

# **Department of Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics**

## **College of Business The University of West Florida**

### **By-Laws**

**May, 2020<sup>1</sup>**

### **Contents**

The Department of Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics is governed by the following by-laws, consisting of the following sections:

1. Preamble
2. Department Faculty Meetings
3. Process for the determination of “B or Better” journals
4. Annual Evaluation Standards
5. Tenure and Promotion Standards
6. Publication Quality Measurement for Tenure and Promotion
7. Summer Teaching Assignment
8. Adoption of By-Laws document

### **Approval chronology**

Sections 1-3: approved November 20, 2009

Section 4: approved October 1, 2015

Section 5: approved September 17, 2010

Section 6: updated October 7, 2014

Section 7: approved November 20, 2009

Title and sections 3, 4, 5.1 and 6.5.2 updated April 26, 2019

---

<sup>1</sup> Ratified on May 26, 2020 by vote of 10-1-1

# Department of Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics By-Laws

## 1. Preamble

The Department endorses the Mission statement of the University and the College of Business.

Issues not covered in these by-laws will be governed by the College of Business by-laws.

## 2. Department Faculty Meetings

The Chair, or his/her designee, shall preside in all meetings of the Department faculty as a whole. Department faculty meetings shall be conducted as follows:

a. The Department faculty shall meet at least once during the Fall and Spring Semesters to execute in a timely manner the business that needs to be transacted. Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, all meetings are to be called with at least five working days notice. However, no such notice is required if the purpose of such meeting is to give or receive information and no other action is required or taken.

b. The Chair shall select a secretary to be responsible for keeping a permanent record of Department faculty meetings. The Secretary is ultimately responsible for keeping and distributing the Minutes as required by these by-laws. The Minutes are to be distributed to the members of the faculty within ten working days of the meeting for which they were taken.

c. The Chair shall convene special meetings of the Department faculty upon petition of at least 25% of the tenured and tenure-earning faculty members or when deemed necessary by the Business College Council or the Dean.

d. A quorum is defined as 50 percent of the voting members of the department for all matters except evaluation standards including Tenure and Promotion, and on matters pertaining changes to the by-laws, when a quorum shall be 75 percent of the voting members of the department.

e. Voting Members on Departmental matters is defined as full-time tenured and tenure track faculty including faculty on phased retirement and full-time instructors. This excludes people with visiting appointments. The chair is a voting member. This definition of *voting members* applies throughout these by-laws with the exception of matters concerning evaluation standards including Tenure and Promotion of faculty, and changes to the department by-laws, which is covered in subsection (f) below.

f. Voting Members on evaluation standards including Tenure and Promotion standards, and on matters pertaining changes to the by-laws is defined as full-time tenured and tenure track faculty including faculty on phased retirement. The chair is a voting member. ~~g.~~ Written Proxies may be submitted to the Chair prior to the faculty meeting. These must designate the procurator and be

signed by the absentee voting member. Such proxies will be counted as present for purposes of determining a quorum.

h. Voting on all matters requires a simple majority of those present for passage with the exception of evaluation standards including Tenure and Promotion standards, and on matters pertaining changes to the by-laws, when a super majority, defined as 75 percent of the voting members of the department, is required.

i. Proposed motions affecting the educational policy of the Department must be submitted in writing to the Chair at least seven working days prior to the meeting at which these motions are to be made, with electronic or paper copies distributed to faculty members at least five working days in advance of the meeting, unless the requirement for advance notification is waived by consent of three-fourths of the voting faculty (as defined in subsections (e and f) above) present at such meeting.

j. The Chair shall prepare and distribute an agenda with the call for each meeting except that a majority of the voting faculty who are present may vote to permit discussion and action on non-agenda items. However, in matters of extreme urgency, such submission and notification may be waived by a three-fourths vote of the voting faculty present at such meeting, providing a quorum is present.

### **3. Process for the determination of “B or Better” journals**

Additions to the Department list of Journals that meet the “B or Better” criteria are made using the following process.

a. The faculty member wishing to add a journal to the list submits a request to the Department Chairperson. The request should include the following information:

1. Journal Name
2. List of Review Board members
3. Published or Open-Source
4. Review process information
5. Affiliation and/or association with any organizational conference?
6. Is the journal independent of conference presentations, proceedings, etc.?
7. Impact factor if available
8. Acceptance rate if available
9. Sample issue or article from the journal (include URL for the website)
10. Statement by the faculty member summarizing the case for inclusion as a “B or Better” journal

b. For pedagogical and case journals, measures of impact for that journal are required.

c. The Department Chair will circulate the request to the department faculty via email and request a “yes” or “no” response. If a response is “no” the faculty member responding “no” is required to indicate a reason.

d. Inclusion of a journal in the department's list of “B or Better” quality journals will require a positive vote of 75% of the voting faculty.

e. If the Chair receives a positive vote, according to c., the journal is added to the approved “B or Better” list and the Chair will notify the faculty that the journal has been approved.

## **4. Annual Faculty Evaluation Standards**

(Revised and approved: October 1, 2015)

This document supersedes all previous documents.

What follows is a set of evaluation standards and allocation of merit funds for the Department of Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics. The set of evaluation standards is a living document. It is constantly evolving as the institution adapts its role to conditions in the environments in which it exists. The College of Business mission statement clearly identifies the priorities of the institution. It is the job of the department chairperson to evaluate individual performance as it relates to the college mission in each of the three areas of Teaching, Research, and Service. The weighting of faculty evaluations in these three areas mirrors the weighting that each has been assigned, both informally and formally, for at least the past 15 years. These weights are: 40 (45)% for teaching, 40 (45)% for research, and 20(15%) for service (note that the teaching research weight can be selected annually by the faculty member and must sum to 100%).

It is expected that each faculty member will apply these evaluation standards in the preparation of their Statement of Contribution. The chairperson will review the documentation presented and arrive, after consultation with the faculty member, at an agreed descriptor for performance in each of the three areas evaluated. These evaluations form the foundation for continued employment, the allocation of departmental merit money, the sustained performance review, and are a major input in the tenure and promotion process.

“Beginning with the 2018-2019 academic year, faculty are required to submit at least one exemplar of teaching quality in addition to the standard university teaching assessment material. Exemplars should be consistent with indicators identified in the Tenure and Promotion guidelines, such as outcome assessment data, peer review observations, syllabi, assessment samples, etc.”<sup>2</sup>

A faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion must be academically qualified at the time of application.

---

<sup>2</sup> Source: [https://uwf.edu/media/university-of-west-florida/academic-affairs/departments/division-of-academic-affairs/collective-bargaining-cba/UWF\\_UFF\\_CBA\\_2017-2020\\_FINAL.pdf](https://uwf.edu/media/university-of-west-florida/academic-affairs/departments/division-of-academic-affairs/collective-bargaining-cba/UWF_UFF_CBA_2017-2020_FINAL.pdf) (accessed March 4, 2019)

## 4.1. Evaluation Standards for Teaching

The department places importance upon superior classroom instruction and this is reflected in the standards for the teaching evaluation.

Teaching performance is evaluated based on measures of effort and quality. Effort is evaluated using measures such as the number of preparations, number of students, and type of class (MBA, online, new prep, quantitative, elective, etc.). Quality will be assessed by student evaluations and other measures including peer evaluations of instruction.

Student evaluations include both quantitative and qualitative observations, where qualitative comments (if available) will be examined for congruence with the quantitative scores. The following translation will be used for the quantitative portion of the assessment:

The scores on the two ‘overall’ items on the University of West Florida Student Assessment of instruction form will be used.

Overall Assessment of Course Organization, and  
Overall Assessment of Instructor

The average score is to be computed on each specific question, where Distinguished = 5 and Poor = 1. The overall quantitative score shall be the combined average of these two quantitative measures.

<b>Evaluative Ratings</b>	<b>Translation into Student Evaluation from Scores</b>
<i>Distinguished</i>	From/to 4.4 to 5 with matching outstanding comments
<i>Excellent</i>	From/to 3.9 to 4.39 with matching positive comments
<i>Good</i>	From/to 2.9 to 3.89 with positive comments
<i>Fair</i>	From/to 1.9 to 2.89 with significant negative comments
<i>Poor</i>	Below 1.9 with significant negative comments

Other factors that are important regarding effort and quality include (but are not limited to):

1. Willingness to assist the department and college in offering the courses needed for their programs throughout the academic year.
2. Development or revision of curriculum and course structure including online.
3. Results from peer evaluations of teaching including course materials and lecturing and classroom management skills.
4. Pedagogical research (e.g., publication of teaching notes, textbooks, cases, and textbook chapters and professional development activities .
5. Course rigor including grade distributions, number and types of assignments, number and types of exams given, and scope and size of course projects and papers.

6. Course evaluation measures compared with averages of other colleagues teaching the similar courses.
7. Teaching awards and other recognition.
8. Collaborative teaching and interdisciplinary development.

## 4.2. Evaluation Standards for Research

Contribution to the discovery of new knowledge, development of new educational techniques, and other forms of creative activity are all included under the umbrella of research. While a considerable investment of time is necessary in the development of any worthwhile research project, it is difficult to evaluate either the quality, or quantity, of work in progress. It is assumed that faculty members have multiple research interests and parallel projects at various stages of completion. For the purposes of the annual evaluation all published (in final form) research products during the evaluation period will be included. Faculty members, at their option, may also include for consideration research products accepted for publication, but not yet in print, such research activities will not be counted again when they appear in final form. A faculty member must make the case for the ranking of a journal as B or better journal in accordance with departmental guidelines. Scholarly activities that are important regarding research effort and quality include (but are not limited to):

<b>Evaluative Ratings</b>	<b>Output Measures of Research Productivity</b>
<i>Distinguished</i>	at least one peer reviewed academic journal article (classified as a B or better journal),  or book in general publication (first year only),  or principal or co-investigator awarded externally-funded grant.  Finishing a dissertation shall also count here as full credit.
<i>Excellent</i>	one refereed journal article (classified as a below B journal),  or at least two refereed (before acceptance) proceedings.
<i>Good</i>	one refereed (before acceptance) proceedings  and  at least one non-refereed proceedings,  or other significant (tangible) work in progress.
<i>Fair</i>	at least one presentation at a national or regional conference,  or significant (tangible) work in progress.
<i>Poor</i>	no visible (tangible) research activity.

Note: Banked journal articles (journal articles not used in previous years) may be included from previous years. Please note that this scale is for the purpose of the annual evaluation. It does not imply that a string of “Good” evaluations will be sufficient for either tenure or promotion. In fact, the rank of “Distinguished” should be the goal for all faculty each year.

### **4.3. Evaluation Standards for Service**

Service is an area where performance in a number of varied activities is expected and evaluated. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the progress of their department, college, university, and in furthering their discipline through professional community contributions.

Evaluation on service is based on the depth and mixture of service in various areas. The mixture of service activities may change over time as faculty members accept new service responsibilities. The depth of service toward a single activity may also change as faculty members provide greater depth of service in new areas. While the mixture and depth may change, it is important to understand that each area of service to the department, college, university, and to the faculty member’s professional discipline community is important. Major deviations in service areas and depth should be discussed and agreed upon between the faculty member and the Department Chairperson through the annual planning process, prior to execution.

In the Department of Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics, service is divided into major service activities and minor service activities. A major service activity requires greater commitment of time and effort. In addition, it should also have a greater impact on the department, college, university, or discipline. In contrast, a minor service activity will require less commitment of time and effort. While it is expected that the minor activity results in value for the department, college, university, or discipline, the value is expected to be to a lesser degree than that of a major service activity. Examples are provided to illustrate for faculty and administration the activities that may be categorized as major or minor services for faculty evaluation. The list is not exhaustive, but provides for a better understanding of what constitutes major and minor service effort, time, and result.

#### **Major Service Examples**

*Example #1: Serving on the editorial review board of a peer-reviewed journal. By accepting an appointment to serve as a member of the editorial review board of a peer-reviewed journal, a faculty member commits time and effort to review multiple manuscripts over the course of a 12-month term.*

*Example #2: Serving as the faculty advisor for a highly active student group or organization that is associated with Marketing, Economics or Logistics. The faculty advisor should actively*

*assist student officers in goal setting, program planning, mentoring, and helping to facilitate interactions between the student organization and external professionals.*

**Example #3:** *Serving on a faculty search committee. Since hiring, along with tenure and promotion, is 'one of the most important things we do' (Ron Bush, paraphrased), faculty should spend a considerable amount of time reviewing candidate materials and developing a list of strengths and weaknesses.*

### **Minor Service Activity**

**Example #1:** *Serving as faculty marshal for graduation. This is a commitment which requires approximately a half day for each ceremony. This service is valuable, but does not meet the standard for major service.*

Department policy is not to compile the definitive list of Major and Minor activities, but rather to give faculty and administrators guidance on separating the activities by effort, time, and contribution. Ultimately, faculty are responsible for making the case that an activity should count as a minor or as a major service activity. The overriding principle is that major service requires a significant time commitment and, if well executed, will generate a direct productive return to the department, college, university, and/or discipline. Again, major deviations should be agreed upon through the annual planning process.

Standards for untenured assistant professors in their first four academic years:

#### **Evaluative Ratings**

#### **Output Measures of Service Productivity**

*Distinguished*

At least 1 Minor activity

*Poor*

No visible (tangible) service activity

Standards for all other faculty:

#### **Evaluative Ratings**

#### **Output Measures of Service Productivity**

*Distinguished*

At least 1 Major activity AND 2 Minor activities

*Excellent*

At least 1 Major activity AND 1 Minor activity  
OR 4 Minor activities

<i>Good</i>	At least 3 Minor activities
<i>Fair</i>	At least 2 Minor activities
<i>Poor</i>	No visible (tangible) service activity

## **5. Tenure and Promotion Standards**

This document supersedes all previous documents.

These standards were approved by vote of the faculty on this date for use in consideration of all faculty seeking tenure and promotion in the department. It is expected that these standards will be reviewed and reaffirmed by a vote of the faculty at least every three years from the effective date.

Departmental standards for tenure and promotion are supplemental to those found in the collective bargaining agreement between the United Faculty of Florida and the SUS, those criteria and standards stipulated in Florida statutes, Board of Trustees rules, and the additional criteria found in The University of West Florida standards that apply to reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

The College of Business requires that a candidate for tenure/promotion must be Academically Qualified (AQ), as defined by the College's Policy on Academic qualification, at the time the application is submitted. In addition, the candidate must demonstrate a consistent record of scholarly activities. The record of scholarship must include publications in peer reviewed journals as well as other intellectual contributions as defined by the departmental standards for tenure, promotion and annual evaluations which may be higher than the minimum requirements for eligibility.

## 5.1. Tenure decision

### Teaching

A majority (in the period since the candidate's hire date) of annual evaluation of teaching ratings must be “excellent.” A minimum of one annual evaluation must be “distinguished.”

### Research

(Research standards for tenure were revised and approved via email vote on May 3, 2017.)

1. Publication of a minimum of four peer-reviewed journal articles (hereafter, articles) or their equivalent; where a minimum of two must have publication dates after the candidate joined the university.
2. The candidate can substitute up to two of the articles according to the following list of acceptable substitution activities:

<b>Equivalent for one substitution of one article</b>
One peer-reviewed, externally funded grant with funding greater than or equal to \$25k (any investigator status)
One research monograph
One new book
Two book revisions
Two book chapters (new)
Four book chapter revisions
Two peer-reviewed proceedings (regional, national or international meeting; including conference-based summary briefs)
Four peer-reviewed paper presentation (not published -- regional, national, or international)
Four faculty research seminar presentations
Four non-peer-reviewed journal articles
Four manual/teacher's guides (published or PAM)

3. Journal and book quality: the faculty strongly believe in the importance of research quality. For articles, this means a majority of the department has voted to include the outlet in the department as “B or Better” list. For new books, this means a majority has voted in a similar manner.
4. A purpose of the “B or Better” list – and comparable mechanisms for other research quality questions – is to discourage disingenuous research activities such as publishing in what are referred to as predatory journals, the faculty believe this activity should carry zero weight.
5. Extra weighting: some contributions deserve extra weight. If a faculty member believes a creative and scholarly activity deserves more weight than that listed above (e.g., an article published in a top-level journal), a faculty member must make the case with the chair via the annual evaluation process.
6. These standards cannot cover all research outlets. For outlets not listed above, if a faculty member believes a creative and scholarly activity deserves a weight:

- equal to or greater than an article, a majority of the department shall vote in a manner similar to include the outlet in the department as “B or Better” list; or
- less than an article (e.g., an activity equal to a conference proceedings), the faculty member must make the case with the chair via the annual evaluation process.

Examples of how candidates can mix and match research activities in order to demonstrate sufficient productivity include:

- Four peer-reviewed journal articles;
- Two articles, one peer-reviewed case in a journal, one peer-reviewed externally funded grant with funding of \$25k;
- Two articles, one peer-reviewed case in a journal, two peer-reviewed proceedings;
- Two articles and two new books;
- Two articles, one new book and one peer-reviewed case in a journal (latter substituting for one of the former).

### **Service**

A majority (in the period since the candidate's hire date) of annual evaluation of service ratings must be “good.” A minimum of two annual evaluations in this period must be “excellent” or better.

## **5.2. Promotion to Associate Professor Decision**

### **Teaching**

A majority (in the period since the candidate's hire date) of annual evaluation of teaching ratings must be “excellent.” A minimum of one annual evaluation must be “distinguished.”

### **Research**

1. Publication of a minimum of four (4) peer-reviewed (refereed) research articles in academic journals classified by the department as “B or Better.” A minimum of three (3) of these must have publication dates after the candidate joined the university.
2. Journal and book quality: the faculty strongly believe in the importance of research quality. For articles, this means a majority of the department has voted to include the outlet in the department as “B or Better” list. For new books, this means a majority has voted in a similar manner.
3. A purpose of the “B or Better” list – and comparable mechanisms for other research quality questions – is to discourage disingenuous research activities such as publishing in what are referred to as predatory journals, the faculty believe this activity should carry zero weight.
4. Extra weighting: some contributions deserve extra weight. If a faculty member believes a creative and scholarly activity deserves more weight than that listed above (e.g., an article

published in a top-level journal), a faculty member must make the case with the chair via the annual evaluation process.

5. These standards cannot cover all research outlets. For outlets that are not peer-reviewed journals (e.g., books for practitioners or principle investigator status on an external grant), if a faculty member believes a creative and scholarly activity deserves a weight:

- equal to or greater than an article, a majority of the department shall vote in a manner similar to include the outlet in the department as “B or Better” list; or
- less than an article (e.g., an activity equal to a conference proceedings), the faculty member must make the case with the chair via the annual evaluation process.

## **Service**

1. A majority (in the period since the candidate's hire date) of annual evaluation of service ratings must be “good.” A minimum of two annual evaluations in this period must be “excellent” or better.

## **5.3. Promotion to Professor Decision**

### **Teaching**

A majority of annual evaluation of teaching ratings (in the period since the candidate's award of current rank), must be “excellent.” A minimum of two annual evaluations must be “distinguished.”

### **Research**

1. Publication of a minimum of ten (10) peer-reviewed (refereed) research articles in academic journals classified by the department as “B or Better.” One of the ten required publications must be of “Better than B” quality. It is up to the candidate to make the case that a particular article(s) meets the “Better than B” requirement. A minimum of four (4) of these must have publication dates after the award of the candidate's current rank, and during the candidate's tenure at The University of West Florida.
2. Journal and book quality: the faculty strongly believe in the importance of research quality. For articles, this means a majority of the department has voted to include the outlet in the department as “B or Better” list. For new books, this means a majority has voted in a similar manner.
3. A purpose of the “B or Better” list – and comparable mechanisms for other research quality questions – is to discourage disingenuous research activities such as publishing in what are referred to as predatory journals, the faculty believe this activity should carry zero weight.
4. Extra weighting: some contributions deserve extra weight. If a faculty member believes a creative and scholarly activity deserves more weight than that listed above (e.g., an article

published in a top-level journal), a faculty member must make the case with the chair via the annual evaluation process.

5. These standards cannot cover all research outlets. For outlets that are not peer-reviewed journals (e.g., books for practitioners or principle investigator status on an external grant), if a faculty member believes a creative and scholarly activity deserves a weight:

- equal to or greater than an article, a majority of the department shall vote in a manner similar to include the outlet in the department as “B or Better” list; or
- less than an article (e.g., an activity equal to a conference proceedings), the faculty member must make the case with the chair via the annual evaluation process.

2. Tangible evidence of the expression of creative and scholarly activity in other venues. These activities include, but are not limited to:

- additional peer-refereed journal articles
- authorship or co-authorship of academic conference presentations and proceedings;
- authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of books whose primary audience is composed of academics;
- authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of books whose primary audience is composed of practitioners;
- authorship or co-authorship in whole or in part of work relevant to the candidate's field disseminated via film or electronic media;
- Principal Investigator or Co-PI of awarded external grants for projects that will advance knowledge in the candidate's field

## **Service**

A majority of annual evaluation of service ratings (in the period since the candidate's award of current rank), must be “excellent.” A minimum of two annual evaluations in this period must be “distinguished.”

## **6. Publication Quality Measurement for Tenure and Promotion**

### **6.1. Journals in economics**

The ranking process exposed the following rule with regard to judging the quality of publications for the economics subset of the department faculty. If the journal is indexed in the Journal of Economic Literature (JEL) then its quality rank is at least a “B or Better.” The JEL index EconLit is available at:

[JEL list of journals](#)

### **6.2. Journals in marketing**

From a marketing perspective, the JEL EconLit index also includes journals from that discipline as well as other “general business” knowledge domains. So that a general departmental rule that if a journal is indexed in the JEL EconLit index then it is at least a “B or Better” would work for most faculty publications. JEL EconLit is certainly not exhaustive with regard to marketing or business publications in general that might also be considered “B or Better.”

### **6.3. Starting list**

It is suggested that a voting process be used to manage additions (and deletions) to (from) the departmental list. A starting list for the “Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics Department ‘B or Better’ Publication List” is below. That list is all journals that department faculty have published in that were ranked “B or Better” by a majority of the faculty in the department.

### **6.4. Process**

For journals not indexed in JEL EconLit or on the “Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics Department ‘B or Better’ Publication List” it is up to the individual faculty member to demonstrate that the quality of that particular journal is a “B or Better” and then submit a request to the department chair. The chair will then begin the process, as described in the Department By-Laws to amend the list.

With regard to what constitutes a “Better than B” journal, it is up to individual faculty members to present sufficient evidence (eg. citation indexes, rankings, etc.) that the journal is of such significant quality that it deserves a “Better than B” rank.

### **6.5. Marketing, Supply Chain Logistics, and Economics Department ‘B or Better’ Publication List**

#### **6.5.1. “B or Better” journals, not indexed JEL**

Business Horizons  
European Journal of Marketing  
International Journal of Physical Distribution and Logistics Management  
International Journal of Technology Management  
Journal of Advertising Research  
Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing  
Journal of Business Logistics  
Journal of Education for Business??  
Journal of Macromarketing  
Journal of Marketing Education

Journal of Nonprofit and Public Sector Marketing  
Journal of Pharmaceutical Management and Marketing  
Journal of Public Policy and Marketing  
Journal of Retailing  
Journal of Strategic Marketing  
Journal of the Market Research Society  
Marketing Education Review  
Performance Improvement Quarterly  
Scandinavian Journal of Management  
Supply Chain Management Review  
Supply Chain Management: An International Journal  
The Journal of Consumer Marketing  
The Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management  
Transportation Management  
Transportation Quarterly

#### **6.5.2. “B or Better” journals, indexed in JEL**

Agricultural Resource and Economic Review  
Applied Economics  
Applied Economics Letters  
California Management Review  
Choices  
College and Research Libraries  
Contemporary Policy Issues  
European Economic Review  
Health Marketing Quarterly  
Human Resource Development  
Journal of Accounting, Auditing, and Finance  
Journal of Applied Econometrics  
Journal of Behavioral Economics  
Journal of Business Research  
Journal of Econometrics  
Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization  
Journal of Economic Psychology  
Journal of Economics and Business  
Journal of Housing Economics  
Journal of Housing Research  
Journal of Industrial Economics  
Journal of Labor Research  
Journal of Macroeconomics  
Journal of Managerial Issues  
Journal of Marketing  
Journal of Marketing Research  
Journal of Regulatory Economics  
Journal of Risk and Insurance

Managerial and Decision Economics  
National Tax Journal  
Public Choice  
Public Finance Review  
Review of Industrial Organization  
Review of Regional Studies  
The Journal of Business  
The Logistics and Transportation Review  
Transportation Journal

### **6.5.3. Added on October 7, 2010 (indexed in JEL)**

Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics  
Journal of Environmental Economics & Management  
Marine Resource Economics  
Resource and Energy Economics  
Review of Environmental Economics and Policy  
Applied Economic Perspectives & Policy  
Environmental Economics and Policy Studies

### **6.5.4. Journals added to the list of “B-or better” journals by vote of the faculty**

Journal of Marketing Management (October 7, 2010)  
Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice (October 7, 2010)  
Journal of International Marketing (October 7, 2010)  
International Journal of Logistics Management (November 20, 2013)  
Journal of Supply Chain Management (October 7, 2014)  
Psychology & Marketing (11-0-1 vote, December 6, 2019)  
Applied Spatial Analysis and Policy (12-0-0 vote, February 20, 2020)  
Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education (12-0-0 vote, May 18, 2020)  
Safety Science (10-0-2 vote, May 18, 2020)

## **7. Summer Teaching Assignment**

TBD

## **8. Adoption**

These by-laws shall go into effect upon adoption by a super majority, defined as 75 percent of the voting members of the department.