

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Department of Economics

**Bylaws**

(December 18, 2024)

**Mission Statement:** The mission of the Department of Economics is to advance economic literacy both inside and outside the University and to train professional economists for work in academic, business, and government organizations. The Department accomplishes this mission by offering general education coursework; undergraduate degrees in economics and in quantitative economics and econometrics through the College of Arts and Sciences; M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Economics; service courses to other programs; and by conducting and publishing high-level economic research.

**ARTICLE I. Structure of the Department**

**A. *Membership***

1. The Department of Economics recognizes the principles of equity of assignment, resources and opportunities of faculty across a multi-campus university. The Department will confer on each faculty member one of the following classes of appointment. Each of these definitions apply equally to faculty on the Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Sarasota-Manatee campuses.
  - a. **Tenure-Track Faculty:** Individuals with appointments as assistant, associate, or full professors who are either tenured or eligible for tenure in the Department of Economics.
  - b. **Non Tenure-Track Faculty:** Individuals with appointments that cannot be tenured nor become eligible for tenure. Depending on the responsibilities the title of these positions can be:
    - (1) Assistant Professor of Instruction, Associate Professor of Instruction, and Professor of Instruction. Full-time instructors with a doctorate degree.
    - (2) Assistant Instructor, Associate Instructor, and Senior Instructor. Full-time instructors without a doctorate degree.
    - (3) Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, and Research Professor.
    - (4) Professor of Practice.
  - c. **Courtesy Faculty:** Individuals holding professorial or professional rank in other departments or organizations; their appointments are granted on a continuing basis until such appointments are discontinued.
  - d. **Visiting Faculty**

(1) Individuals teaching full-time for a determinate period of time set forth in their employment contract.

(2)

responsibilities as delegated by the President, Provost, and College Dean. He or she is the official liaison between the Department and the Administration. Duties of the chair include, but are not limited to, the following.

- a. The chair will convey

- d. Campus Coordinators: The chair may, after consultation with the relevant campus faculty, appoint campus coordinators for one or both campuses that are not the chair's home campus. The chair may recommend to the faculty that the coordinators receive a course-load reduction from their normal teaching loads.

3. Term of office

The chair shall serve a three-year term and be eligible for two consecutive terms. However, a different length of term of office may be negotiated between the College De4(go)-9(53BT/F1 12 Tf14



available the ranking of the candidates by the faculty to the College Dean.

If the College Dean decides not to select any of the ranked candidates, the College Dean shall appoint an interim chair in consultation with the faculty and reopen the search.

### **C. Campus Coordinator**

- 1.

2. In the case of regular meetings and for special meetings not of such an emergency character that pressure of time prevents, the chair shall announce the meeting. An agenda shall be sent by email least 24 hours before the meeting. Any faculty member may request that an item or items be placed on the agenda.

### **C. *Conduct***

1. Ordinarily the chair will preside over the faculty meeting. The chair may make proposals and suggestions, participate actively, and lead discussions, but shall not make formal motions. The chair is a voting member of the Department, and his or her right to vote is not confined to the case of breaking a tie. Maximum informality is desired in the conduct of faculty meetings; however, in case of unresolved disagreements as to procedure, shall apply.
2. A secret ballot will be taken if a personnel issue is involved if the chair believes the issue demands one or if any faculty member requests a secret ballot.
3. On issues concerning promotion, only faculty holding at least the rank to which the candidate is applying may vote on the candidacy. For purposes of voting on promotion, instructor levels 1, 2, and 3 are considered to be separate ranks.
- 4.

- (5) The committee may also develop policies concerning governance and evaluation. Any such proposals will be presented to the faculty for their consideration. Such action may be self-initiated by the Committee or a response to a request made by the chair or one of more faculty members.
- b. The Governance and Evaluation Committee shall consist of 4 tenured members elected by Department faculty. All members of the Department defined under Article I.A.1.a and A.1.b are eligible to vote. Three members are to be elected each year. One of these three members will be elected to serve a two-year term and will serve as Committee chair in the second year. The remaining members shall serve a one-year term. No member can be elected in the year following completion of a term on the Committee. There will always be at least one member from a branch campus.
  - c. Faculty may be nominated for the Governance and Evaluation Committee by the chair, by themselves, or by any other faculty member. In the case of nominations by other faculty, the candidate should be asked for permission to be nominated before being nominated.
  - d. Committee elections should be held as soon as possible in the Fall Semester of each year.
2. Tenure and Promotion Committee: The G&E Committee serves as the T & P committee. All tenured faculty, regardless of home campus, vote on tenure and promotion to associate professor, and all ~~Professors~~, regardless of home campus, vote on promotion to full professor.
3. Graduate Policy Committee: This



Appendix

I. PE

A.

and promotion to associate  
ment of Economics. These  
e and/or promotion and to  
in teaching, research, and  
s of equity of assignment,  
university. As defined in

economic literacy both  
onomists for work in aca-  
ment accomplishes this  
rgraduate degrees in  
h the College of Arts  
ice courses to other  
research.

B. C.

applications for tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor, only tenured faculty members are considered eligible voting members of the Department faculty. Applications for promotion to the rank of full professor are considered at two levels within the Department: The chairperson (or a designated full professor should the chairperson hold the rank of associate professor) and faculty members of the rank of full professor, meeting in closed session and voting by secret ballot.

3. Sequence. Evaluations by the Governance and Evaluation C7 667oGm-3(ei)-3(yte)6(r,JTJETQq0.000

## 2. Assessment of Quantity

Historically, successful candidates for tenure in the Department of Economics had five to eight peer-reviewed articles or the equivalent either in print or accepted for publication during their tenure-earning years. Candidates with more publications can be rejected if the quality of the journals is low. Candidates with fewer publications will be considered only if the work is considered to be of extremely high quality. Evidence of future productivity in the forms of papers with requested resubmissions, submitted but not yet accepted papers, and publicly available completed working papers will also be taken into consideration during the evaluation process.

## B. TEACHING

Successful candidates for tenure must be excellent teachers, as demonstrated in and through the categories below. Excellence in teaching is evaluated primarily at the Department level

c. Supervision of undergraduate honors theses



scholarly or professional society or association; and by serving as editor or associate editor of a national or international scholarly journal.

A two-thirds vote of the faculty is required to amend this document. After amendment, it must be approved by the Offices of the Dean and Provost. This document will be reviewed in years that end in five and years that end in zero.

Approved by faculty vote on January 8, 2016.

Approved by Dean's Office on January 11, 2016.

Approved by the Provost's Office on June 1, 2016.

Revised for Consolidation and approved by Dean's Office and Provost's Office, June 11, 2020.

Approved by faculty vote June 16, 2020.

Approved by faculty vote September 8, 2023

## Appendix 2: *Guidelines for the Evaluation*

The Department of Economics recognizes the importance of defining and assessing journal quality for tenure, promotion, and faculty evaluations. A well-defined framework can reduce ambiguity, ensure fairness, and support the department's goal of advancing its academic standing. This document outlines a revised framework for evaluating journal quality, emphasizing transparency, consistency, and alignment with departmental objectives.

### **Challenges in Measuring Journal Quality**

1. **Diversity of Journals:** Economists publish across a wide array of journals, including interdisciplinary venues, complicating efforts to establish a universal ranking.
2. **Outdated Rankings:** Commonly used rankings, such as Combes and Linnemer (CL), often fail to reflect the current academic landscape.
3. **Citation Bias:** Rankings heavily reliant on citations may overvalue journals publishing reviews or special issues, while undervaluing interdisciplinary or niche journals.
4. **Emerging Journals:** New journals often remain under-ranked despite publishing high-quality research, highlighting the need for regularly updated metrics.
5. **Field Comparisons:** Cross-field journal comparisons are inherently subjective and contentious.
6. **Granularity:** Broad groupings (e.g., elite vs. excellent) risk misrepresenting quality and incentivizing faculty improperly.

### **Goals of the Proposed Framework**

1. Establish clear and transparent criteria for tenure, promotion, and annual evaluations.
2. Develop a composite index for evaluating journal quality.
3. Align evaluation metrics with the department's research productivity goals and aspirations to improve academic rankings.

### **Composite Index for Journal Quality**

The composite index integrates multiple journal rankings to provide a balanced evaluation metric. The proposed rankings are:

1. **ABDC Journal Quality List**
  - Annual ranking by the Australian Business Deans Council.
  - Journals categorized as A\* (7.4%), A (24.4%), B (31.9%), and C (36.2%).
  - Includes 2680 journals and 681 economics journals.
  - **Strengths:** Comprehensive and updated annually.
  - **Limitations:** Broad categories penalize top journals; uneven field representation.
2. **Academic Journal Guide (AJG)**
  - Annual ranking by the Chartered Association of Business Schools.
  - Journals ranked from 1 to 4+, with 4+ being the highest quality.
  - Includes 1703 journals and 333 economics journals, though some are categorized under other disciplines.
  - **Strengths:** Respected in business and management disciplines.
  - **Limitations:** Arbitrary categorization; economics journals often underrepresented.
3. **Ham, Wright, and Ye (HWY) Top 100 Economics Journals**
  - 2023 ranking identifying the top 100 economics journals.
  - Two tables: Table 1 excludes invitation-only journals; Table 2 includes them.
  - **Strengths:** Highlights prestigious journals.
  - **Limitations:** Limited scope and needs periodic updates.

### **Proposed Methodology for Ranking**

#### **Defining Economics Journals**

Economic journals will be identified using codes 3801, 3802, 3803, and 3899 from the ABDC Journal Quality List. Journals not meeting this criterion will be classified as interdisciplinary. In 2022, there are 681 economic journals.

#### **Ranking Economics Journals**

Economics journals will be divided into seven groups:

1. **Top 5 (AAA):**
  - AER, Econometrica, QJE, JPE, RSTUD.
  - Recognized as the pinnacle of economics research.

2.

## **Final Notes**

1. ABDC and AJG rankings are annually updated and newer journals will eventually be included in our composite journal rankings.
2. Table 2 of HWY includes AER P&P where several faculties published. Thus, publications in this outlet will be classified as A-level.
3. No journal ranking is perfect including our composite journal ranking.

Approved: 12/16/2024

Approved by Dean's and Provost's Offices, January 27, 2025

## Appendix 3: **Guidelines for the Annual Evaluation of Economics Faculty**

### **I. General**

Faculty will be evaluated in whatever areas they are assigned effort according to the amount of effort they are assigned in each category. For example, instructors are typically assigned effort in Teaching and Service and Tenured faculty are typically assigned effort in the areas of Research,

short haul and long haul. In other words, a balance should be struck between giving credit for work done in the year under consideration and giving credit for overall career development. If a colleague has been productive for many years, their ratings should not be lowered because of a seemingly unproductive year; the colleague should be given an opportunity to present evidence relevant to the overall performance. And if work is produced that is beyond the highest standards for any given year, it should receive carryover credit to subsequent years.

The spirit of this rule is to account for the unpredictable and often lengthy nature of activities such as publications or teaching evaluations that are used to demonstrate excellence in research, teaching, and service. For example, if a colleague has published high quality articles in recent years, their rating in a given year should not be lowered if they do not have publications in that year but have continued to develop projects that will ultimately result in high quality publications. Similarly, if a colleague is heavily involved in service that also requires a good deal of current scholarly knowledge (such as directing a dissertation, or editing a journal), their rating should not be lowered if such service temporarily slows their original output. Or, if a colleague is involved in substantially redesigning a course or in the professional development of students, their rating should not be lowered if such activities temporarily lower their teaching evaluation scores.

The spirit of this rule also pertains to offsetting the vagaries of lean-year, fat-year salary distribution. A colleague deserving a certain level of reward who is scantily rewarded in a lean-year should have parity over the long haul with a colleague deserving the same level of reward but who is richly rewarded in a fat-year. It is theg0i6u6(lar)5(y )JTJETQa proflaheir rating



substantial achievements in some of the above activities with the necessity of either the submission, revision, and/or publication in a peer-reviewed economics or non-economics journal, an invited journal article or the authorship of a book, monograph or book chapter

Satisfactory (3) effort in research might entail a combination of a few the above activities with the necessity of evidence of progress on a working paper or the submission to a peer reviewed journal.

Unsatisfactory (2) effort in research entails meeting only one of the above activities.

Unacceptable (1) effort in research entails not meeting a single one of the above activities.

#### **IV. Teaching**

Evaluation of contributions to teaching will be based only on information provided in the faculty self-evaluation, student evaluations, and any other information known to the G&E Committee and to the Chair.

Potential information to include in self-evaluation:

Documentation of efforts to improve content delivery, to develop curriculum, or to otherwise contribute to student success outside of the typical requirements of one's course load.

Syllabi, tests, assignments, and web site innovations

Number of preps and new preps, required or elective courses, modality (online) service or major courses, and any other relevant information about courses.

Level and content of the courses taught

Teaching awards, nominations for such awards, major external teaching fellowships, unsolicited letters from students

Student evaluations of teaching (in relation to the level and content of the courses taught, the number of students enrolled, and the percent completing the evaluation)

Peer review or observation of teaching. This could be completed by another faculty member in the Department, or by someone outside the Department (e.g., Center for Teaching Excellence)

Student mentoring

- Descriptions of all activities should include the depth of involvement (chair, supervisor, committee member, etc.), status of the project, and outcomes including any presentations, publications, submissions, graduation, and job placement.
- Ph.D. dissertations
- Master's oral examinations
- Undergraduate Honors Theses
- Directed research activities

- Mentoring efforts outside of service on committee, e.g. providing feedback on student presentations and papers, advice on networking and job applications, writing reference letters etc.
- Number of post-docs or students involved, and number directly supervised

Training grant or research grant administration that involves mentoring

Publications, presentations or participation in conferences and workshops relating to the science of teaching and learning

Narrative self-assessment that discusses teaching activities not documented elsewhere, such as specific challenges faced in a semester or teaching philosophy

Description of responsibilities, type and degree of involvement, contribution to university, college, and department goals

Participation in the peer-review process

-

Satisfactory (3) effort in service might entail a combination of a few of the above activities with the necessity of participation in departmental governance.

Unsatisfactory (2) effort in teaching entails meeting only one of the above activities.

Unacceptable (1) effort in teaching entails not meeting a single one of the above activities.

## **VI. Appeals Procedures**

If a colleague wishes to appeal the department Chair's evaluation, they should inform the Chair of the G&E committee and the department Chair in writing. The G&E committee will conduct a separate evaluation of the faculty member, which will be included together with the department Chair's evaluation. Faculty wishing to appeal the department Chair's evaluation are encouraged to first meet with the department Chair, as appropriate, to understand the basis of the evaluation and/or to present new material or to shed light on old material.

Approved: 2/2/2023





- c. Assistant professor
  - d. Instructor
2. Within a given academic rank, priority will be given to faculty with the greatest seniority in years as a member of the Department. Should two or more members hold an equal ranking, priority will be determined by a random draw.

**C. *Other Considerations***

1. A ranking only gives a faculty member the option to select an office at his or her slot in the ranking. Faculty members are free to exchange their slots in the ranking with other faculty.
2. When a faculty member vacates his or her office, this allocation system will be used to determine which faculty member has priority to occupy the vacated office (if he or she so desires). When the chair or graduate program director leaves that position, he or she will have access to any vacant office according to the above allocation system.