice vote will occur by simultaneous written or emailed ballot. The Director of Administration and Finance will tally votes and the results will be shared with the current DPC Chair. There will be no discussion between Faculty members and the Director of Administration and Finance regarding the votes during the election period. In the event of a tie, there will be a run-off election.
- 4.1.4.** Chair of the DPC. The members elected to the DPC will determine the chair of the committee. If the DPC cannot agree on a chair, then the member with the most faculty votes will be the chair.
- 4.1.5.** Independence of the DPC. On personnel actions for which the CBA identifies independent roles for the DPC and the Chair – such as AFR reviews, reappointment, promotion, tenure, PMYRs, merit-pay allocations, and anomaly recommendations – the DPC will operate independently, and the Chair must not attempt by any means to influence the deliberations or judgment of the members of the DPC.
- 4.1.6.** DPC Meetings and Operations. All members of the DPC must participate in deliberations and voting for which they are eligible. Non-unanimous votes will be reported as such. As the DPC addresses confidential personnel matters, DPC meetings will not be open to non-DPC members.

**4.1.7. DPC Consideration of Merit Pay.** When the CBA authorizes the award of merit pay and authorizes the DPC to recommend or determine the amounts of merit pay to be allocated to individual members of the Faculty, the DPC must adhere to the CBA's terms for eligibility and the basis of evaluation for such allocations. The DPC may not exclude from consideration any merit-eligible member of the Faculty based on tenure status, rank, full-time equivalency, or constraint of assigned duties.

**4.2. Department Executive Committee (DEC)**

**4.2.1.** DEC purview. The DEC advises and assists the Chair in the management of the Department, reports on the DEC members' operational areas, and promotes communications between the Chair, the Faculty and the Staff.

**4.2.2.** DEC composition. The DEC includes the following members: the Department Chair, the chair of the DPC, the Undergraduate Program Director, the Graduate Program Director, the chair of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee, and the Director of Administration and Finance.

**4.3 Undergraduate Studies Committee (USC):** The undergraduate curriculum is managed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Undergraduate Program Director and the Chair of the Department. Faculty groups in undergraduate focus areas may consult with the Undergraduate Studies Committee, the Undergraduate Program Director, and the Chair of the Department with respect to undergraduate curriculum development. Undergraduate students in Resource Economics will meet the requirements agreed to by the faculty through the Undergraduate Studies Committee. The undergraduate curriculum is certified through a vote of Tenure Track Faculty and Full-Time Lecturers, including the Department Chair.

**4.4 Graduate Studies Committee (GSC):** The graduate curriculum is managed by the Graduate Studies Committee, Graduate Program Director, and Chair of the Department. Faculty research groups may consult with the Graduate Studies Committee, Graduate Program Director and Chair of the Department with respect to graduate curriculum development (suggestions for new courses, research emphases, teaching assignments, etc.). Graduate students in Resource Economics will meet the requirements agreed to by the faculty through the Graduate Studies Committee. The graduate curriculum is certified through a vote by Resource Economics Graduate Faculty.

**4.5 Willis Experimental Lab Committee:** The Department of Resource Economics administers the Cleve Willis Experimental Economics Laboratory. The primary purpose of the Lab is to conduct controlled economic experiments. It is also understood that the Lab can be used for teaching purposes including classes, testing and tutorials, but that the conduct of experiments takes precedence over these other uses. The Cleve Willis Experimental Economics Laboratory is managed by a standing committee of the Departmental Faculty, the Director of Administration and Finance, and the Department's IT and Technical Support person. All members of the Department are welcome to use the lab for both research and teaching purposes.

**4.6 Diversity, Equity and Inclusion committee (DEI):** The Department's DEI committee is charged with advising the Department Executive Committee and department on matters related to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Additionally, it provides a space where faculty, staff, or students can voice concerns related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

**4.7 Service Obligations:** Resource Economics faculty will rotate through major service obligations

to principal committees including: Undergraduate Studies Committee; Graduate Studies Committee; Graduate Program Director and Undergraduate Program Director. Pre-tenure faculty are not typically asked to be Program Directors and only Graduate Faculty can serve on the Graduate Studies Committee or as Graduate Program Director. Terms shall last no more than three years. At the end of a term, faculty can request reappointment to the committee or to the major service position for a maximum of two consecutive terms. In making such appointments the Chair will consider representation of faculty groups on committees and may consult with the DPC regarding both the equitable division of labor and representation of instructional/research areas. The Undergraduate Program Director is asked to work with the Chief Undergraduate Advisor to advise and support the undergraduate student association, the Resource Economics Society, and sit on the Scholarship Committee. The Graduate Program Director is asked to coordinate the 1-credit Seminar in Resource Economics for first-year graduate students as part of her/his assignment.

5. **UMass Tax School:** The Department of Resource Economics administers the UMass Tax School for the purpose of providing continuing education for professional tax practitioners. The UMass Tax School is part of an educational program developed by the Land Grant University Tax Education Foundation Inc. and approved by the Internal Revenue Service. The UMass Tax School is managed ultimately by the Department Chair. As appointing authority, the Department Chair hires a qualified and experienced individual to be the Tax School Director. The Director hires program instructors approved by the Department Chair. The Department Chair in consultation with the Director and the Director of Administration and Finance hires an administrative assistant for the program. The program's administrative staff and instructors are paid by the UMass Tax School. All hiring must be consistent with UMass hiring policy. *(Amended April 17, 2019)*

## 6. Tenure-System Faculty Search Committees and Procedures

- a. **Planning.** The Department will review its current hiring plan each year during a fall faculty meeting. Any faculty member has the opportunity to make a hiring case for a new tenure-stream colleague to the Chair at any time. Proposed positions should reflect some or all of the following considerations: strategic planning, departmental identity and intersections with current faculty; composition of the faculty including recent hires and anticipated departures; diversity; curricular demands and considerations; graduate training; campus priorities; field or market developments; and compelling ideas and prospects. If a general hiring solicitation is made from the Dean, the Chair will rely on the current hiring plan or will draft a modified hiring plan to fit with the Dean's solicitation with input from the faculty. If the Dean requires the Department Chair to rank, select or prioritize cases for hiring, the Chair will provide a priority rationale using the list of considerations above and will discuss the recommendation with the faculty.
- b. **Appointment of search committees.** Search committees of three to four faculty will be assembled by the Department Chair with the goal of ensuring that the necessary research and teaching expertise exists on the committee as well as attending to committee diversity. The Department Chair will appoint the Search Committee Chair. The Search Committee will collaborate with the Department Chair to develop the position description, advertising/recruitment plan, and other elements of the hiring requisition. In general, the Search Committee is charged with reviewing all applications and deciding upon a short list (15 – 25 applicants) to be interviewed at the winter Allied Social Sciences Association meetings. These short 30 to 45 minute interviews will be used to

select finalists (3 to 5 applicants) for on-campus interviews. The Search Committee may use a different method of selecting finalists if the situation warrants.

- c. Reviewing, recommending, and ratifying. For tenure-track searches, all Department of Resource Economics faculty (both Tenure Track and Lecturers) will have access to the CVs and job market papers of the finalists. The Department Chair and any faculty (other than the Search Committee) who wish to view additional applicant materials may do so only after first signing the appropriate confidentiality statement. At the close of the on-campus interview visits, feedback regarding finalists will be solicited in two ways. First, an online feedback form asking about strengths and weaknesses of each finalist, as well as the basis on which those assessments are being made (e.g., read materials, met over a meal, attended job talk), will be distributed to all faculty members and graduate students. Second, as early as possible after the last finalist's departure, the faculty, graduate students and staff will provide verbal feedback and engage in discussion during a meeting with the Search Committee and Department Chair. These discussions will be followed by the Search Committee's own deliberation, which will consider feedback from the rest of the Department.
- d. Soon after the Department meeting and discussion, the Search Committee will conduct an advisory vote by an online ballot (or email ballot) among all full-time Department faculty (tenure track and full-time lecturers). The Search Committee will devise a voting procedure to elicit a ranking of the finalists.
- e. The results of the vote are made known to the faculty and the Department Chair. The search Committee and the Department Chair will make separate hiring recommendations to the Dean, as required, with the results of the faculty vote and Department discussion included.
- f. In keeping with Trustees' procedures, new faculty appointments with tenure must additionally be ratified by the DPC, following tenure review.
- g. For special hiring opportunities (for example, partner hires), the DPC may act as a proxy for a Search Committee and will review and issue a recommendation to the faculty regarding whether to pursue the hire. The process outlined in 4.3 through 4.6 will be followed.
- h. Role of Faculty in Tenure-System Searches & Selection. All tenure-system members of the Department's faculty have a duty to engage in the search and selection process from the beginning of the campus-interview phase through the faculty vote to rank the acceptable finalists. In order to fulfill that duty, the faculty should inform themselves by reviewing candidates' application materials and attending candidates' public sessions. The Department's lecturers are welcome to engage in the search and selection process but they do not have a duty to do so. Only full-time lecturers are eligible to vote on the ranking of acceptable finalists.
- i. Conflicts of Interest. A real or perceived conflict of interest between an applicant and a Faculty member engaged in the search process must be disclosed and must be managed, mitigated, or eliminated. The principles underlying the above prescription include:
  - i. Neither professional nor personal relationships between applicants and evaluators should influence or appear to influence the selection decision.

- ii. When such relationships exist, the evaluator must disclose the relationship.
- iii. Management, mitigation, or elimination of such conflicts should occur as follows: (1) Search committee members engaged in a personal relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving that particular applicant. In most cases, a search committee member with a personal relationship with an applicant who has reached the campus-interview list should recuse him/herself from the committee's work, including deliberations over other applicants. (2) Search committee members engaged in a close professional relationship with an applicant must disclose the relationship to others involved in the evaluation of the candidate and must recuse him/herself from any deliberations involving the applicant but may vote along with other department faculty on all applicants. (3) A search committee member with a distant professional relationship (few collaborations or collaborations older than five years) with an applicant who has reached the shortlist need not recuse him/herself from the committee's work but should disclose the relationship to others involved in evaluation of the candidate. The Faculty member may participate in all discussions of that applicant and need not abstain from voting on any applicant.

7. **Non-Tenure-Track (NTT) Faculty Search Committees & Procedures:** The Department will conduct individual non-tenure-track faculty searches using the same procedures as those described above for tenure-system faculty searches with these exceptions:
- a. **Committee Composition.** Committees composed for NTT searches need not favor senior or tenure-system faculty and should include at least one current NTT faculty member if the Department has such a faculty member available whose workload composition would permit such participation.
  - b. **Purview of Search Committees in NTT Searches.** The purview of the search committee in NTT faculty searches is the same as that for tenure-system faculty searches except that in lieu of convening to deliberate on the finalists, the committee may solicit feedback from all of the Department's faculty after the last campus interview; will write a recommendation that reflects the faculty's feedback, the committee's ranking of the acceptable finalists, and the committee's rationale for that ranking.
  - c. **Role of the Faculty in NTT Searches.** The Department's faculty have a duty to engage in searches for NTT faculty whose appointments are 50% FTE or greater due to the potential for such faculty eventually achieving continuing appointments.
8. **Representation by Faculty on College- and University-Level Committees.** Tenure-system faculty have a duty to serve on college- and university-level committees and in similar service roles. Service on the following committees, however, is by election as described below:
- a. **College Personnel Committee (CPC).** Tenure-Track Faculty and Full-Time Lecturers, excluding non-unit Faculty, will vote to elect one representative to the CPC to perform the functions assigned to it by the CBA every two years. Eligibility for service on the CPC will be limited to full-time tenured faculty who have achieved the rank of Associate Professor. The Department's CPC representative should not also be on the Department Personnel Committee, thus the vote for the CPC representative will occur after the election of the DPC in the spring semester. Term limits are determined by the College.

- b. College Review Committee (CRC). The CRC reviews the promotion applications of Lecturers and senior Lecturers and is elected at large across the College by Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer. The Department's Faculty with any form of the title Lecturer may be asked to serve as a member of the CRC.
9. **Meetings:** The Department Chair will schedule at least three faculty meetings per semester at a time and day when most Faculty can be in attendance for the purpose of conducting departmental business. The dates of the meetings will be announced at the beginning of the semester. The Department Chair will publish the agenda, together with items that will be discussed and then voted on, ahead of each meeting. All votes will be conducted by secret ballot (written or emailed). The Union may request to appear at a regularly or specially scheduled department meeting. This request shall be granted at least once per year provided the request is made at least ten working days in advance of said meeting.
10. **Semi-Annual budget report:** At the final faculty meeting each semester, the Department Chair will report broadly on the departmental budget for the current fiscal year and projections for the semester or fiscal year to come, including discretionary account balances, anticipated programmatic revenues and expenditures, significant changes (if any) in TA and part-time instructional resources, revenue programs, fund-raising efforts, expected consequences of University and College budget cuts or new revenues, etc.
11. **Department Specifications for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT).** All standards and most procedures related to reappointment, promotion, and tenure of Faculty are governed by the CBA and the Red Book. The following additional terms do not alter or interpret those standards and procedures but instead set department-level specifications where the CBA and Red Book permit local control.
- a. External Reviews of RPT Cases.
    - i. Personnel Actions Requiring External Reviews. All promotion and all tenure cases for tenure-system faculty require external reviews (as specified in the Red Book and CBA). Reappointments of tenure-system faculty during their probationary periods do not require external reviews. Neither reappointments nor promotions for non-tenure-system faculty require external reviews; however, as permitted by the CBA's Article 21, Lecturers may request external reviews.
    - ii. Number of External Reviews. The Department Chair will make a good-faith effort to secure at least ten "arm's-length" external reviews for every promotion and/or tenure case that requires external reviews. The Chair may solicit and add to the file any number of reviews from reviewers "close" to the candidate. Such close reviews are especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate's particular contributions to collaborative work.
    - iii. Identification and Solicitation of External Reviewers. The CBA charges the Department Chair with soliciting external reviewers and permits the candidate to suggest external reviewers. The Chair may consult with the DPC or other members of the Faculty in identifying appropriate external reviewers but may not delegate the solicitation process to others. Similarly, the Chair may receive assistance in describing the "standing" of each external reviewer in the candidate's file, but the Chair is ultimately responsible for ensuring that each description clearly and completely makes the case for why that external reviewer is well positioned to perform the review; this description should be crafted for academic audiences who are unfamiliar with the pertinent scholarly field. Under most circumstances, the solicitation of external reviews should occur no later than three months before the candidate's file submission deadline.



- iv. **Qualifications of External Reviewers.** In general, external reviewers should be well-recognized scholars or professionals in the candidate’s field, should hold the rank of Professor, should have active scholarly programs, and should be at institutions that are at least peers of UMass. External reviewers who do not meet these criteria may be appropriate and acceptable, but in describing the “standing” of such reviewers, the Chair should carefully explain why such reviewers are appropriate for the task of commenting on the candidate having met the relevant standards.
  - v. **Candidate’s Rights Regarding External Reviewers.** Before making such solicitations, the Chair must show the solicitation list and solicitation message to the candidate, who may comment on but may not demand changes to the list or message. A good faith effort should be made to balance the list with reviewers suggested by the candidate. If the candidate identifies a conflict of interest with any of the proposed reviewers, the Chair should assess whether a true conflict exists and, if one does, should eliminate, mitigate, or manage the conflict.
- b. Internal Reviews of RPT Cases.**
- i. **Identification & Solicitation of UMass Faculty & Staff Reviews.** The candidate and the Chair may identify potential reviewers internal to UMass Amherst. Such internal reviews are not required and should not be regarded as substitutes for external letters. Internal letters may be especially helpful in cases where the reviewer can describe the candidate’s particular contributions to collaborations within the department or across campus. The Chair must individually solicit such internal reviews.
  - ii. **Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews.** The Chair may solicit confidential comments from individual students. Written, signed comments from individual students—especially from those for whom the candidate has served as a teacher, advisor, mentor, or collaborator—are especially helpful in identifying the candidate’s work inside and outside the classroom. Such reviews should be individually solicited. The Chair may also solicit comments from groups of students; responses to such non-individual solicitations are never protected by the candidate’s waiver of access rights, and any “group solicitations” should advise potential respondents that their responses will not be confidential.
- c. Waiver of Rights of Access to Review Letters.** A candidate for RPT may waive or decline to waive her or his rights of access to internal and external review letters that have been individually solicited. The decision whether or not to waive those rights belongs exclusively to the candidate, and neither the Chair nor any other member of the Faculty should pressure the candidate to decide one way or another.
- d. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for RPT.** The CBA’s Article 33 requires that every department develop or adopt one or more modes appropriate to the evaluation of teaching in that unit and procedures for the administration of student evaluations of teaching. In compliance with that requirement, the Department adopts the following:
- i. **Student Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness in Classroom Settings.** All Faculty should use the centrally administered SRTI instrument to solicit and receive student evaluations in every course section taught. Faculty may not themselves administer or collect student evaluations. Individual Faculty may supplement but may not replace the SRTI instrument with other instrument(s).
  - ii. **Peer & Expert Evaluations of Teaching Effectiveness.** Untenured Faculty in their probationary period and NTT Faculty intending to seek promotion are encouraged to seek consultation and formative evaluations of their teaching effectiveness from the Institute for Teaching Effectiveness & Faculty Development. Such Faculty and

tenured Faculty expecting to apply for promotion within a year or two may solicit evaluations through direct observation of their teaching from peers inside or outside the Department. While peer and expert evaluations are not required of any Faculty member, they help provide valuable evidence in making a case for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.

- iii. Identification and Solicitation of Student Reviews. The Chair may solicit confidential comments from individual students. See 9.2.2 above.
- iv. Contributions to Program & Curriculum Development. Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to program and curriculum development (if any).
- e. Evidence of Effective Service for RPT. Applications for RPT should include evidence of the candidate's contributions to service. The CBA and Red Book require that all tenure-system Faculty engage in service. NTT faculty are required to engage in service only if it is part of their assigned duties. The CBA requires that service to the faculty union and service outside the Department be considered at the department level as part of any Faculty member's AFR or evaluation for RPT purposes. In general, Departmental service is given priority, but the consideration of service is inclusive, acknowledging the contributions that candidates make both inside and outside the Department and inside and outside the University. The extent to which service outside the University is relevant to a case for RPT depends on the pertinence of that service to the individual's professional profile or to advancement of the University's mission. Service may include that provided in governance or management of the Department, the College, the University, or the profession; that representing outreach to extend knowledge beyond the university/professional community; and that intended to promote community engagement as a benefit both to the university community and to the off-campus community. Especially important in promotion to Full Professor is evidence of leadership in making service contributions.

**12. Annual Faculty Review and Evaluation.** The CBA's Article 33 requires use of the bargained AFR form by every member of the Faculty who is 50% FTE or greater. The department expects all faculty to submit their AFR's in a timely manner. Faculty who fail to submit an AFR will not be considered by the DPC for Merit, or other Faculty Awards. The DPC and the Chair should substantively and candidly conduct their evaluations of each Faculty member's AFR.

**13. Department Chair:** The Department of Resource Economics shall be headed by a Chair who is responsible for providing leadership and ensuring proper procedures are followed at the departmental level. Other roles and responsibilities include: advocating for faculty resources, overseeing allocation of resources, coordinating administrative matters related to personnel actions, keeping faculty informed of their rights and responsibilities, appointment of administrative positions, ensuring compliance with University policies and collective bargaining agreements, evaluation of staff, and developing and maintaining long range planning . [See also 3.5 and 6.4 of the Redbook]

- a. Selection of Department Chair: The Department Chair will be determined in accordance with Faculty Senate guidelines and the guidelines that follow. (*Amended December 4, 2020*)
  - i. The DPC requests that all faculty (tenure-track and full-time non-tenure track) rank all eligible faculty members (tenure-track and full-time non-tenure-track) for the chair search committee (Committee). Before requesting the vote the DPC determines and shares with the faculty a method of aggregating faculty members' ranked choices. The DPC forwards the aggregated ranked list as advisory to the

Dean who, as the appointing authority, constitutes and charges the Committee. Per the Faculty Senate Guidelines (Sen. Doc. No. 90-029) the Committee will also include at least one outside faculty member. In addition, the Department urges the Dean to request Department staff to nominate a representative to serve on the Committee.

- ii. The Committee shall choose from among its members a committee chair.
  - iii. The Committee solicits candidate nominations from all faculty and staff (including self-nominations). Candidacy is established by nomination unless the nominee declines to be considered. Any Candidate on the Committee is excused from the Committee, and the Department urges the Dean to replace any Candidate based on the ranked list.
  - iv. Once the complete list of Candidates is known, the Committee solicits additional comments on the Candidates through interviews. All faculty and staff members have the opportunity to provide input on which member(s) of the Committee conduct(s) their interview. The information gathered through interviews is strictly confidential. The committee may choose to gather additional information through other means.
  - v. The Committee will strive for consensus in determining its recommendation based on the information gathered. The Committee presents its recommendation to both the Department and the Dean. If the Committee is unwilling to recommend any Candidate, the Committee shall begin the process again by soliciting additional nominations (see 13.1.3 above).
  - vi. The Committee conducts a vote by the Department to indicate acceptance or rejection of its recommendation. Eligibility to vote is regulated in point 3.7 of these bylaws. The ballot provides a **yes/no** choice for the voter. The Department accepts the recommendation with a majority of **yes** votes (more than 50 percent of votes cast).
  - vii. The result of the vote is forwarded to the Dean and the procedure outlined in the Faculty Senate guidelines (Sen. Doc. No. 90-029) is followed.
- b. **Term of Office:** The appointment of a faculty member as Chair of the Department should be made for a period of three years, with the possibility of renewal for another three-year term, with the consent of the faculty and the Dean.
- c. **Review of the Chair for Renewal:** If the Chair/Head wishes to be reappointed to another term in that position, the Department's Faculty, led by the DPC, will conduct a review of the Chair/Head during the fall semester of the final year of her/his appointment. The DPC will follow the procedures prescribed by Senate Document #82-021, beginning the process no later than December 31 during the final year of the Chair/Head's appointment.
- d. **Representation:** The Chair will consider representation across Department teaching and research areas when appointing Department committees. This does not pertain to the DPC because that committee is elected by the faculty and not appointed by the Chair.
- e. **Instruction:** Teaching assignments are allocated by the Chair of the Department. The preference of the Department is to have faculty teach in their areas of expertise. The Chair is guided in her/his allocations by a regular survey of faculty teaching preferences and discussions with faculty groups about teaching required courses for that major or option. All faculty should be able and willing to teach general education courses and the core undergraduate courses in microeconomic theory and quantitative methods when the need arises due to faculty leaves, retirements, etc.

- 14. Implementation of these bylaws:** By at least a two-thirds majority vote of the Faculty, these bylaws are adopted and take effect on October 26, 2017. The terms of these bylaws supersede existing policies or practices of the Department to the extent that the bylaws conflict with such policies and practices. However, if ongoing processes would be unreasonably disrupted by implementation of these bylaws, individual provisions of these bylaws may be deferred until those processes are complete. Deferral of individual provisions will not result in deferral of other provisions.
- 15. Governance amendments:** Amendments to any clause within this memorandum of governance can be introduced by any faculty member by requesting that the Chair add an agenda item to an upcoming faculty meeting. All faculty members must be informed of the proposed amendment at least one week prior to the meeting in which the amendment will be discussed. The Department Chair will circulate the amendment by email to all faculty following the meeting with any changes in the amendment noted as well as a summary of faculty discussion of the amendment. Any change to the memorandum of governance will require a positive two-thirds or greater vote among the full faculty (including all tenure-system and non-tenure system, see Article 3.7), conducted by online ballot or by email in order to include those on leave as well as those both present at and absent from the faculty meeting in which the amendment discussion occurred. The Department Chair has the right to vote on all changes to governance. Any change to governance that is passed can be deferred for a maximum of one year by a 2/3 majority vote of the faculty, otherwise it is effective immediately. *(Amended December 18, 2019)*

## **Appendix 1: Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation and Merit Scoring**

*Added May 8, 2018*

### Goals:

As distilled from discussions with the faculty, the goals for the merit score guidelines are:

1. To ensure fairness and transparency.
2. To reward productivity and excellence in research, teaching, and service.
3. To evaluate productivity and excellence in research, teaching, and service, and send the appropriate signals for tenure and promotion.

For each of research, teaching, and service, the elements to consider in the evaluations have been divided into two sub-categories, and a table was devised to facilitate scoring.

These criteria will be used by the Department Personnel Committee (DPC) to determine the merit score for each faculty member according to the following procedure:

- Each DPC member will separately rate each category (research, teaching, service) for each faculty member on a 0-5 scale on the basis of the criteria below and after having reviewed the AFR and other relevant material (see teaching section).
- Large discrepancies in scores between DPC members will be discussed. Once discrepancies are resolved, the ratings given by DPC members will be averaged for each category.
- The ratings will then be aggregated to a single 'score' using the weighting scheme presented in section 2 for tenure-track faculty, section 3 for lecturers, or section 4 if a special case applies in a given year.
- Individual share of the merit pool dollar amount will be determined as described in section 5.
- The DPC will send a memo to each faculty member that will specify the average scores that the individual received for each of research, teaching and service, as well as the weights applied to obtain the overall merit score. The memo will also include your expected proportion of the merit pool. The memo will not include the distribution of merit scores in the department.

### Outline:

1. Guidelines of Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation and Merit Scoring
  - 1.1 Research
  - 1.2 Teaching
  - 1.3 Service
2. Weights to be applied to each of Research (R), Teaching (T), Service (S) in percentage term
3. Guidelines for Lecturers Evaluation and Merit Scoring
4. Special Cases
  - 4.1 Unpaid Leaves
  - 4.2 Paid Leave – Sabbaticals
  - 4.3 Paid Leave – Parental and Sick Leaves
  - 4.4 Joint Appointments
5. Merit Distribution

# 1. Guidelines for Tenure-Track Faculty Evaluation and Merit Scoring

## 1.1 Research

### Research Scoring Table

		Publications			
		<i>None</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>
Pipeline	<i>None</i>	0	1	3	5
	<i>Low</i>	1	1	3-4	5
	<i>Medium</i>	2	2	3-4	5
	<i>High</i>	2 (other than 1 <sup>st</sup> two years) 3 (1 <sup>st</sup> 2 years)	2 (other than 1 <sup>st</sup> two years) 3 (1 <sup>st</sup> 2 years)	4	5

#### Things to consider when evaluating the pipeline:

- “In progress” work, # of working papers, # of submissions, # R&R, quality of journal.
- Presentations (conference, seminar, invited) and grant proposals submitted will improve your pipeline score. Grants funded will be even more beneficial.

\* For “in progress” work please specify in the AFR the work that has been done.

\*\* Please call a complete draft a “working paper” in your AFR.

- Expectations for “high” pipeline:
  - ⇒ Large number of papers ideally at all stages: revise and resubmit, submitted, working paper, in progress.
- Expectations for “medium” pipeline:
  - ⇒ Several papers in some of the following stages: R&R, submitted, working paper, in progress.
- Expectations for “low” pipeline:
  - ⇒ Light on the number of pipeline items.

#### Things to consider when evaluating publications:

# of publications, quality of publications

(While interdisciplinary work is valued, publications should be predominantly in economic journals)

- Expectations for “high” publications:
  - ⇒ Multiple papers, and at least one in a top field journal (or higher), or
  - ⇒ One paper in a top general economic or closely related field or top academic journal (e.g., Science, Nature).
- Expectations for “medium” publications:
  - ⇒ More than one paper published, but not in top field journals; or
  - ⇒ Only one publication, but it is in a top field journal.
- Expectations for “low” publication:
  - ⇒ At least one publication in a low quality journal.

+1 for a publication in a top 5 economic journal (AER, JPE, QJE, Econometrica, RESTUD)

## 1.2 Teaching:

### Teaching Scoring table

		Courses			
		<i>None*</i>	<i>Below</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Above</i>
Non-course	<i>None</i>	0	1	2	3
	<i>Below</i>	1	1	2	4
	<i>Meets</i>	2	2	3	5
	<i>Above</i>	2	3	4-5	5

\* Not teaching is a special case the committee plans to address later.

\*\* Assistant professors in their first two years, the DPC may give higher weight to courses than non-course activities if it improves the score. In other words, higher scores than what appear in the table can be obtained for having a small number of non-course activities in the first two years.

#### Things to consider when evaluating courses:

The DPC would like to support student experience and learning outcomes by incentivizing both the appropriate rigor of the course and faculty's investment in students' engagement activities. The DPC will thus consider the following elements in its evaluation of teaching.

- Course evaluations: SRTI Q1 through Q12 and comments, considerations for # students, response rate, and level/rigor of course, and graduate vs undergraduate courses.
  - New course preparations
  - Investments in the course or the teaching of it: changes in the course, new lectures, updates to increase relevance.
  - Engagement strategies as evidenced in the syllabus
  - Course overload (teaching an additional non-compensated course)
  - # of credits
  - Number of students
- 
- “Above” expectations with regards to courses:
    - ⇒ Exceptional teaching evaluations across all courses; or
    - ⇒ Strong teaching evaluations and teaching a course overload, or a large number of students/credits, or preparing a new course, significant course redesign, or significant investments in student engagement or experience, etc.
    - ⇒ University or professional association involvement or recognition, e.g., TEFD Lilly, Innovate, etc. will be recognized.
  - “Meets” expectations with regards to courses:
    - ⇒ Strong teaching evaluations, or evidence of student engagement activities, or other evidence of teaching effectiveness or effort.
    - ⇒ Pre-mini tenure: reasonable teaching evaluations and preparing a new course, or a large number of students (~>100)/credits, etc.
  - “Below” expectations with regards to courses:
    - ⇒ Low teaching evaluations and little evidence of student engagement or teaching effectiveness.

**Things to consider when evaluating non-course teaching:**

- Advising: PhD, MS (field essay, thesis).
- Advising undergrads (BDIC, independent studies, honors thesis, internships)
- Research opportunities for undergrads (supervising undergrad RA)
- Supervising graduate and undergraduate TAs

- “Above” expectations:
  - ⇒ Supervising graduate students’ research, or
  - ⇒ Supervising one or more honors thesis outside of the assigned course load; or
  - ⇒ Supervising/advising a large number of students
- “Meets” expectations:
  - ⇒ Engagement with students in some of these non-course roles (internships, committee member, outside member, one BDIC or one independent study).
- “Below” expectations:
  - ⇒ No/little engagement with students in these non-course roles.

Exceptional (+1):

- Recognition from outside the department for exceptional teaching (campus/college award, award from profession), or
- Being the supervisor of a PhD student that graduated in the academic year under consideration.

**1.3 Service**

**Service Scoring table**

		Department/College/University			
		<i>None*</i>	<i>Below</i>	<i>Meets</i>	<i>Above</i>
<u>Profession</u>	<i>None</i>	0	0-1	2	3
	<i>Below</i>	0-1	1	2-3	3-4
	<i>Meets</i>	0-1	2	3	5
	<i>Above</i>	0-1	3-4	4-5	5

\*It is unlikely for someone to be doing no on-campus service. It is your responsibility to ensure you are serving the department and campus community. \*\* Please report your duties/activities for each service role.

**Things to consider when evaluating Department/College/University Service:**

Membership and leadership of committees

- “Above” expectations:
  - ⇒ Member of College Personnel Committee or other large College or University role (eg.: member of a College/University level search committee, leading College/University initiatives), with some other role in the Department; or
  - ⇒ Provides major service to the department through one of the following (or similar) roles: Chair of major committee (Personnel, GPD, UPD, faculty search, AQAD, etc.), faculty search committee member, or DPC member.
  - ⇒ Pre-mini-tenure junior faculty: plays an important role in department committee work (major committee work).



- “Meets” expectations:
  - ⇒ Plays important role in department committee work (major committee assignment); or
  - ⇒ Some college or University level (particularly for more senior faculty members) and a more limited role in department committee work.
  - ⇒ Pre-mini-tenure junior faculty: play a role in department committee work.
- “Below” expectations:
  - ⇒ Limited department committee work, small or no role at College and University level.

**Things to consider in evaluating service to the profession (and other non-university service):**

Ad hoc reviews, reviewing abstracts/papers for conferences, grant panel, organizing sessions, editorship, advisory boards, outreach, hosting conferences/workshops, writing reference letter for tenure/promotion, association officer, National Academies, national councils (e.g., C-FARE)

- “Above” expectations:
  - ⇒ Leadership in service to profession (e.g., editorship, advisory board, chair of committee, member of grant panel, etc.)
- “Meets” expectations:
  - ⇒ Completed some ad hoc reviews, and
  - ⇒ Evidence of involvement in profession (e.g., reviewing abstracts/papers for conferences, organizing sessions, etc.)
  - ⇒ Pre-mini tenure: one of the above is sufficient.
- “Below” expectations:
  - ⇒ Little involvement in service to profession

Exceptional (+1): Combination of major service roles listed under “Above”.

## 2. Weights to be applied to each of Research (R), Teaching (T), Service (S) in percentage terms

Pre-tenure: 50-40-10 (R-T-S)

Post-tenure: 40-40-20 (R-T-S)

In rare circumstances, late career faculty may negotiate a higher teaching and/or service load in exchange for a reduced weight on research. This would need to be approved by the chair, reviewed by the DPC and formalized in a memorandum of understanding.

Administrative position (non-bargaining unit faculty): weights determined relative to the position.

## 3. Evaluation and Merit for Lecturers

- Evaluated based on the terms of contract.
- The weights (research, teaching, service) will be based on the terms of the contract and communicated to the lecturer and the DPC by the Chair.
- Lecturers can receive +1 for exceptional teaching/service or other activities (Research, Service, non-course teaching (see p.4-5)) not written into the contract.
- Teaching is evaluated the same way as “Courses” component from section 1.2.

**Things to consider when evaluating courses:**

The DPC would like to support student experience and learning outcomes by incentivizing both the appropriate rigor of the course and faculty’s investment in students’ engagement activities. The DPC

will thus consider the following elements in its evaluation of teaching.

- Course evaluations: SRTI Q1 through Q12 and comments, considerations for # students, response rate, and level/rigor of course.
- New course preparations
- Investments in the course or the teaching of it: changes in the course, new lectures, updates to increase relevance.
- Engagement strategies as evidenced in the syllabus
- # of credits
- Number of students

- “Above” expectations with regards to courses (Merit score: 4-5):
  - ⇒ Exceptional teaching evaluations across all courses; or
  - ⇒ Strong teaching evaluations, and at least one of: a large number of students/credits, or preparing a new course, significant course redesign, or significant investments in student engagement or experience, etc.
  - ⇒ University or professional association involvement or recognition, e.g., TEFD Lilly, Innovate, etc. will be recognized.
- “Meets” expectations with regards to courses (Merit score = 3):
  - ⇒ Strong teaching evaluations, or evidence of student engagement activities, or other evidence of teaching effectiveness or effort.
  - ⇒ Before “continuing appointment”: reasonable teaching evaluations and preparing a new course, or a large number of students (~>100)/credits, etc.
- “Below” expectations with regards to courses (Merit score = 1-2):
  - ⇒ Low teaching evaluations and little evidence of student engagement or teaching effectiveness.

#### 4. Special Cases

##### 4.1 Unpaid Leaves

- Refer to current MSP contract.
- The DPC and Chair will evaluate individuals on full-year leave and may decide to award merit for meritorious research, advising Department’s students, and/or professional service done during the year on leave.
- If part-year leave, the faculty member should typically be evaluated based on the work done while being paid by the University. In other words, there is no penalty in the merit ratings for unpaid leave.
  - ⇒ The DPC and Chair will evaluate individuals and may decide to award merit for meritorious research, advising Department’s students, and/or professional service done during the time on leave.
  - ⇒ Merit allocation will be determined by the merit rating and the percentage of time paid by the University.

##### 4.2 Paid Leave – Sabbaticals

- Part-year sabbatical
  - ⇒ 1 course release
    - Teaching: 27%, service: 10%, research: 63%
  - ⇒ 2 course release
    - Teaching: 14%, service: 10%, research: 76%

- Full-year sabbatical
  - ⇒ 100% weight on research, with consideration for professional service and non-course teaching activities.
- DPC and Chair will review the sabbatical report the year following the sabbatical to determine contributions to research pipeline.

#### **4.3 Paid Leave -- Parental and Sick Leaves**

- Refer to current MSP contract.
- The faculty member should be evaluated relative to the time not on leave. In other words, there is no penalty in the merit ratings for parental/sick/family leave.
- Merit allocation will be determined by the merit rating. It will not be pro-rated by the percentage of time on leave from the University.

#### **4.4 Joint Appointments**

- Joint appointment are reviewed in the home department.
- Expectations and assignments for research, teaching and service will be determined jointly by the chairs/directors of the two departments/centers/institutes based on the positions' descriptions.
- Service and teaching in both departments will be considered and treated equally in the evaluation.
- Research: Both departments/centers/institutes will evaluate research pipeline and publications.
- While all publications count, promotion and tenure evaluations are based on the standards of the home department.

### **5. Merit Distribution**

Each faculty member's merit proportion will be determined by:

- Taking the average scores for each of research, teaching, and service, and by multiplying by the respective weight (section 2 for tenure-track faculty, section 3 for lecturers, or section 4 if a special case applies in a given year). This is the overall merit score for the individual.
- Merit proportion is obtained as the individual's overall merit score divided by the sum of all overall merit scores for the department.
- The salary raise is the individual's merit proportion multiplied by the amount of money available in pool A.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Your actual merit allocation may differ from the expected proportion of merit indicated in the DPC memo due to changes in who is eligible for merit at the time of distribution.