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Introduction. Broadly speaking, research astronomers can be separated into two classes, “theoreticians” and “observers,” depending on whether they specialize in the collection and interpretation of data or in developing theoretical interpretations which can then be tested (although many researchers combine elements of both in their work). While the astronomers currently in the Villanova Astronomy & Astrophysics Department are mostly observational in their orientation, some also carry out theoretical investigations. Observational astronomical research consists of 1: the collection of data relevant to a system or class of systems under study, 2: the interpretation of these data to determine the physical properties of the object(s), and 3: the development of a theoretical framework or construction of theoretical models to explain the observed properties and resolve remaining questions. Given a theoretical framework, the observational astronomer can also select systems for data collection which might test the framework, but the pattern of data collection and interpretation is basic. The length of scientific papers in the field vary from brief to lengthy but what counts is whether their substance is important enough to be publishable in a first tier peer-reviewed journal.

Observational astronomy utilizes a variety of ground-based and space-based telescopes for data collection. The faculty at Villanova has access to two separate private ground-based telescopes by membership in the Robotically Controlled Telescope (RCT) and Automated Photometric Telescope (APT) consortiums. “Public” ground-based facilities, i.e., those to which any US astronomer may apply for observing time, include optical and radio telescopes and are funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF). Space-based telescopes, for observing forms of light which cannot penetrate Earth’s atmosphere (such as ultraviolet light and X-rays) are funded by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). In general, a “call for proposals” is issued once or twice a year for both ground-based and individual space-based instruments and requests for observing time are evaluated by peer-review panels.

Funding for carrying out astronomical research is obtained chiefly through grants from the federal government. These funds cover such expenses as salary, travel to conferences and observatories, capital items (e.g., computers), journal page charges, etc. The principal funding agencies are the NSF and NASA. NASA grants tend to focus on research utilizing NASA facilities (e.g., the Hubble Space Telescope), while NSF funds programs involving ground based facilities. Grants can be received for programs involving new observations with active facilities, for analysis of archival data, for theoretical investigations, and for instrument development. Competition for this funding is stiff for both ground and space-based projects with some satellites having as many as 10 applicants for each one accepted. Rapid publication based upon past grants is one of the factors involved in winning new grants.

The department considers grant applications and awards to be part of the research process and therefore takes data on grants into account when evaluating a faculty member’s research performance.

Scholarship
• The Specific Questions:

This basic pattern of astronomical research is reflected in the department’s answers to the specific questions asked in the VPAA’s memo:

1. Publication pattern (book length monographs vs. anonymously refereed articles)
Book length monographs are not common in astronomy because of the nature of the research process described above. Most publications appear in anonymously refereed articles or in conference proceedings. Occasionally, Villanova astronomers serve as editors of such proceedings and such efforts are recognized in both research and service evaluations.

2. The discipline’s relative reliance on electronic publications, conference publications etc.

Refereed electronic publications are becoming more common in astronomy and astrophysics than they were previously and are considered valid for purposes of making rank and tenure decisions (depending upon the article’s impact and the journal’s ranking). Some journals are switching formats from paper to on-line. As with paper publications, electronic publications must be judged and ranked. For example, the *Astronomische Nachrichten* (published in English) would outrank the *International Bulletin of Variable Stars* online, just as it did when they were both published only on paper. The department makes no distinction between refereed paper{s} and refereed electronic publications for the purposes of faculty evaluation. Distinctions are made between peer-reviewed and non-reviewed articles for both media.

Conference proceedings remain important to the field and some of these are now appearing on-line. In astronomy, conference proceedings are not usually reviewed and are rarely, if ever, considered final publication for a project. References to the project would normally cite the peer-reviewed paper once it is published. The faculty submitting his/her publication list should distinguish between conference proceedings subjected to the peer-review process and those which are not peer-reviewed. In astronomy, a conference proceeding may at times be carefully peer-reviewed, but the peer review process for conference publications varies considerably and often may not be as rigorous as a major peer-reviewed journal.

3. Availability of widely-accepted “impact studies” of scholarship (citation indexes)

The primary bibliographic source for astrophysical research is the Smithsonian/NASA Astrophysics Data System (ADS), an on-line service with large search capacities. It indexes refereed, conference, and abstract publications worldwide. The online abstracts include a citation history as well as references to all stellar objects discussed, references in the article and associated articles (see attached sample pages). Articles and data bases published only on-line are also included in this reference source. Another source of citation ranks is the ISI Science Citation Index.

4. Availability of commonly agreed-upon rankings or classifications of scholarly journals.

ISI gives citation information for 46 peer reviewed journals for Astrophysics worldwide. There are other useful journals but these are primary. Within these 46, a small group is considered “First Tier” journals and preferred publication venues. Three American journals are leaders: *Astronomical Journal* with an impact rating over 5; *Astrophysical Journal* with an impact rating over 6 and the *Astrophysical Journal Supplement* with an impact rating above 14. *Publications of the Astronomical Journal of the Pacific, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, Astronomy & Astrophysics, and Icarus* make up the remaining “First Tier” journals. The department takes publication in these “first tier” journals very seriously. Some of these are American, others are European.

5. Relative prestige and importance of the various book publishers in the discipline.

The majority of the peer reviewed journals are published by academic societies not commercial companies. Several European companies do publish conference proceedings, but the identity of the publishing company has little significance in the field of astronomy. It might become significant, should a faculty member actually plan or write a monograph.
6. *The role of applied versus basic scholarly research.*

The basic division (as discussed in the introduction) in astronomical research is between theoretical and observational, not applied versus basic. The development of software and instrumentation might be considered applied science work, but such work requires the input of significant astronomical expertise and usually involves solving unique problems. The department does not consider the division of applied vs. basic research to be applicable to astronomy. Both observational and theoretical astronomy is considered “basic” research.

7. *The varying importance of lab-, clinical, survey-, or literature-based studies.*

Astronomical studies do not make these distinctions. The complexity of astronomical research includes: direct new ground-based and space-based instrument observation, theoretical and observational modeling, and working with both archival data and newly observed data. All data must be evaluated, calibrated and “reduced”, using analytical tools and software. Which data is more important to a particular project will depend on the varying quality of the data itself. Literature-based work is utilized in all these approaches.

8. *Modes of assessing the fine and performing arts.*

Should the department re-establish a working planetarium, the creation of new planetarium programs might need to be assessed under this category, but, otherwise, the question does not apply to Astronomy & Astrophysics.


Astronomy and Astrophysics is an international discipline and the department regularly publishes with co-authors from Europe, South American and Asia. Foreign journals are included under question 4 (above). Some are listed among the “first tier’ journals; some are not.

10. *Multi-authored works: How should joint authorship be weighed and counted?*

The majority of astronomical research publications are multi-author works. Evaluating them has historically been done one of two ways: 1) by considering the first author position on a paper as an indication that the first scholar named did the most work on the paper, second author next most etc. The department’s detailed tenure procedure gives full “credit” for publishing a refereed paper only to these two positions. Faculty listed in later positions are expected to indicate the degree of their contribution to the article in their evaluation or tenure application. For papers with undergraduate first authors, the leading faculty name on the paper would get first author “credit”. 2) An alternative approach was taken by Helmut Abt (former editor-in-chief of *Astrophysical Journal*) in his 1991 discussion of astronomical productivity [*Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific* 102, 1161-1166]. There he equated authorship on a 4-author paper as worth 1/4 of a single author paper. He used this approach to deduce that 23% of the 2,865 American Astronomical Society members in 1989 publish at least 1 full peer-reviewed paper a year. Using these standards only 3% of the membership in 1989 published more than 10 full peer-reviewed articles a year.

Unless the order of authors is clearly alphabetical, the Villanova Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics prefers to consider author position in weighing the value of a faculty member’s contribution to a given publication rather than the strictly mathematical approach.
DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY

Introduction. The Department of Biology recognizes the multifaceted nature of academic responsibilities and values the contributions of its faculty members in the areas of teaching, research, and service. In each category, a core set of activities and level of effectiveness are considered fundamental obligations for every faculty member. Adequate fulfillment of these responsibilities is necessary, but may not be sufficient, for favorable consideration for tenure or promotion. Individual faculty members are expected to make additional contributions according to their particular talents and interests.

A. Teaching

The Department recognizes that teaching performance is a multidimensional task that includes: presentation of effective lectures; development of challenging and rigorous laboratory or field exercises; a continued focus on course development and innovations; mentoring of student research projects; enhancement of student learning through written, oral and quantitative assignments; and support of student needs through advising. Our mission statements emphasize that our students should be exposed to applications of hypothesis testing, critical thinking, and data interpretation, and that they should be taught the principle that science is a continuing human endeavor that includes research, learning, and teaching. All of these activities will be assessed in the evaluation of teaching performance. The Department's needs are varied and all faculty members are expected to contribute consistently and effectively to the instructional mission. Individual faculty members will not be expected, however, to participate in all of the different teaching activities of the Department.

Faculty members must demonstrate competence in teaching and must document efforts in the development and implementation of innovative educational approaches. Although effective teaching of large lecture or introductory courses is highly valued and essential to the Department and will be noted as a positive contribution, it is not required of every faculty member. In contrast, the teaching efforts of every faculty member must include effective instruction of lecture/laboratory-based courses with advanced and current content in their area of expertise (undergraduate or graduate level) and mentoring of student research that culminates in the completion of thesis requirements at the undergraduate or graduate level. The Department expects all faculty members to serve on MA comprehensive examination panels and/or MS thesis committees, and to participate in academic advising that supports the needs of our undergraduate biology majors.

Some activities are not essential nor sufficient by themselves for obtaining tenure or advancing in rank, and may not be undertaken by all faculty members, but nonetheless are viewed as positive contributions and are important to Departmental operation. These activities include: instruction in introductory courses for majors or non-majors; instruction of Honors courses; instruction of senior or graduate seminar courses; service as academic advisor to undergraduates outside the biology major; service as an academic advisor to graduate students outside the context of research supervision; submission and procurement of grants (for improvement of teaching, course development, or obtaining laboratory equipment); and participation in faculty development programs/workshops.

B. Scholarship

- Research Program
  Faculty members are expected to exhibit sustained and successful research that addresses
important questions and problems in biological science. The faculty member must
demonstrate temporal progress in a research program involving steps that build upon each
other or that fit into a sensible sequence. The faculty member must demonstrate plans for
the future direction and development of the research program.

The Department recognizes the value of collaborative endeavors with peers or students or
both. If the candidate’s research program, or specific components, involves collaboration,
the program should nevertheless feature the faculty member as a principal investigator,
and that individual’s distinct contribution to joint efforts should be apparent, identifiable,
and measurable.

The Department expects all faculty members to demonstrate successful direction of
student research, culminating in thesis at the undergraduate and/or graduate level. While
this activity falls largely under Teaching, student research activities should be integrated
within the research program.

• Productivity
 Each faculty member must demonstrate a sustained and continuing publication record
that includes papers in appropriate peer-reviewed journals. The faculty member must
demonstrate that research conducted since coming to Villanova is published in strong,
peer-reviewed journals in area(s) of specialization. The publication record must include
sufficient quality and quantity to demonstrate likelihood of continuing scholarly
productivity into the future. Some or all of the scholarly productivity may involve student
co-authors; such publications are strongly encouraged though not required.

Competence in all phases of research is expected; these phases include conceptualization
and planning, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and dissemination including
publication. At a minimum, an identifiable subset of the research program should
demonstrate the faculty member’s ability to carry out all phases from start to finish
during the candidate’s employment at Villanova.

Faculty members are expected to present research results at professional meetings. The
record should include a regular pattern of participation in national or international
scholarly conferences.
Each faculty member is expected to seek external support for their research program
through submission of grant proposals for outside funding.

The following additional types of scholarly productivity are important, but are neither
essential nor sufficient by themselves for attaining tenure or advancing in rank: review
articles in peer-reviewed journals; book chapters in edited volumes; papers in conference
proceedings volumes; and publications or conference presentations of pedagogical
research. Publication of books is a relatively uncommon mode of dissemination of
original research results in most sub-disciplines within biology. Consequently,
presentation of research in book form is valued but not required of faculty members in the
Department, as long as a scholarly record through other channels (especially refereed
journal articles) exists.

Presentation of invited research papers at professional conferences or invited research
seminars is important and commendable but not essential. Presentations that include
student-generated data are strongly encouraged.

Although faculty members are expected to submit proposals for external funding, the
securing of internal or external funding is not required. Faculty members are strongly
encouraged to seek internal funding of research activities, as such funds will support research activities for acquisition of preliminary data to support external proposals.

**Recognition**
Faculty members should establish a record of scholarly accomplishment that is recognized by peer scientists. The faculty member’s research should have a demonstrable impact on other scholars within the relevant sub-discipline(s) within biology, as may be evidenced by citations of the faculty member’s publications, solicitations to review manuscripts and grant proposals, invitations to give scholarly presentations, or receipt of honors and awards.

Outside evaluations from peer scholars obtained through the Rank and Tenure process must indicate that (1) the faculty member is recognized as an accomplished investigator in an area of biological research; (2) the candidate has produced a record of publications that represent a significant contribution to knowledge within the relevant subject area; (3) the candidate’s work has had impact on other investigators working in the relevant subject area(s).

**C. Service**

The Department of Biology recognizes that service to the Department, College, University, profession, and community is essential for the proper functioning of those entities. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate effective citizenship and a collegial approach to participation in academic affairs. The Department will judge the service involvement to be adequate with demonstration of effective service in all required activities and some optional activities.

Every faculty member must demonstrate: regular and effective participation in Department meetings, seminars, and student presentations; regular and effective participation in Departmental service assignments, such as standing and ad hoc committees, regulatory functions, and organizational duties; participation in College and University academic functions such as Commencement, Convocation, Medallion ceremonies, and Mendel Medal functions; membership in professional societies; active involvement in the profession, which may include attendance at scholarly meetings, presentation of contributed papers, chairing sessions, etc.; and activity in some outlet as peer reviewer.

In addition, Biology faculty members are expected to participate in some of the other important and commendable activities listed below though involvement in these activities alone is not sufficient for attaining tenure or advancing in rank. The degree of involvement in these service activities may vary among faculty members according to their particular other roles in teaching and research. These additional service activities include: participation on College or University committees; contribution to the operation of professional societies by serving on committees or holding office; service as Editor or Editorial Board member for peer-reviewed professional journal(s); review of manuscripts for professional peer-reviewed journals or books; review of scholarly books or textbooks; review of grant proposals; service as member of scientific advisory committees for external institutions; service as member of regulatory committees for external institutions; service as external evaluator of peers at other institutions for purposes of promotion or tenure; service as advisor to a Villanova student group, including especially those with academic emphasis; service as external evaluator or member of dissertation or other student research committees at other institutions; participation in educational outreach relating to area of expertise; or contribution to the outside community or to government agencies in an area of professional expertise.
DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY

A. Teaching. Chemistry faculty are evaluated by students (through CATS evaluations) and by peer evaluation. Chemistry faculty teach both traditional (lecture) courses and laboratory courses; the goals and methodologies of the two course types are very different. Emphasis will be placed upon the faculty member’s ability to teach traditional courses and upper level (3000 and 4000 numbers) laboratory courses relative to introductory laboratory courses. Introductory laboratory courses have teaching contributions from others beyond the faculty member, and as a result the evaluations (especially by students) may not accurately represent the teaching effectiveness of the faculty member. Also, faculty mentoring of students in research, the direction of undergraduate and graduate theses, and related activities are expected from Chemistry faculty and are included in teaching evaluation.

B. Scholarship

- Publications. Peer-reviewed publications are accepted as the norm. Letters to the editor and papers in proceedings or other non-refereed forms are not accepted as evidence of scholarly research for the purpose of evaluation. Villanova Chemistry faculty have published in a diverse group of journals; the choice of venue is determined more by the potential audience of the journal than its perceived prestige. In evaluating the quality of publications, the collective professional judgment of the department is called upon to determine the impact and importance of the research presented. Outside letters of evaluation are obtained according to the procedure described in the guidelines for rank and tenure. Outside reviewers will conduct an evaluation of the significance of the research, and not simply note where the paper is published. Citations of research papers are also considered.

Listed below are several basic questions that are considered in evaluating scholarly publications in the Department of Chemistry.

1. Nature of the research: What is the scope of the project described in the paper? Is the research significant in the broader context of current studies in the specific sub-discipline? To what audience will the paper be of interest? How challenging was the problem? Are the results likely to be used outside of the research director’s laboratory?

2. Type of publication: Is the publication an article, communication, or note, and is it appropriate for the type of project and the results obtained? Full papers typically require more extensive results and explanation; communications are reserved for more urgent results by certain journals; notes are usually published for additional results of a previously reported study or for studies of more limited scope.

3. Co-authorship and collaboration: Are students listed as coauthors? What was their contribution? Was the research collaborative? If so, what was the contribution of the Villanova faculty member and/or students relative to those of the collaborators?

- Student Supervision and Student Participation. As a primarily undergraduate institution that emphasizes student research, faculty members in Chemistry are expected to actively supervise research students. The quality of student mentoring is evidenced by student reports, presentations, and continued interest in research. Relevant questions asked during the evaluation process include: Is the faculty member working alongside students on a regular basis? Do students have the opportunity to present their research at meetings, or to publish
their results? In what other ways does the research experience have an impact on the students’ development?

- Outside Support. External support is extremely important for funding research projects in Chemistry and in providing opportunities for student involvement in research. Efforts to obtain external support for research are expected, including participation in the Villanova Summer Research Grant Program, contributions to Departmental proposals, support through research collaborations, (including those with researchers in industry, and other academic or government institutions), donations of equipment, and collaborations on projects with an educational component. The award rate for the most competitive chemistry grants, such as those from NIH and NSF, are typically below 20% and lower for first-time investigators in certain sub-disciplines. A new applicant to the General Medical Sciences Section of NIH can expect an award rate of about 15%. Petroleum Research Fund and Research Corporation awards are given at a rate of about 30%. In view of these statistics, effort made to obtain grants has to be recognized in some way in the rank and tenure process. The award of an outside grant or fellowship is viewed as an outstanding achievement.

- Collaboration. Industrial support or equipment donations secured by a faculty member are also recognized. Collaborations with researchers at other universities or industries are often critical elements of the broad base of support that is necessary to maintain a productive research laboratory. The Department appreciates the value of collaborative research and recognizes it in evaluation.

C. Service. Service to the Chemistry Department, College, and University as described in the guidelines for Rank and Tenure is expected. For professional service, chemistry faculty are encouraged to participate and contribute to the chemical community at a level commensurate with their experience. Participation is often expressed through membership in appropriate professional societies; the American Chemical Society is the major professional society within the chemical community. Participation in science honor societies such as Sigma Xi, or in educational societies such as the Council of Undergraduate Research, is acceptable means of professional service. Participation in meetings and symposia are other ways that chemists can contribute to the professional community.

D. Criteria for Promotion to Full Professor. The Guidelines for Promotion to Professor indicate that an “established reputation among scholars nationally and/or internationally” is necessary. Within the Chemical profession, indicators of such include a consistent record of publication since promotion to Associate Professor, the publication or editing of books, or acting on the editorial staff of a peer-reviewed journal. Letters from external reviewers will play a major role in assessing the scholarly impact of a candidate on the chemistry profession.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

Introduction. The faculty of the Communication Department believes that our primary goal is to develop and sustain ourselves as an intellectually stimulating, collegial community of teacher-scholars. We believe that the enterprise of teaching is nurtured and sustained by sound scholarship; moreover, the ideal teacher brings the fruits of classroom dialogue back to his/her research. Consequently, we will weight teaching and research as equal in considerations of tenure and promotion. Additionally, to fulfill these intertwined roles of teacher and scholar, and to create the proper atmosphere for student learning, faculty themselves must be active learners—and be willing to listen to and learn from each other in the Department’s “unending conversation” about who we are as a Department, College, and University. Consequently, the Communication Department believes it incumbent upon faculty to participate fully in their various communities through service.
**Evaluation Process.** In order to ensure a rigorous, yet fair evaluation process, the Communication Department has established a Faculty Evaluation Committee. The committee is composed of three tenured faculty, elected by the Department’s full-time faculty for a three-year term; the election occurs during a regular faculty meeting, and the three tenured faculty receiving the highest number of votes are named to the committee. The committee is tasked with providing comments and recommendations to the Department Chair, who includes them as part of each faculty member’s annual/triennial evaluation form. The committee bases its comments upon each faculty member’s completed evaluation form, CATS scores, and accompanying supplemental material (such as in-class peer evaluations reports, examination of syllabi, course assignments and exams, and any other materials specified below, in section I.); the Chairperson provides an evaluation separate from that of the committee, but does attend the committee’s meetings in order to serve as an information resource for the members of the committee.

In addition to the scheduled annual and triennial evaluations, each untenured faculty member undergoes a Third-Year Review, in accordance with the policies set by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The committee for this review consists of all tenured faculty in the Department, and is chaired by the faculty member whose area of expertise matches that of the faculty member undergoing evaluation; in the case where no faculty member’s scholarship is a perfect match, the Department Chair will, at his/her discretion, name one member of the tenured faculty to serve as chair of the committee. The committee develops its evaluation of the faculty member undergoing evaluation by considering his/her Third-Year Narrative and supporting materials in light of the Department’s Criteria for Promotion and Tenure [described below]. As with the annual and triennial evaluations, the Department Chairperson does not participate in the ensuing discussion (and writes an independent evaluation of the faculty member), but s/he serves as an information resource for the committee members as they consider the faculty member’s credentials. The result is an evaluation of the faculty member’s progress toward tenure and promotion, and a recommendation to approve or deny his/her application for junior sabbatical. The comments of the committee members are compiled and edited by the committee chair, who forwards the resulting report to the Department Chairperson for inclusion in the materials sent to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences.

A. **Teaching.** For purposes of evaluation of a faculty member’s teaching, the Communication Department evaluation committee follows the most recent version of the University Rank & Tenure policy.

B. **Scholarship:** Faculty is required to engage in ongoing scholarly research on matters central to the field of Communication. Such research will typically range across and between the Department’s 8 specializations: Interpersonal Communication, Journalism, Media Production, Media Studies, Organizational Communication, Performance Studies, Public Relations, and Rhetorical Studies. Scholarly research within our field includes the discovery, dissemination, and application of new information in any area considering the creation, processing, understanding and/or dissemination of human symbols (including knowledge of how learning is encouraged and fostered); to this end, such scholarship may be inter- and/or intra-disciplinary. Although there are no “hard and fast” rules for evaluating the product of intellectual inquiry in the field of Communication, the rank and tenure process for evaluating proficiency and performance of such research includes the following considerations:

- Given the breadth and diversity of the field of Communication, there are a wide variety of excellent outlets for our work. Consequently, we do not rank order the journals in which Communication Department faculty might publish, or reduce them to a “short list” of approved outlets.

- There is no one “approved” medium for scholarly publication in the field of Communication (e.g., books vs. journal articles vs. performance/production work); thus, there are multiple types of work which may be taken as legitimate evidence of a candidate’s success in producing scholarly research.
Successful departmental tenure and promotion recommendations require the creation of quality scholarship extending beyond the work contained in one’s doctoral dissertation and, if applicable, other than that contained in one’s post-doctoral research. Promotion to Professor requires the creation of quality scholarship extending beyond the work which merited promotion to Associate.

For purposes of evaluation of a candidate’s program of research, the Communication Department distinguishes between scholarship and publication as follows:

1. *Scholarship* refers to the fruit of a faculty member’s intellectual inquiry into his/her area of interest, including:
   a. direction of and/or significant participation in ongoing research that holds demonstrably evident promise of making a major contribution to knowledge;
   b. solicitation, and especially receipt, of extramural research grants;
   c. papers delivered before scholarly societies;
   d. other marks of scholarship such as respect of competent colleagues and professional honors and recognition (e.g., Fulbright awards);
   e. attendance at professional conferences, although a valuable means of keeping abreast of one’s field, in and of itself it is not considered as evidence of scholarship;

2. *Publication* refers to the successful conversion of such scholarship into a medium recognized within the field of Communication (e.g., scholarly book, edited collection, book chapter, conference proceedings, academic journal, performance, or production):
   a. the acceptance of an extramural research grant proposal will not constitute a form of publication, for purposes of evaluation, but receipt of external grants will be considered when evaluating the overall quality of one’s scholarly research;
   b. formal and final written acceptance of publication of a completed scholarly work (or letter of award by a granting organization or authority) normally is to be deemed the equivalent of publication, provided the acceptance is by a recognized scholarly journal or press and provided the work in question has undergone rigorous peer review under the auspices of the editor (or the equivalent review for creative and applied research work);
   c. acceptance of other manuscripts or productions, and contracts for books and monographs not yet completed, generally are not counted as publications. Such acceptance is to be evaluated in the light of the candidate’s previous scholarly work relating to the content of the item in question;
   d. although research encompasses publication, some publications (e.g., textbooks, most book reviews) more appropriately fit into the teaching or service categories than the research category.

3. Drawing upon this distinction, tenure and/or promotion in rank will not be granted a candidate based solely upon scholarship, without the support of publication.

As described in the University Rank & Tenure Policy, the research produced by a faculty member in the Communication Department will typically fall into one or more of the following categories, and will be evaluated as such:

1. Basic research (theoretical, applied and critical), which typically results in new data, new understandings, and/or new interpretations in matters of interest;
2. Applied research, in which knowledge is brought to bear in new or particularly effective ways on, e.g., physical, intellectual, emotional, social, cultural, or moral.
problems or conditions to produce new understandings, solutions, technologies, models, materials, or inventions in matters of interest;

3. Rigorous instructional research, which is a type of applied research oriented toward discovery of new modes or techniques for student learning in the discipline. Such scholarly research is not to be equated with the sort of research that is involved with routine course and curriculum design, but it may be a precursor to curriculum-related efforts;

• In order to evaluate all of the above types of research, the Communication Department’s Rank & Tenure Committee will read all of the publications submitted by the faculty member, and, for purposes of evaluation, will apply three criteria:

1. Quality. In evaluation of the quality of a faculty member’s research:
   a. generally speaking, blind peer-reviewed publications will be viewed more highly than invited publications; publications undergoing editorial review (but not blind peer review) will be viewed more highly than invited publications;
   b. for journal articles, judgment of their quality will vary based upon the journal’s relationship to the field (i.e., a National Communication Association journal, an International Communication Association journal, a regional Communication association journal), the journal’s affiliation with a recognized, interdisciplinary scholarly association (e.g., Semiotics Society of America, Rhetoric Society of America, etc.), the journal’s review policies, and any available information on the journal’s prestige, such as its editorial board, rejection rate, appearance in electronic databases, and circulation (as reported by the editor, or by such resources as the The Iowa Guide: Scholarly Journals in Mass Communication and Related Fields). All of the above factors being equal, the Rank & Tenure Committee’s evaluations of quality will not differentiate between scholarly journals published electronically and those published in print forms;
   c. for scholarly books, judgment of their quality will vary based upon the perceived quality and prestige of the press (i.e. university press, commercial scholarly press [e.g. Routledge], small independent press), the nature of the press’ review process, and pre- and post-publication reviews by scholars in similar fields. Chapters in scholarly books or edited collections will be evaluated using similar criteria for quality. All of the above factors being equal, the Rank & Tenure Committee’s evaluations of quality will not differentiate between scholarly books published electronically and those published in print forms;
   d. for extramural research grants awarded, judgment of their quality will vary based upon the size of the grant awarded, the prominence of the granting agency or foundation, and the nature of the outcome of the award.

2. Impact. In evaluation of the impact of a faculty member’s research, the committee will supplement their own evaluation of this research with evidence such as:
   a. the required written assessments provided by the scholars or other experts outside Villanova;
   b. awards and/or external recognition of excellence in scholarly research;
   c. citations of the candidate’s published work in the scholarly literature (typically found via a search of Google Scholar, EBSCOHost Communication & Mass Media Complete database, or the Social Sciences Citation Index). Although this is not required for candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure, such evidence will be used by the evaluation committee to help determine the impact of the faculty member’s research;
d. inclusion of a candidate’s published work in the course syllabi of other scholars in his/her field;
e. use of a candidate’s scholarly research by government agencies, corporate entities, and/or non-profit organizations;
f. citations of a candidate’s scholarly research in popular media of quality.

3. Quantity. In evaluation of the quantity of a faculty member’s research, the committee will look for the candidate to demonstrate an ability to contribute regularly to her/his discipline and/or related disciplines. Although collaborative research with other scholars is desirable, it is important that each faculty member undertake and execute a program of research that clearly demonstrates the individual’s independent scholarly abilities and achievements. Consequently, in order to assist the committee in its evaluation of the quantity of a candidate’s research, each candidate for tenure and/or promotion should indicate the degree and nature of his/her contribution to any collaborative publication or grant project—so that the individual’s distinct contribution to joint efforts is apparent, identifiable, and measurable. Typically, in the field of Communication, order of authorship denotes the amount of work contributed to the grant/book/edited collection/article/chapter; any deviation from this tradition should be especially highlighted as part of the discussion of the candidate’s contribution. Any exception to this disciplinary practice must be noted and documented within the candidate’s dossier—and confirmed by the evaluation committee.

C. Service: For purposes of evaluation of a faculty member’s service, the Communication Department evaluation committee follows the most recent version of the University Rank & Tenure policy.

General Note: Promotion to Full Professor. For purposes of evaluation of a faculty member’s application for promotion to Full Professor, the Communication Department evaluation committee follows the most recent version of the University Rank & Tenure policy.

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTING SCIENCES

Introduction. The Department of Computing Sciences has prepared the Tenure and Promotion Criteria Statement (Revised May 16, 2007) that implements the university policy and provides specific guidelines for applicants and evaluators as they prepare or read dossiers from faculty members in the Department. The summary below is based on this Statement and outlines the areas in which expectations in the Computing Sciences may be different from the expectations in other departments. All areas of the university policy are assumed to apply unless explicitly mentioned in this summary.

A. Teaching

Because the field of computing sciences is relatively young and growing very fast, faculty members are encouraged to contribute to the department’s ability to offer courses in emerging technical areas. Thus, faculty evaluation will include consideration of new courses and new topic areas in existing courses that have been developed and implemented by the candidate for promotion or tenure.

Recognizing the challenge of reflecting changes in a dynamic field in current course content, consideration of currency of existing courses will be an important consideration in evaluating the teaching of faculty.
B. **Scholarship**

The publication environment in the computing sciences relies heavily on conferences. Whereas there are a wide variety of conferences and journals, both are important in scholarly activities of computing scientists. The good conferences and good journals are well known by the members of the discipline, who are able to evaluate the importance of these venues in disseminating significant work. Good conferences are double-blind refereed and have acceptance rates lower than many journals. Conference submissions are full, well-researched papers. The difference between conference publications and journal publications is that conferences require that the original submission, after refereeing, be either accepted with very minor modification or rejected. There is no time for extensive revision and many rounds of review. This implies greater pressure on the person submitting the work to make a clear and well-organized presentation of the value of the submission. If significant revision is required, the submission will be rejected, revised, and submitted to a different conference. Many conference papers do undergo this process before acceptance. The significance of conference submissions in computing sciences is well understood and documented within the discipline. [Computing Research Association, *Evaluating Computer Scientists and Engineers for Promotion and Tenure. A Best Practices Memo*, Computing Research News, September 1999]

The rate of change within the computing discipline requires continuous effort to remain current. Taking courses, participating in on-line research discussion groups, or attending conferences and workshops will be considered significant scholarly activities.

C. **Service.** Service expectations in the computing sciences are similar to those of other disciplines. One significant factor, however, is that there is a critical shortage of computing professionals at the present time. This results in increased pressure for service work in the profession. Time spent in service must necessarily reduce time available for other types of activities.

D. **Procedures.** No discipline wide standards for listing multiple authors of a paper exist. Faculty members cited a number of ways that the list of contributors to their multiply-authored papers were organized including (1) alphabetically, (2) students first, (3) students last, (4) principal contributor first, (5) random, and (6) changing with each paper. Individual candidates with multiply authored papers will provide information about their publications.

The department’s annual review committee consists of three tenured faculty members plus the chair. Each faculty member serves a three-year term. Appointments to the committee are rotated through the tenured faculty following the master list.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND COUNSELING**

**Introduction:**

- **Standards for Evaluation of Teaching, Research, Professional Activity, and Service:** Standards used to evaluate and to shape faculty work are broadly described below. They set a basis of comparison for judging quality. The work must be high quality, the scope of recognition should grow over time from local to regional to national to international, effort should be sustained, and the impact of the activities should be apparent. A brief explanation of the standards follows.

- **High quality work as judged by peers and students:** Work selected by a jury, panel, series or reviewers will be particularly valued. In teaching, student judgment will be used as one criteria of assessment. In service, effective contributions or leadership positions are more significant than
holding membership.

- **Scope of recognition at the international, national, regional, or local level.** Having a wide scope of recognition is positively evaluated.

- **Sustained effort, involvement, and record of accomplishment.** Consistent accomplishment over time is more positively evaluated than less sustained effort and more positively evaluated than a comparable work in progress.

- **Impact of activities:** Candidates for tenure and promotion should demonstrate a positive impact on students, peers, or profession as a result of their teaching, scholarly/creative/professional activity, or service. Impact on students is of primary importance.

The following enumerated points describe examples of evidence that might be provided to demonstrate mastery sufficient for tenure and promotion. Every point in each category does not have to be met in order for a candidate to achieve tenure or promotion. They are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive but rather to reflect the spirit behind an ethical and positive process. Candidates are expected to demonstrate accomplishments in all three categories; however, this does not imply that candidates must present evidence of accomplishment in every example or perform equally well in every example.

A. Teaching

Some examples of the skills and characteristics that mark an effective teacher are:

- **Instruction and Course Materials**
  1. Mastering the subject; staying current in one’s field; participating in professional conferences to improve one’s teaching; offering a variety of course topics.
  2. Presenting skillfully—this includes employing effective communication skills and appropriately varied materials, methods, formats, and approaches—in teacher education, we recommend including a use of technology.
  3. Generating students’ intellectual curiosity and desire to learn.
  4. Developing students’ critical thinking and leadership skills; encouraging them in service to others and in advocacy for their prospective students and clients.
  5. Showing an awareness of both individual differences as well as sensitivity to varying cultures and heritages within the classroom. Teaching students to do the same in their work.

- **Non-classroom Instruction**
  1. Acting as a role model; teaching by example; imparting to students an ethical basis for decision-making, supporting diversity as an enriching strength.
  2. Conducting tutorials and individualized instruction if necessary; directing graduate projects or theses; supervising internships; directing practica and etc.

- **Advising**
  1. Assisting students with specific course plans, career goals, personal and professional development
  2. Making appropriate referrals when necessary—and teaching students to do the same
  3. Availability to students; scheduling office hours that are suitable to students (especially graduate students).
  4. Willingness to advise the range of students from undergraduate to graduate.

B. Scholarly/Creative/Professional Activity

Scholarly/professional activity is given particular weight if it is linked to effective teaching.
• **Research:** Research is communicated to the academic community through professional journals, published books, editions, chapters, original papers for conferences or professional societies, service as editor or reviewer of scholarly works or proposals, panels, meetings, published manuals, handbooks to accompany textbooks, instruments or equipment, and electronic media. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods are typical in the fields of education and counseling. Individual as well as collaborative research with other professionals and students is encouraged.


1. **Disciplinary research:** Contribution to knowledge in a field through presentation of newly derived data or original critical interpretations of existing information.

2. **Applied research:** Development and/or evaluation of solutions to practical problems within a field. Curriculum development may be considered applied research if designed for groups outside of the University. Textbooks for use in K-12 settings will be considered scholarly activity.

3. **Pedagogical research:** New insights and methods for transmitting knowledge to students.

• **Professional and intellectual development in the field:** Examples include pursuing additional graduate degrees, engaging in post-doctoral fellowships, internships, residencies, and personal studies within the field.

• **Professional services as a consultant or practitioner:** These are considered scholarly when they involve the creation rather than consumption or application of existing knowledge. They must also have an impact on one’s profession or discipline. Example: Using original research when consulting for a company, creating national standards for an accrediting agency, designing curricula for national or regional use.

• **Creative endeavors:** As informed by research specialty, that contribute to the field. These are considered scholarship when they create new knowledge, change perceptions, or induce insights. Examples: Creating and teaching case studies, art therapy, music therapy, or psychodrama.

• **Expository writing about the field:** Examples: Critiques or interpretations of existing practices in education, human services, or counseling.

C. **Service**

• **To the Department, College and University**
  Contributions to the effective operation and growth of the institution. Act in a collegial fashion within the department and campus-wide.
  Examples: creating or significantly revising programs, curricula, courses; active participation on or chairing departmental, college and university-wide committees, organizations, task forces; advising student organizations or clubs; participation in campus governance or as an elected faculty representative; participation in off-campus programs or workshops as an invited representative of the University.
To the Profession
Contributions are made to the advancement of academic profession through active participation in professional and scholarly organizations.
Examples: holding membership and/or office in a professional organization within one’s academic discipline; participating or leading professional organizations by serving on governing boards, chairing meetings, leading discussions; acting as a member of an accrediting team or review board.

To the Community
Contributions are made through the application of the faculty member’s academic skills and experience to the solution of local, national, or international problems.
Examples: advising student organizations; acting as guest lecturer; membership and active participation in charitable, civic, and cultural organizations; acting as resource person for education, government, business, hospitals and mental health facilities, or industry.

Additional Criteria: Bases for Tenure and Promotion: Teaching, Scholarly/creative/ professional Activity, and Service

The standards and competencies required for tenure and promotion in the Department of Education and Counseling are complex because the Department’s mission includes both academic and professional education. In such an endeavor the realities of theory and practice -- scholarship and teaching -- are inextricably connected. In addition to educating students in the academic content of Education and Counseling, the faculty simultaneously prepares students as practitioners in varied settings. At the baccalaureate level, students graduate as state certified secondary school teachers and human service practitioners working in schools and in mental health and human resource settings. Students completing their graduate education in this department are further prepared as teachers, K-16 administrators, elementary and secondary school counselors, and mental health counselors.

Theories, and often the faculty’s scholarship, inform, enhance, and refine not only their teaching but also their professional work with students. In this discipline, the creation of new knowledge not only advances the field, but it also has the capacity to contribute directly to the development of individual professionals. Consequently, the standards for promotion and tenure must reflect competence in both theory and practice. The unique dispositions we require in faculty may include the following: modeling teaching and counseling behaviors, supervising individual student’s clinical or teaching skills, building relationships with local school districts and agencies, and meeting with on-site supervisors. In addition, the faculty member is expected to be knowledgeable about current and constantly changing societal and educational or clinical mental health issues (e.g., school violence, grief and trauma work, changing special education regulations) and to ensure that students have developed the judgment to handle whatever they may encounter in their professional practice.

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

Introduction. Any attempt to quantify the amount of scholarly work, whether published or in the process of production, needs to reserve as an essential condition an evaluation of its quality as well as what it promises for a continuing, longstanding career of research interest and productivity. The tenured faculty of the English Department will use these standards in reviewing and evaluating the work submitted by a candidate for tenure. With an assessment falling necessarily then on the demonstrated merit and perceived potential of this work, it is possible still to project, in some approximate form, a fair and adequate measure of the amount of writing that will provide a sufficient basis for the departmental faculty to make its assessment. What follows here is a sampling of the kinds of combinations a credible tenure candidacy might feature. There is also an attempt to provide a rationale for the quality and kind of work expected,
and an indication as well to readers outside the department what credible work in our discipline may resemble.

A. **Teaching.** The English Department evaluation of teaching begins with the faculty member’s Teaching Portfolio outlining the goals and objectives of their teaching and how they seek to realize them. The Department also reviews CATS scores and student evaluations while realizing that scores can vary depending on the kinds of classes taught (e.g., a required freshman composition class vs. an upper-division elective in one’s field) and understanding the accurate evaluation embraces as well such matters as a program of regular class visitations and examination of course syllabi.

B. **Scholarship**

In the field of English, strong candidates for tenure may present a completed book manuscript, published or under contract to a recognized press, or 5-6 scholarly articles, published or accepted by recognized journals and/or presses (or, for creative appointments, an equivalent amount of creative work).

In the spirit of section IV.B.2.b of the university policy statement, book manuscripts that are nearing completion and that the candidate presents for formal review as part of the tenure application may carry some weight, “in light of the candidate’s previous scholarly work relating to the content of the item in question.” In our department, presenting such a book manuscript in combination with approximately 4 articles also may in some cases constitute an appropriate body of work. (The special status that work of this type conforms to requires that it be assessed by standards applicable to it in particular; therefore, in the process of submitting the work for external review, a manuscript in process will be sent on its own to a separate reviewer, and it will be assessed by standards directly relevant to the issues a submission of this type raises: does it have the scope and dimension of a major, book-length work; what are its growing points and what are its claims to a major place in the field it occupies, etc.)

These numbers represent neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for a successful tenure application. Fewer articles of exceptional individual merit may constitute a credible submission, while six or even more of indifferent quality will not prove adequate. In establishing the category of “exceptional” the department means to hold the works submitted to the very highest of applicable criteria. Work deemed to be “exceptional” needs thus to appear, or to have been accepted for publication, in elite media. These journals are commonly recognized and understood as such by members of our department. Conversely, the departmental judgment of sub-standard quality in a submission will result from our assessment of the quality of the work, not necessarily on our verdict of the prestige of the journal in which it appears.

The numbers cited above reflect a legitimate expectation for candidates in a six-year probationary period; the rationale lies in the idea that an article of major scope and depth represents adequate—or even ambitious—work for a single academic year. In accordance with disciplinary practice (and publication standards) in our field, the department expects scholarly articles to be substantial undertakings. Scholars working in English often produce fewer articles than those in some other fields, but our discipline expects to achieve a density of analysis and/or scope of argument that is concomitantly large. It also is typical of the publication process in our field to require substantial editorial back-and-forth, and backlogs to publication are common. Thus the University’s statement in IV.B.2.b. that “formal and final written acceptance for publication . . . is to be deemed the equivalent of publication” is particularly germane, and it would be quite normal for a tenure candidate in our field that a substantial fraction of the work offered in the dossier be “forthcoming.”
The discipline of English is in a moment of evolution: as a whole, it currently inhabits intersections of rhetorical, historical, cultural, aesthetic, theoretical, and pedagogical analysis. Thus many kinds of contributions are possible; work of qualitative excellence may often synthesize several of these areas.

In regard to the issue of articles or books that have grown from Ph.D. theses, a crucial concern in evaluating this activity is whether it confirms a deepening acquaintance on the candidate’s part with the subject of the dissertation and a demonstrable advance in the placement of this discourse within the accepted and recognized media of the profession. It is of course possible that prominent chapters in the thesis will be published as originally written and this sort of success may well provide a testament to the worth of the work. In all cases, however, a candidate needs to demonstrate ample activity beyond the thesis. The standard of ongoing intellectual activity requires the candidate to show that the interests the thesis originally defined have either advanced or been advanced from: the old work will have been renewed with fresh perspectives or considerable extensions, or novel undertakings of recognizable worth will have occurred.

In the field of English, conference papers are works in progress, sometimes modified during the course of a conference, often presented at a conference precisely as experimental ventures, and often written in a somewhat different style than a manuscript for publication. Allowing for this kind of stylistic license, the text of these conference presentations will be submitted in an appendix in line with the new requirements for tenure applications.

C. Service. The Department attempts to evaluate the quality and degree of service as listed by the faculty member. No rigid guidelines exist for this effort. Candidates for tenure or promotion should present evidence of appropriate service to the department, college, and/or university. Credit is given as well for a candidate’s service to the profession or professionally related service to the community, but these cannot substitute for service to the university.
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Specific concerns that might be especially relevant to the English department:

- On book-length monographs versus refereed articles: This has become an issue for discussion within our field because of recent MLA statements recommending that departments reduce their reliance on books. In fact, we anticipated this suggestion; our guidelines refer to an alternative path towards tenure that would rely on articles rather than a book.

- On new forms of publication, “impact studies,” and rankings of journals and publishers: In our field, there are no accepted impact studies or formal rankings of journals and publishers. We evaluate new publishers and journals (including electronic journals) the way we always have: judging such things as their editorial board, who publishes in them, what is the quality of the work they publish, and what their rates of submission and publication are. (The same is true of well-known print journals and publishers: they have established reputations, but their quality can move up or down, and they can quickly develop strengths in particular areas.) It is also worth noting that our outside evaluators comment on the places where our candidates publish, which is especially useful when a candidate has a specialized subfield. Most importantly, however, we rely on our own scholarly expertise to make our own assessments of the quality of the candidate’s work, regardless of where it has been published.

- On modes of assessing the fine arts, which in our case would be creative writing: Our statement follows a discussion of scholarly publication by referring to “an equivalent amount of creative
work.” We do not see a way of being more precise, because the range of possibilities is so broad—
-for example, from a short lyric poem to a long novel. We seek to evaluate a body of work case
by case, and when we assess it formally, to explain exactly what is the basis for our judgment of
its substantiality, significance, and quality.

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY & ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

MEMORANDUM

From: Francis A. Galgano Jr.
Chair, Department of Geography and the Environment

Subject: Rank and Tenure Standards for Geography and Environmental Science

1. **Purpose.** This memorandum summarizes rank and tenure guidelines specific to the Department
of Geography and the Environment (GEV). As such, it is provided to guide GEV faculty as they
pursue their scholarly development and to assist College and University rank and tenure committees as
they evaluate scholarly productivity in the disciplines of Geography, Geospatial Science, and
Environmental Science. This document also spells out the teaching, scholarship, and service
expectations of the department’s faculty. The disciplines inherent to this Department are broad,
spanning the social (i.e., Human Geography) and physical sciences (i.e., Physical Geography and
Environmental Science), as well as highly technical areas (i.e., Geospatial Sciences). Hence, these
guidelines are not intended to be used as a definitive checklist or to emplace a quantitative set of
expectations, and they should not be applied uniformly to every case of tenure and promotion because
of the numerous specializations within each of our disciplines. Rather, these benchmarks are intended
to serve as a guide to best practices in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.  

2. **Rank and Tenure Benchmarks.**

   a. **Teaching.** Department faculty should be teaching effectively across all levels of the
curriculum, be involved in the advising of students, and clearly demonstrate the promise of continued
strong contributions to the Department, College, and University in the future. Data from departmental
and student teaching evaluations should establish convincing evidence of effective teaching and, most
importantly, the data should indicate demonstrated improvement as a teacher over time.

   (1) Technology, such as Global Positioning Systems (GPS), Geographic
Information Systems (GIS), satellite platforms, and digital modeling (DTM) has revolutionized
Geography and the Environmental Sciences during the past decade. Thus, there is an expectation that
teaching should manifest some integration of these technologies into courses where appropriate.
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Additionally, there is a reasonable expectation that faculty are developing new courses to incorporate emerging technology as well.

(2) Candidates for associate professor should be teaching a variety of required introductory (e.g., GEV 1050/1051 and 2310), mid-level electives, and in the core curriculum (e.g., Mendel Science Experience) where appropriate. Environmental science assistant professors should be developing new lab courses to support the curriculum. Candidates at the professor level are expected to develop and teach upper-level, integrating courses, such as seminars and student research projects. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are expected to develop and teach new courses that are consistent with the growth demands of a new and growing department. In all cases, candidates should demonstrate that their courses are multidisciplinary (a foundation of the department), stimulating, focus on problem solving, and strive to achieve an intellectual convergence of the Department’s three programs.

(3) Undergraduate research with professors is a cornerstone of the Villanova system and this department. Accordingly, tenured and tenure-track faculty should be actively engaged with students in mentoring undergraduate research. It supports this important academic function and demonstrates academic engagement beyond the classroom.

b. Scholarship. The fundamental measure of scholarly performance is publication in peer-reviewed journals and other refereed outlets appropriate to the faculty member’s area of expertise. These publications are expected to address research beyond the dissertation and post-doctoral level, especially for a candidate seeking promotion to full professor. The expectations of publications are concerned more with quality and promise, rather than with their sheer number or volume.

Evidence of high-quality research and scholarship is not limited to peer-reviewed journals. As noted previously, the breadth of GEV disciplines are broad, encompassing a number of specialty areas, each with unique research methodologies. Furthermore, there has been a revolution in geographical research techniques (i.e., GPS, GIS, and DTM) during the past decade. This revolution has fostered a wider scope of acceptable publication outlets because of the timeliness required for the publication of highly technical research methods, as well as the high cost of color reproductions required for satellite imagery and digital cartographic techniques. Furthermore, any evaluation of geography and environmental faculty for tenure and promotion must be viewed against the background of the current state of scholarly research and publishing in the humanities, social sciences, and sciences, which differs fundamentally from the situation of even a decade ago. Recent studies have identified a number of important trends, principally driven by publication costs, which have altered the availability of publication venues. Consequently, the publication environment now relies heavily on refereed conference proceedings, refereed on-line journals, and peer-reviewed specialty volumes. Additionally, physical geographers and environmental scientists are presenting in a wider variety of specialty conferences, many with excellent refereed proceedings (e.g., American Society of Civil Engineers or the Geologic Society of America). In the case of research products that are not traditional peer-reviewed journal articles, the applicant is expected to provide evidence of equivalence to peer reviewed publications. Such evidence could include editorial boards, reviews, and description of breadth of audience.

(1) Journal Articles. Publication in a peer-reviewed journal remains the “gold standard” and evidence of scholarship normally include articles in geography, environmental, geospatial, or specialty journals. Because of variation from one sub-field to another, exact
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quantification of required published output is not possible and there is a broad array of highly regarded publication outlets. These extend to science education journals, which allow our faculty to highlight innovative inquiry-based learning exercises developed for the classroom. Nonetheless, the most prestigious journals are refereed using a double or single-blind procedure, however, there is no difference between single- or double-blind reviewing, neither for the prestige of the journal or publisher, or for the validity of the review.

Given the multidisciplinary nature of most contemporary research requiring collective expertise in the geographic, geospatial, and environmental sciences, projects and resultant publications are typically the result of collaborative work. Hence, the candidate will specify his or her contributions in the case of multiple authored works. In nearly every instance, disciplines common to GEV faculty use the following conventions: (1) the primary author is listed first and the order of listing of other authors is consistent with relative contributions to the paper; and (2) student researchers are typically listed ahead of faculty advisors in cases where the researcher is the principal writer. Certainly, there will be deviations from these conventions, thus it is incumbent on the candidate to articulate clearly his/her contribution to papers with multiple authors. Although, especially in the physical sciences, it is common practice for multiple researchers to author papers, independence should be demonstrated by lead or single authorship of some of these publications. However, single-authored papers, chapters, and books may be more appropriate for a scholar at a more senior (i.e., professor) level considering a more highly developed level of research experience.

The wide scope of disciplines and specialty areas inherent to GEV precludes a definitive list of “flagship” journals. Each GEV discipline has a subset of leading journals, and there is a number of high quality specialty and multidisciplinary journals in which we would expect our faculty to publish. Furthermore, there is a variety of highly regarded regional journals as well. A representative list of leading journals is given in the appendix.

The importance of impact factors and citation indices has been diminished in GEV disciplines because of the proliferation of on-line journals, peer-reviewed proceedings, and peer-reviewed specialty volumes. These publishing outlets have become more popular because the publication cycles of traditional, top-tier journals have not kept pace with technology and the capability of digital data analysis and mapping. For example, it takes two-years to publish a paper in the leading journal in the field of coastal science (i.e., Journal of Coastal Research) with minimal revisions. This cycle is too long considering the perishability of data that can now be collected and analyzed given the powerful tools available to researchers. Hence, innovative research is increasingly being published in on-line journals, peer-reviewed proceedings, and peer-reviewed specialty volumes because of faster turn-around times with no discernable loss of quality. This evolution in publishing is problematical because most of the “new” publication venues receive no visibility in various citation indices. Consequently, it is important that the candidate explain thoroughly the importance and impact of these types of papers. Nevertheless, we encourage GEV faculty to continue to publish in traditional, top-tier journals. In those cases, impact factors in the 1 to 3 range are considered very good, although citations are too variable to quantify.

(2) Conference Presentations. The scholarly record must include research presentations at regional, national, and/or international meetings of professional societies and organizations. Once again, because of the scope of GEV disciplines, there is no definitive list of conferences in which our faculty are expected to present. Additionally, there are a wide variety of national/international specialty conferences and outstanding regional and local conferences. The good conferences are well known by members of the discipline—these will be addressed in the Candidate’s
packet and Chair’s letter, rather than attempt to list them here. High-quality conferences have reviewed abstracts and refereed proceedings. The principal difference between refereed conference proceedings and journal publications is that conferences require that the original submission, after refereeing, be either accepted with limited modification or rejected. Consequently, with no time for extensive revision the person submitting must have a clear and well-organized paper.

3) Other Evidence of Scholarship. In all GEV disciplines, the publication of a book, especially by a nationally recognized publisher, is to be considered an excellent indicator of scholarship, regardless of the candidate's contributions (i.e., editor/co-editor, author/co-author, or editorial board). Similarly, refereed chapters in books are also to be considered compelling evidence of scholarship.

c. Service. Service in national and regional professional/scholarly organizations demonstrates leadership in one’s discipline. Although it is difficult to quantify precisely service expectations because of varied circumstances and timings, candidates should demonstrate a clear commitment to assisting and advancing academic governance at Villanova University as well as a commitment to enhancing academe through service in professional organizations.

1) All candidates should demonstrate the willingness and ability to participate in committee work and carry out their share of the various activities required for a properly functioning academic department. Service at the College and University level is highly desirable because it demonstrates a commitment to academic governance at Villanova University, but also from a developmental perspective, it provides a candidate with important insights into the functioning of the College and University as a whole. Furthermore, aside from the important developmental aspects of service on College and University committees, this type of service provides important networking opportunities and cross-campus linkages as well. Thus, at the associate professor level, the expectation is service on one or more college or university-level committees. Candidates for professor should demonstrate service on multiple college and university-level committees and perhaps service as a committee chair.

2) Faculty should demonstrate a commitment to community outreach and thus, assist the public in understanding the goals, methods, and findings of the discipline and of the university community. Additionally, community outreach service fosters and enhances the reputation of Villanova within the local community. In terms of Geography, Geospatial Sciences, and Environmental Sciences there are numerous opportunities and venues to accomplish this task given Villanova’s geographic location. Evidence of outreach may include working with a program in a local high school (or other school); some form of work with a local museum or society, or perhaps applied research and consulting with a local governmental organization (e.g., a water quality assessment).

3) All, faculty are expected to contribute to the development of their discipline and of the larger community of scholars. The review committee should recognize that the nature of each faculty member’s service activities would differ depending on his/her circumstances. However, it is reasonable to expect that the candidate would have served in a governing position in a professional/academic society at the national or regional level. This can be in the hierarchy of a national-level organization, in one of many specialty groups within a national organization, or in another position of importance, such as a regional counselor for a professional/academic organization.

There are a number of respected regional organizations in the field of Geography and the Environmental Sciences (e.g., Middle States Division of the Association of American Geographers, Northeastern Division of the Geological Society of America), and service in one these organizations
should be regarded highly as well. Other important evidence of service may include: (1) service on an editorial board of a journal or other periodic publication; (2) service as a reviewer for leading professional journals and/or funding agencies; (3) serving as an external evaluator for a department at a peer institution; or (4) serving as a reader/reviewer for a colleague undergoing tenure or promotion review at another institution.

3. Questions regarding the guidelines published in the memorandum should be directed to the undersigned, 9-3337, or francis.galgano@villanova.edu.

Appendix to Rank and Tenure Standards for Geography and Environmental Science

Representative Journals in Geography, Geo-Spatial Sciences, and Environmental Sciences

- Flagship Journals:

  Annals of the Association of American Geographers
  Geographical Review
  Geology
  Journal of Geophysical Research
  Nature
  Proc. of the National Academy of Science
  Science
  The Professional Geographer

Leading Specialty Journals and Interdisciplinary Journals:

- Applied Geochemistry
- Biogeochemistry
- Cartographic Perspectives
- Cartographica
- Cartography and Geo. Information Sciences
- Chemical Geology
- Ecocscience
- Ecosystems
- Environmental Science and Technology
- Geochimica Cosmochimica Acta
- Global Biogeochemical Cycles
- International Journal of Climatology
- J. of Remote Sensing and Photogrammetry
- Journal of Climate
- Journal of Coastal Research
- Limnology & Oceanography
- Shore and Beach
- The J. of the Am. Water Resources Association
- The Soil Science Society of America Journal
- The Pennsylvania Geographer
- The Journal of Soil and Water Conservation
- The Journal of Asian Studies
- Science of the Total Environment
- The Southeastern Geographer
- Population Geography
- Global Change Biology
- The Journal of Environmental Quality
- The Geographical Bulletin
- Middle States Geographer
- Environmental Geo-Sciences
- Ecology
- Forest Science
I. **Preface.** The two-fold purpose of this document is to guide History and Art History faculty in their scholarly development, and non-historians on university and college rank and tenure committees in their evaluation of scholarly productivity and quality in the disciplines of history and art history.

The Department of History believes that it is virtually impossible in these fields to specify quantitative expectations that could be applied uniformly to every case of tenure or promotion, because of the highly individualized nature of scholarship in the humanities. This difficulty is magnified by current conditions and trends in scholarly publication, with the emergence of new technological means of disseminating scholarship, on the one hand, and what has been termed recently as a “crisis” in humanities publishing at the present time.

II. **The Current State of Scholarly Publishing in the Humanities.** Any evaluation of Villanova history and art history faculty for tenure and promotion must be viewed against the background of the current state of scholarly research and publishing in the humanities, which differs radically from the situation of even a decade ago. Several recent studies by major associations in the humanities have identified a number of important trends, leading some to speak of a “crisis” especially for young scholars needing to publish monographs in order to receive tenure; even the more optimistic describe the system of scholarly publication as “strained.” Important trends relevant for Villanova University include:

- The scholarly monograph retains its status as the “gold standard” in evaluating junior scholars for tenure. (MLA)
- There is a limited range of other kinds of scholarly activity besides the monograph that departments and/or universities consider acceptable.
- Yet under the pressures of rising costs and shrinking markets for academic books, university presses have cancelled or severely reduced their lists. This reduction is particularly severe in certain disciplines, such as art history (where costs of production are especially high), and for certain topics and periods in history and art history, such as pre-modern eras or regions outside the US or Europe.
- The rising costs of book production have particularly affected art historians, whose works must include high quality photographs, due especially to the escalation in fees charged by museums, etc. for the permission rights and the costs of reproduction. (CAA)

Among the recommendations made by these associations that are particularly pertinent to those who must evaluate scholarship in history and art history at Villanova, the History Department considers the following to be the most useful and pertinent:

1. Decrease the emphasis on the publication of scholarly monographs as the chief criterion for tenure and promotion. (The MLA, for example, recommends against the “tyranny of the monograph.”) While the academic book continues to be recognized as valuable in the humanities, the production of a monograph should not necessarily be the *sine qua non* for tenure at Villanova University. A single-authored monograph may be more appropriate for a scholar at a more senior level and with more research experience.
2. In cases where the candidate has written a monograph, shift the emphasis from acceptance by a press by a certain deadline to an evaluation of the manuscript’s quality by internal and external readers.
3. Consider how other kinds of publications are equivalent to single-authored books in the humanities.
4. Recognize the legitimacy of forms of scholarly output besides monographs and articles, such as textbooks and translations, and in new media, such as electronic publishing.

5. Base assessments of the quality of publications on well-chosen outside reviewers who are senior scholars and experts in relevant fields.

6. Develop and adopt institution-specific and appropriate criteria for tenure and promotion in accordance with the institution’s mission, and make those criteria and the process as transparent as possible. (To an admirable extent this is already the case at Villanova.)

7. Consider ways to offer scholars, especially junior scholars, subventions for publication.

The History department has revised its 2001 statement on standards and expectations for tenure and promotion with these considerations and recommendations in mind. Section III deals with the nature of scholarship in history and art history; Section IV deals with issues that particularly affect the discipline of art history; and Section V outlines the department’s expectations of scholarly output for promotion and tenure.

III. Research and Scholarship in History and Art History

A. Forms of Historical and Art Historical Scholarship. Scholarship in history and art history may be categorized into the following three types:

1. The advancement of knowledge, which includes:
   - original research and scholarship, generally published in one of four forms:
     1. peer-reviewed monographs, published by academic or reputable trade presses;
     2. peer-reviewed articles, published in print or online academic journals relevant to the article’s content and author’s subspecialty;
     3. chapters in edited books or contributions to edited collections of articles, usually solicited by the editor(s) or resulting from invited participation in a scholarly conference, and peer-reviewed by outside referees and/or the editor(s).
     4. essays and substantial entries in museum or exhibition catalogs.
   - documentary or critical editions and translations
   - editorship of a book-length collection of articles
   - papers or lectures given at scholarly or professional meetings or conferences
   - museum exhibitions or similar projects or programs.

2. The integration of knowledge, published in a review essay, textbook, newsletter, popular history magazine, encyclopedia, newspaper, or other form of publication, or disseminated through a paper, lecture or exhibition.

3. The application of knowledge, which includes public history (exhibitions, tours, etc. in museums and other cultural and educational institutions), consulting and providing expert testimony on public policy and other matters; contract research on policy formulation and policy outcomes; participation in film and other media projects; writing institutional and other histories. Some forms of professional service--editing journals and newsletters, organizing scholarly meetings, and community service drawing directly upon scholarship -- fall under both scholarship and service.

---

5In history a review essay (in a journal or anthology), unlike a book review, criticizes and synthesizes existing scholarship, is published under a separate title, and allows the author to develop his or her own intellectual argument. Many journals also submit them for blind peer review. While usually less weighty than an article, review essays should be considered contributions to scholarship, not as service to the profession.
B. Characteristics of Scholarship in History and Art History

- **Collaborative vs. Individual Research.** Individual research and writing remain the norm in history and art history. When collaborative research does take place, it usually takes the form of comparative or interdisciplinary research, large projects requiring collective expertise, or non-traditional forms of scholarly activity. The results of collaborative work in history and art history are commonly the product of equal effort by the collaborating scholars.

- **Access to Research Sources.** Unpublished primary sources, usually found in archival collections, are essential to high quality research and scholarship. Often archival collections are located far from the scholar’s home institution, and access to them, even in the United States, can be problematic. Thus archival research is generally dependent on conditions outside the control of the scholar, whose work may therefore be delayed, protracted, or complicated by such problems of access and usage. In evaluating scholarship the Department takes into account the ways archival research have affected the rate of scholarly production in individual cases (each is unique), especially for young scholars.

- **Outlets for Publishing.** There is a plethora of outlets for publishing in history and art history – not only numerous university and other presses both in the US and abroad but also a large number of diverse journals, both general and specialized. With certain exceptions (eminent university presses such as Harvard UP, or the highly competitive journals published by leading professional associations, such as the American Historical Review), it is difficult, even impossible, to rank journals or presses by their quality or the rigor of their selection process. More significant is the appropriateness of that press or journal for the kinds of scholarly work being done, and the audiences they reach.

- **Review Process.** In most cases manuscripts of articles and books are sent by journals and presses to scholars for evaluation in a single- or double-blind procedure. There is no difference between single- or double-blind reviewing, neither for the prestige of the journal or publisher, nor for the validity of the review.

- **Foreign Publications.** Publishing abroad and in a foreign language should be considered a strength in a candidate’s tenure and/or promotion dossier. The department encourages history and art history faculty to participate in international conferences and symposia whenever they are appropriate and useful, and to publish in international venues. Foreign journals and presses often have different procedures for reviewing and evaluating manuscripts than American ones, though these differences do not mean necessarily that the process is less rigorous, or the publication venue less prestigious. Faculty who publish abroad should provide information on the publisher, journal, and editorial or review process, and English-language abstracts for publications in foreign languages.

IV. Issues Specific to Research and Scholarship in Art History

- **Publishing with Images.** As mentioned in Section II above, it has become increasing difficult to obtain the images necessary for publishing in art history. Finding the necessary photographs can take considerable time and effort; the costs of making high-quality reproductions are high; and museums, galleries and other owners of art works charge high fees for permission to reproduce them. The effort and cost involved can significantly prolong the publication process, narrow the number of journals or presses willing to consider a manuscript, and increase the costs of research for the individual art historian. One colleague
estimates that even a journal article costs between $200 and $500; costs associated with publishing art history books by Yale University Press, one of the leaders in the field, are reported as high as $10,000. Often journals and presses expect or require subventions for publishing research in art history.

- **Publishing Abroad.** As the College Art Association points out in its recent report, “art history is an international discipline and American art historians routinely publish their work on other continents” and in languages other than English. Publishing abroad is not only desirable but necessary for art history scholars in certain fields. The CAA makes two pertinent recommendations in this regard:

  1. Review committees should avoid the practice of measuring the impact of scholarship in art history by the number of citations, since works published abroad are not consistently reported in citation indexes;

  2. Given the difficulty of ranking journals published outside the US, review committees should base their assessment of the quality of a candidate’s publications on the evaluations of outside reviewers in the field.

V. **Scholarly Expectations in History and Art History**

- **Expectations For Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

  In history and art history a scholar’s first publications have usually though not necessarily been based on the doctoral dissertation, revised and augmented with additional archival and other research. Traditionally, the greatest value has been assigned to printed, book-length monographs resulting from specialized original research. Although the Department of History encourages its candidates for tenure to produce high-quality publications of this type, it recognizes that external circumstances may prevent the timely publication of a monograph in print form. Consequently a candidate may be able to demonstrate a similarly high level of scholarly productivity and quality in published articles and other forms.

  In general, the successful candidate for tenure and promotion to associate professor has established an ongoing research program that shows promise of leading to an authoritative position in the candidate’s area of specialization, demonstrated primarily by:

  1. The publication of a series of journal articles in single- or double-blind, peer-reviewed journals or chapters in refereed, edited books, which have had significant impact for the candidate’s field, or

  2. The completion of a book-length monograph either already published by a university press or reputable trade press; in press; under contract with a publisher; or completed in manuscript and able to be evaluated as a whole by external and internal readers. (Formal and final acceptance of a manuscript for publication is considered to be the equivalent of publication.)

- **Expectations For Promotion to Professor.** In history and art history the successful candidate for promotion to full professor should demonstrate the continuation and elaboration of an ongoing research program that has earned him or her an authoritative position in his or her field, normally demonstrated by a series of publications in appropriate scholarly media, preferably including at least one book-length work or its equivalent (e.g., in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, contributions to collaborative works, etc.) since promotion to Associate Professor.
Additional Evidence of Scholarly Achievement. In addition to a scholar’s publications, additional evidence of scholarly achievement may be provided in the form of competitive research grants awarded (reviewers’ reports may be submitted), conferences or panels organized, and papers presented at conferences or seminars (particularly those whose proceedings were subsequently published, although papers not subjected to a blind reviewing process will not be given as much weight; opinions of outside reviewer-participants may be submitted on the organization of conferences and panels, or on papers presented in them). For interdisciplinary research or non-traditional forms of disseminating historical scholarship, such as museum exhibitions, films, or computer software, the department may solicit opinions from outside experts.

Guidelines Used by the History Chairperson and Department Evaluation Committee for Faculty Annual and Triennial Evaluations

Introduction. The History Department Evaluation Committee assists and advises the department chairperson with annual and triennial faculty evaluations, and conducts the University-mandated peer classroom observations and evaluations of tenure-track teaching. The committee consists of three tenured faculty, of any rank, and is chaired by the department chairperson. The term of membership on the committee is three years (so that the committee participates in one triennial evaluation). Committee members are elected by a majority of all full-time, tenured or tenure-track history department faculty, including those on sabbatical or leave. All tenured full-time faculty are eligible to serve, except those faculty who just completed a 3-year term on the committee. The department chairperson calls meetings of the faculty evaluation committee, in advance of which s/he distributes to committee members copies of faculty annual/triennial self-evaluations, along with the chairperson’s recommended numerical rankings and qualitative evaluations. Final evaluation scores and qualitative assessments are the result of consultations between the chairperson and committee members. The chairperson and committee follow guidelines for evaluation established by the department, as stated below.

- The chair and committee use only integers. No +s or –s are given, and fractions (e.g. 4.5) are used only in exceptional cases.

- The duration of the evaluation period – one year or three years – is taken into consideration with respect to all criteria in all categories.

A. Teaching

Satisfactory: 3
- Teaches a variety of courses needed by the undergraduate and graduate curricula; uses traditional teaching methodologies; CATS evaluations at department averages; infrequent advising of students (not including College advising) or supervision of theses or independent study.

Superior: 4 and 5 (some, not all, of the following = 4)
- Develops new courses
- CATS scores higher than department averages
- Uses innovative methodology, technology
- Supervises independent study, directs theses, graduate teaching interns
- Extends teaching beyond classroom through field trips, etc.
- Participates in professional teaching activities such as workshops, institutes, etc.
- Obtains VITAL or other teaching grant
- Receives teaching award
- Serves as an informal mentor, advises students other than official advisees
B. Scholarship. The chair and committee take into consideration the quality and reputation of journals and presses.

Satisfactory: 3
• Evidence of an ongoing research program and involvement in scholarship
• Occasional attendance at scholarly conferences
• Occasional publication

Superior: 4
• Evidence of strong commitment to research (e.g. archival visits, short and long-term research and publication goals)
• Papers regularly delivered at conferences
• Works currently under preparation for publication
• Occasional publication of articles, review essays, book chapters in peer-reviewed journals or books
• Pursuit of grant opportunities

4.5 = book manuscript submitted to press

Superior: 5
• Receipt of major grant(s)
• Publication of a book – monograph or edited volume for which faculty member had major responsibility -- or 3 or more peer-reviewed articles in three-year evaluation period, fewer publications for one-year evaluation period.

C. Service

Satisfactory: 3
• Evidence of ongoing, constructive participation in department and/or college committees and activities
• Advising of students who are not enrolled in faculty member’s courses – i.e. advising assigned by college and/or department
• Limited professional involvement: e.g. attendance at scholarly conferences and meetings, occasional book reviewing
• Membership in scholarly and professional societies

Superior: 4
• Significant investment of time and effort in department, college or university committee or activities
• Contributions (not merely membership) to diverse committees or other activities that range across the college
• Leadership role or new initiative
• Substantial involvement in profession: regular book reviewing, grant and pre-publication manuscript reviewing, service as referee for tenure/promotion cases at other universities, service on governing boards of professional organizations or editorial boards of journals

Superior: 5
• Exceptional university service, demanding significant time and effort
• Professional service that is wide-ranging and/or entails leadership role (e.g. editorship of a journal, leadership of a professional organization)
**DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES**

**Introduction.** The faculty in Humanities hail from a variety of disciplines, and focus on a diversity of areas, specialties, and sub-disciplines within their fields of study. We employ an equally wide array of methodologies across and within our disciplines. In this document, we seek to balance our commitment to excellence in disciplinary and interdisciplinary teaching and research.

Due to the interdisciplinary character of Humanities, it is clear that no single discipline-specific standard could suffice. In the rank and tenure process it will be especially important for individual faculty members as well as the Department Chair and Committees to explain to College and University Rank and Tenure Committees such matters as the quality of journals in which the faculty member has published, the expectations of peer review in the discipline in question, or the standard practice for citations of multiple authors in the discipline in question.

Each evaluation committee is composed of all tenured members of the Humanities Department as well as colleagues from outside the Department, chosen primarily on the basis of their familiarity with the specialty of the faculty member being evaluated. This collaborative work allows for comprehensive, constructive, and equitable evaluation of our faculty at every stage of their careers.

A. **Teaching.** To cultivate pedagogical excellence, the Department follows the practices and procedures outlined in the University rank and tenure documents.

B. **Scholarship**

- **Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**
  
  Sheer numbers of articles represent neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for a successful tenure application. Fewer articles of exceptional quality may be more than sufficient. Numerous articles of mediocre quality are clearly inadequate. The Departmental judgment of quality depends in part on the quality of the journal in which the article appears. Where possible, we will rely on the journal rankings in the discipline in question.

  In regard to the issue of articles or books that have grown from Ph.D. theses, a crucial concern is whether the work reflects a growing understanding of the subject of the dissertation and a demonstrable advance in the placement of the fruits of the inquiry in scholarly venues. The standard of ongoing intellectual activity requires the candidate to show that the thesis will have been renewed with fresh perspectives or considerable extensions, or new undertaking of recognizable worth.

- **Third-Year Review.** Completing the third year review process depends on a faculty member progressing well in terms of the standards for rank and tenure associated with the six-year probationary period. Some faculty members will have published several articles during their first few years. Others will be devoting their time to writing a book and so will have not have as much published. The important consideration is always whether they are making adequate progress towards reaching the kinds of standards they will be expected to attain at the time of their evaluation for tenure and promotion.

- **Promotion to Full Professor.** The standard for promotion to full professor in the Humanities Department in terms of research is evidence of an ongoing research program that has earned the candidate an authoritative position in his or her discipline, normally demonstrated by a series of publications in appropriate scholarly media, including one book-length work or its equivalent.
since promotion to Associate Professor (e.g., peer reviewed journal articles, book chapters, contributions to collaborative works, etc.).

- **What Counts as Scholarship?** The 2003 University Rank and Tenure Policy uses the term “scholarship” to include “the discovery, dissemination, and application of new knowledge, including knowledge of how learning is encouraged and fostered.”

1. **Discovery.** This includes original, disciplined investigation that contributes to the advancement of human knowledge, usually communicated in one of three forms:

   a. *A peer reviewed monograph, published by an academic or reputable trade press.* While the major university presses remain standard marks of excellence in most disciplines, recent years have seen the development of various reputable trade presses, reputations for quality as high or higher than some university presses. The Department Chair and the Department Rank and Tenure Committee are responsible for clarifying the quality of the press and the contribution of a monograph to the discovery of knowledge within the discipline of the faculty member being evaluated.

   b. *An article published in a peer reviewed journal in one’s discipline or subdiscipline.* The Department recognizes journals of national and international importance. It also recognizes that these vary across disciplines. The Department Chair and the Departmental Rank and Tenure Committee are responsible for clarifying the quality of journals and the contribution of particular articles to the discovery of knowledge in the various disciplines and fields within the disciplines. The department recognizes that its faculty will publish in a variety of disciplinary journals and collections. Disciplines substantively related to scholarship in our department will include philosophy, theology, biblical studies, classical studies, linguistics, rhetoric, history, sociology, literature, architectural history and theory, music, ethics, economics, political science. Scholarship may also be brought forth in venues devoted to interdisciplinary studies (e.g., Medieval or Patristics Studies; religion and literature; theology/philosophy and science, etc.). Scholarly contributions in these and other fields are recognized and encouraged. It should also be noted that the department believes that electronic books and journals are valid media for publication, when peer-reviewed with the same criteria as print media.

   c. *A chapter in an edited book or contribution to an edited collection of articles, usually solicited by the editor(s) or resulting from invited participation in a scholarly conference, and peer reviewed by outside referees as well as reviewed by the editor(s).* It should be noted that invited publication in an international *Festchrift* is normally a sign of international recognition of scholarly accomplishment in Humanities.

*Documentary or critical editions and translations.* Across the Humanities, the publication of critical editions and/or translations of primary sources is a crucial and demanding dimension of the “scholarship of discovery,” often requiring archival research, manuscript work, computer-assisted text comparison, and more. Such work is among the most rigorous scholarship in the field and is accorded due credit in our departmental evaluation committees.

*Papers or lectures given at scholarly or professional meetings or conferences.* It is normal to see the same topic appear first as a conference presentation, then in a volume of conference proceedings, and finally, in a revised and expanded version, as a journal article. Such a progression is evidence of an advancing and deepening research agenda and is encouraged both within the profession and by the department. There is no accepted practice across our disciplines for the standards for acceptance of conference papers or conference proceedings. Some conferences require the submission of a paper and use blind reviewing; other
conferences require only an abstract. Consequently, the department evaluates conference presentations on a case by case basis. The same is true of conference proceedings, some have editorial practices that are as rigorous as journals, and others have much more relaxed standards.

2. **Scholarship of Integration.** The University rank and tenure guidelines recognize “serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.” The scholarship of integration includes multi-disciplinary work, “research at the boundaries where fields converge.” It also means “fitting one’s own research--or the research of others--into larger intellectual patterns”, to provide a “larger, more comprehensive understanding” of what original research may mean. The disciplines within Humanities reflect this scholarly commitment toward interdisciplinary, interpretive, and integrative studies that are increasingly moving toward the center of academic life. “Scholarship of integration” will include, but is not limited to:

   a. *Review essays of significant books or articles in a field or subfield, published in journals of record.* A review essay (in a journal or anthology), unlike a book review, criticizes and synthesizes existing scholarship, is published under a separate title, and allows the author to develop his or her own intellectual argument. While usually less weighty than an article, review essays should be categorized as contributions to scholarship, not as service to the profession.

   b. *Editorship of a book-length collection of articles.* Published volumes of articles in a field or subfield are often points of contact and dissemination for new methods and/or schools of thought. Editing and publication of such volumes contributes to the creativity and critical acumen of the disciplines.

3. **Scholarship of Application.** The application of knowledge to solve consequential problems and serve the interests of the larger community. New appreciation of the dynamic, integral relationship of theory and practice in the humanities suggest that new critical scholarly perspectives can and do arise in the very act of “application”—whether in shaping public policy, serving as a consultant, or developing new models of practice. It is the task of the Department Chair and the Departmental Rank and Tenure Committee to clarify the relationship of particular applications to integral, rigorous scholarly work.

Examples of such initiatives will change over time, and may include:

   a. The fruits of scholarly work that have appeared in public venues such as newspapers, national magazines or journals. Public intellectuals can do much to cultivate a culture of reasonableness in the nation and this kind of work will be encouraged and recognized at the department level.

   b. Political, public policy, and/or social justice issues

   c. Ecumenical and interreligious dialogue

   d. Scholarship on pedagogy and the practice of teaching

   e. Scholarship on the character of interdisciplinary inquiry and its application to the life of the mind

C. **Service**

- **University, College, and Departmental Service**

  1. Humanities follows the standard guidelines for service to Villanova, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Department itself.
2. Participation in the peer reviewing process for publications or grant applications.

3. Publications that contribute to a candidate’s record of service include book reviews, bibliographies, and other types of reference tools.

- **Service to the Church and Wider Community.** The department values faculty contributions to the wider public through the sharing of their expertise with non-academic audiences, in the form of public lectures, workshops, and other venues – political, pastoral, cultural, etc.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS and STATISTICS

Department of Mathematics and Statistics; Statement of Rank and Tenure standards; approved April 22, 2016.

**Introduction.** The Department of Mathematics and Statistics endorses the principle that tenure and promotion should be based upon a record of achievement and promise of continuing success in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. While excellence in one area may compensate for less activity in another, an outstanding record in one area alone is not sufficient.

**A. Teaching.** Excellence in teaching is a requirement for the awarding of tenure and promotion. Teaching is evaluated based upon a variety of types of evidence, including student course evaluations (CATS) and peer classroom visits, course syllabi, the appropriateness of exams and assignments, and other evidence of success in fostering discovery and learning. A substantial portion of our department’s annual enrollment comes in multi-section courses at the first- and second-year levels, but there are also abundant opportunities for individual faculty members to teach upper-level and graduate courses. Thus, in evaluating a candidate’s teaching contribution, we consider the kind of classes taught, such as service courses, upper-level courses for majors and minors, and graduate courses. Candidates for promotion to Professor, in particular, will be expected to have taught successfully at multiple levels of our curriculum. The department also values both the development of new courses, such as new core courses or upper-level electives and seminars, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and the introduction of innovative teaching methods. We also value the incorporation of technology in the classroom, whether as a teaching tool or as a part of the mathematical content of a given course. In appropriate cases, teaching may also include supervising independent-study reading or research, though this is not required. All faculty are expected to participate in student advising. The department recognizes that teaching is a multi-dimensional activity which admits a range of successful techniques and presentation styles. Therefore, the evaluation of excellence in teaching is a holistic judgment.

From the University document *Guidelines for Preparation of Rank and Tenure Files*, Section III, Paragraph D (Dossier Content: Teaching), items D.1., D.3., D.6., and D.8. must be included in the dossier; other items should be included if appropriate.

**B. Scholarship.** We evaluate research and scholarship largely in terms of the quality and number of the candidate’s publications, taking into account the comments from the
external reviewers. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should provide a narrative describing their ongoing research program and goals. Candidates for tenure must be able to demonstrate that they are independent researchers whose work has progressed beyond the doctoral dissertation and shows future promise. Candidates for promotion to Professor must demonstrate that their scholarly endeavors have gained wide recognition. Some indicators of this might include a consistent record of publication since promotion to Associate Professor, the publication or editing of books, or acting on the editorial staff of a peer-reviewed scholarly journal. In all cases, the letters from external reviewers can provide important evidence in assessing the scholarly impact of a candidate’s work.

The primary evidence of a productive research program in the mathematical sciences is a successful record of publication in recognized, peer-reviewed journals. Articles by department faculty have appeared in a diverse array of journals. These include mathematics and statistics journals as well as journals in areas that apply mathematics and statistics, such as business, physics, health sciences, engineering, and social sciences. The contribution that a particular publication makes may assume a variety of forms, including the discovery of significant new knowledge at the “cutting edge” of a particular sub-discipline, the exposition of fresh insights into and new connections between existing areas of inquiry, the development of novel methodologies and new applications for existing approaches, investigation into the history of the mathematical sciences and the evolution of communities of mathematical and statistical scholars, contributions to the theory of pedagogy and mathematical and statistical education, and the communication of advanced mathematical and statistical knowledge and methods to a wider audience. The department values all such work and places a premium on the originality, significance, and potential impact of the published results.

While the quality of a candidate’s research and scholarly work is critical, the quantity is also important. At the same time, it is difficult to specify any minimum acceptable quantity. Substantial contributions can be made by a small number of influential publications or by a larger number of articles with more modest influence. The Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences found that a publication rate of three papers over a five-year period, which it referred to as “frequently published”, was met by about 8% of faculty in the mathematical sciences nationally. We view this as a reasonable approximate benchmark for candidates for tenure and/or promotion at all levels. Overall, the quantity of publications will be considered in relation to the quality and the significance of the work as reflected, for example, by reviews and the frequency of citation.

It is fairly common for papers in mathematics and statistics to have multiple authors. In this case, the role of the candidate must be made explicit in the dossier. Clarification beyond basic designations such as “lead author”, “co-equal author”, or “secondary author” is preferred.

Impact factors are not widely used in mathematics or statistics. Nor is there an agreed upon formal ranking of mathematical journals. Several different rankings of journals in statistics and probability have been created, though how widely used these are is not clear.
Presentations of papers at scholarly conferences, and the publication of such presentations in conference proceedings, can provide evidence of a fruitful research program and of a candidate’s reputation among their peers, particularly if a presentation is invited. In general, it is to be hoped that presentations will find their way into print in the form of refereed articles.

The department neither requires nor expects any candidate for tenure or promotion to have been awarded external funding to support their scholarly activities. At the same time, we look favorably upon a candidate who obtains or attempts to obtain funding, including research support awards from within Villanova University, as such applications show commendable initiative and increase the visibility of the department. The award of an outside grant or fellowship is viewed as an outstanding achievement.

From the University document *Guidelines for Preparation of Rank and Tenure Files*, Section III, Paragraph E (Dossier Content: Scholarship), items E.1., E.2., and E.4. must be included in the dossier; other items should be included if appropriate. Colloquium talks should be listed with sub-item E.2.(j).

C. Service. For junior faculty, service is expected primarily at the departmental level, though some service to the profession and at the college or University level is desirable. Examples of departmental service include regular participation in department meetings and colloquia and involvement in department committees. A candidate for promotion to Professor should have demonstrated exemplary, major service to the department, college, University, or the profession, or some combination of these. Community service is definitely valued, but alone is not sufficient.

From the University document *Guidelines for Preparation of Rank and Tenure Files*, Section III, Paragraph F (Dossier Content: Service), items F.1. -- F.5. should be included in the dossier as appropriate. Any post-publication reviews written for Math Reviews or similar digests should be included with sub-item F.4.(f).

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

Introduction. The Philosophy Department adheres to the standards and practices described in the various rank and tenure documents. The following statement is intended to further clarify department practices by commenting more specifically on those practices in light of the peculiar character of the discipline of philosophy.

A. Teaching. The Philosophy department follows the practices outlined in the various rank and tenure documents. The department reviews syllabi, tests, CATS ratings, student comments (when submitted), grade distributions, peer observation reports and the candidate’s philosophy of teaching statement. The department pays particular attention to the use of primary texts, the amount of writing assigned, and the level of student participation. We also consider the number of students attending the class and the kind of classes taught (service courses, upper level courses for majors, courses offered for other departments and programs such as Honors) as part of our overall evaluation of the candidates success as a teacher.
B. **Scholarship.** As a discipline, philosophy adheres to the typical standards of other humanities disciplines and gives greatest recognition to scholarly books and to publications in peer-reviewed journals. Although it is difficult to quantify, we tell candidates that we look for a book and a few additional publications in journals or edited volumes or at least six articles in journals or edited volumes as the minimum standard for tenure and promotion. We encourage our candidates to publish in well recognized journals. While normally we expect publications that are in philosophy journals, in fields which are inherently interdisciplinary, it is considered completely acceptable to publish philosophical works in journals that are specialized in that area, even if they are journals that are open to publications from other disciplines.

It is more common these days than in the past to publish an article or chapter in an edited volume or anthology. These publications do not fall into the same category as peer-reviewed articles in recognized journals, but often they are highly valued and prestigious in the profession and, when this is the case, the evaluation committee treats them accordingly.

Sometimes, book reviews and/or citations of an author’s work can be a further indication of the quality of a book or article and a gauge of the importance of an author’s work in the profession and we encourage candidates to submit such evidence to the committee.

Our department recognizes the importance of active participation in the scholarly life of the profession and encourages candidates to present their scholarly work in venues relevant to their expertise. Many conferences have careful, blind, peer-reviewed, and competitive processes for acceptance of conference papers and presentations. These conferences are weighed more favorably by the evaluation committee. Similarly, in our discipline, conference proceedings are sometimes selective and at other times accept everyone on the program for publication. In all cases, these accomplishments are valued and weighed on a case by case basis. In general, conference proceedings are not a replacement for peer-reviewed articles in journals and candidates are encouraged to publish proceedings papers in peer-reviewed journals, since conference proceedings do not usually restrict the right to publish the paper in other venues.

C. **Service.** The philosophy department follows the standard guidelines for service. We take into consideration the relative importance of each service activity as well as the extent of the demand it places on the person. We particularly recognize candidates who are active in a spread of activities and who demonstrate academic citizenship.

D. **Annual and Triennial Evaluations.** The department holds an annual meeting of all tenured faculty to discuss and evaluate temporary, continuing and tenure-track faculty. Committees for triennial evaluations are composed of two senior and one junior member of the faculty appointed on the basis of a rotation of eligible faculty.

**DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICS**

**Introduction.** It is understood that junior faculty should devote their effort to the development of their teaching skills and the establishment of a viable research program. Service at this level is expected, primarily at the departmental level. For the achievement of promotion, service assumes an important role in the overall evaluation of the faculty member’s performance. More service is expected from faculty at higher ranks. Similarly, with regard to teaching and scholarship the faculty handbook will be our guide. Namely, there should be clear evidence of teaching and advising effectiveness, and continuing quality scholarship for the rank of Associate, and evidence of distinguished fulfillment of these requirements over time for the rank of Professor.
A. Scholarship

- **Facts and Expectation.** To be a successful researcher in physics requires and intense and continuous effort on the part of the individual. On-going research and long-range plans securing future success and self-reliance is the goal.

- Evidence. Issues to be addressed by the applicant are: The quality of research and its impact usually published in internationally recognized refereed physics journals of the caliber of the Physical Review series. The citations that a published article has received are another measure of the impact made on the field, the acceptable number of publications during the evaluation period, the extent to which the applicant has contributed to any research done in collaboration (specify any student participation), successful research grants.

B. Teaching

- **Expectations.** Challenge, the appropriate extent of coverage, the degree of success in communicating knowledge, training students to reach the level of competence required, how to learn on their own, develop work ethics as well as good working habits.

- **Evidence.** A listing of the courses taught and the number of students, with accounting for the small number expected for some courses; sample course syllabi, examinations, and electronic or other supplements, if part of the course; annual evaluation reports by the chairperson; and results of the University-approved instrument for student commentary on courses and teaching over time. Evidence of the success of a new teaching method may be obtained by comparative studies with other/previous methods.

Anecdotal evidence from colleagues, advisees, and former students may be included.

C. Service

- **Expectation.** Service is encouraged as long as it does not hinder the performance in teaching and research. In matters of tenure and advancement in rank, outstanding service will not compensate for not having the record of excellence required in those areas. For tenure and promotion, one expects faculty to carry the routine burdens that all must carry in order to make a department work. As one moves up through the ranks, one must assume greater responsibility for the well being of one’s department, college, university, and profession. It is therefore assumed that all faculty will carry their share of the service and administrative burdens and that senior faculty carry a particular responsibility as befitting their status.

- **Evidence.** Refereeing research papers, textbooks, or grant proposals are considered as service to the profession. Such activities persisting over several years are also an indication of the impact an individual has made on the scientific community. Other professional activities may include serving as an officer in professional organizations, organizing or chairing society meetings, and editorial work in professional journals. However, since such prominence usually requires the individual to have already reached the rank of full professor, these particular activities are not considered a minimal requirement for promotion.

In presenting evidence of service, the applicant should explain the extent of his/her contribution to the various committees or university bodies, or to any other effort contributing to the welfare of the students and the university at all levels.
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Introduction: This document contains general expectations that will apply to Political Science faculty. Our department will always seek, in a spirit of collegiality and flexibility, to ensure that each case is judged fairly on its own merits. The Department endorses the principle that tenure and promotion should be based upon a record of achievement and promise of continuing success in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Furthermore, in some cases, excellence in one area may compensate for relative weakness in another; but that in no case can an outstanding record in service alone compensate for deficiencies in both teaching and scholarship. The department will not support a candidate for tenure or promotion with a deficient record in teaching or scholarship.

A. Teaching – The Department of Political Science generally adheres to the Villanova University Rank and Tenure Policy for the expected performance standards for teaching.

B. Scholarship

- **General expectations:** We emphasize the development an ongoing program of original research and the publication of the results of such research in peer-reviewed media of quality. Appropriate media include scholarly books and monographs (published by reputable university presses or trade publishers) and articles in peer-reviewed, academic journals. The primary criteria used in evaluating the merit of a candidate’s research will be department members’ judgement of the publications’ quality. Candidates should inform the Department about the standing and review procedures of the journals and presses that have published their work.

- **Nature of scholarship:** The Department will judge scholarship according to how effectively it advances, integrates, and applies knowledge, and transforms knowledge through teaching.

1) The advancement of knowledge includes:

**Original research** based on manuscript and printed sources, material culture, oral interviews, field investigation, or other source materials--published in the form of a monograph or refereed journal article; disseminated through a paper or lecture given at a meeting or other project or program; or presented in a contract research report, policy paper, or other commissioned study; documentary or critical edition;

2) The integration of knowledge includes:

**Synthesis of scholarship**--published in a review essay (journal or anthology), textbook, newsletter, magazine, encyclopedia, newspaper, or other form of publication; disseminated through a paper or lecture given at a meeting or conference or through a museum exhibition, film, or other public program; or presented in a contract research report, policy paper, or other commissioned study; edited anthology, journal, or series of volumes comprised of the work of other scholars.

3) The application of knowledge includes:
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Consulting and providing expert testimony on public policy and other matters; Contract research on policy formulation and policy outcomes; Participation in film and other media projects; Professional service--editing journals/newsletters, organizing scholarly meetings, etc.; Community service drawing directly upon scholarship--through state humanities councils (e.g., public lectures, etc.)

4) The transformation of knowledge through teaching

In general, the department does not seek to prescribe or proscribe any particular path of scholarly development. We encourage faculty to explore creatively various sources and approaches bearing in mind that any work is to be judged on its merits as a product of honest, accurate, and critical scholarship addressed to other scholars and to the educated public, which may also include students.

- Specific expectations: Quality of research and publication is more important than quantity. The Department does not mandate specific quantitative levels of research and publication for tenure and promotion; however, some rough guidelines for each level are provided.

For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor: The candidate should establish an ongoing research program that shows promise of leading to a respected position in the candidate's areas of scholarly inquiry as discussed in the candidate’s letter of application for appointment to the department, demonstrated preferably by publication after peer review through a university press or reputable trade publisher of at least a book-length monograph that exhibits significant research beyond the doctoral dissertation (though it may be a revision of the dissertation itself), or alternatively in the form of an equivalent series of articles in peer-reviewed journals or chapters in refereed, edited books.

For promotion to Professor: The candidate must continue and elaborate on the ongoing research program that has brought the candidate a respected position in his or her area(s) of scholarly inquiry. This is normally demonstrated by a series of publications in appropriate scholarly media, preferably including at least one book-length work or its equivalent (e.g., in the form of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, contributions to collaborative works, etc.) since promotion to Associate Professor. In accordance with its understanding of scholarship, the department encourages a broad range of scholarly activity, and as with candidates for tenure, we will take into account potential limitations on traditional forms of scholarly publication in individual cases.

- Evidence: Quality in the aforementioned scholarly work can be shown both in the quality of the media used (publisher or journal) as well as in reviews by established scholars in major journals in the author's field. Due to the enormous range of possible outlets for publication in our disciplines, it is impossible here to provide a list of "preferred" journals or publishers, far less to attempt to provide a ranking of journals. Most members of the department are members of the American Political Science Association, but the size of these organizations precludes all but a few from publishing in the American Political Science Review. We generally expect publications in those journals that address the main groups of specialists in his or her field, and that are peer-reviewed by specialists.

Additional evidence may include competitive research grants awarded (reviewers' reports may be submitted), conferences or panels organized, and papers presented at conferences or seminars. For interdisciplinary research or non-traditional forms of disseminating scholarship, such as in museum exhibitions, films, or computer software, the department may solicit supplementary opinions from experts in other disciplines. Electronic books and
journals are valid media for publication, provided that they are peer-reviewed with the same criteria as print media.

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

Introduction. The Department of Psychology is strongly oriented toward high quality scholarship and the advancement of psychological knowledge. The Department’s conception of performance evaluation is based on the view that the quality of professional behavior is only partially quantifiable and ultimately is based on the informed judgment of peers. It is further understood that not all efforts are equal and that opportunities to excel may be differentially distributed among teaching, research and service across faculty members. The Department has explicitly chosen to avoid the impossible complexities of ranking or assigning numerical values to behaviors of differing quality, quantity, desirability or direction. It is the duty of each individual faculty member, the Chair, and relevant departmental committees to clearly delineate the dimensions of a faculty member’s contributions.

The Consultative Nature of Annual and Triennial Evaluations. The Department of Psychology has a Department Evaluation Committee consisting of three tenured faculty members. The committee members are elected for a three-year term by all tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the Department. Members cannot be elected to successive terms in order to ensure a changing membership over time. At the time of annual or triennial evaluations, the members of the Department Evaluation Committee review the statements (i.e., self-reports) of every faculty member and provide substantive, concrete recommendations to the chair regarding each faculty member’s performance in teaching, research, and service. Members of the Department Evaluation Committee also assist the Chair throughout the year in making classroom visits for the purpose of peer evaluation of teaching (see Teaching, below, for a full discussion of this activity).

A. Teaching. The Villanova University Rank and Tenure Policy describes the expected performance standards for teaching and the evidence to be considered in evaluating a faculty member’s teaching performance. The Department of Psychology generally adheres to these University performance standards and methods of evaluation in the area of teaching. Special concerns for the Department of Psychology are the following:

- **Teaching Responsibilities.** In addition to teaching in a specialty area, Department members should be able to teach the foundation course (General Psychology). This does not mean that all members of the Department will teach General Psychology. Many will, and some will not, but all should be able and willing to do so.

- **Research Supervision.** As a research-oriented department with a strong M.S. program, undergraduate- and graduate-student research supervision, and, especially, M.S. thesis supervision is a highly valued teaching activity that can weigh heavily in a faculty member’s overall teaching evaluation. A faculty member’s performance in this area is reflected by the extent of his or her research supervision and its quality. Evidence in this regard will include, but is not limited to, graduate students’ thesis proposals and students’ productivity in terms of authorship or co-authorship of published papers or conference presentations. (Note that written thesis proposals are disseminated to all members of the department and are defended orally in front of the whole department.)

- **Peer Evaluation of Teaching.** Peer review of classroom teaching is taken seriously by the Department of Psychology and weighs heavily in a faculty member’s overall teaching evaluation. Each academic year, the Chair and members of the Departmental Evaluation Committee make several visits to the classes of all tenure-track faculty members (and, when
requested, to the classes of tenured faculty members). The visitor submits a written report describing and evaluating the teaching demonstration. This report is shared with the instructor and serves as the basis for a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses that were evident in his or her teaching. Although the emphasis of this process is on mentoring and support in order to foster teaching excellence, these observations also are a rich source of information about a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

- **CATS Scores.** The Department of Psychology firmly believes that CATS scores can be interpreted meaningfully only in the context of the full body of evidence related to a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

- **Oral Defense of Thesis Proposals.** Attendance at oral defenses of Master’s thesis proposals is an important teaching-related activity in the Department of Psychology. Faculty presence and, when appropriate, active participation is essential to realizing the educational goals of these events.

- **Advising and Counseling.** All Department members participate in advising with the specific responsibilities divided between the members of the Graduate Advisory Committee, the members of the Undergraduate Advisory Committee, Thesis Directors and Program Directors.

B. **Scholarship.** The Department of Psychology generally adheres to the performance standards for scholarship and to the nature of evidence of scholarly achievement that are described in the Villanova University Rank and Tenure Policy.

A faculty member’s scholarly productivity and contribution to the field is indicated by the quantity and quality of his or her scholarly output. However, it is impossible to quantify an acceptable level of productivity. Substantial contributions can be made by a small number of influential publications or by a larger number of publications with more modest influence. Furthermore, typical publication rates can vary considerably across the many sub-disciplines of psychology, partly because projects in some sub-disciplines simply take longer to complete. Therefore, the Chair, the Department Evaluation Committee, and Departmental Committees on Rank and Tenure will consider the quantity of publications in relation to: (1) a faculty member’s particular sub-discipline within psychology, and (2) the quality of his or her publications in terms of the quality of the outlet and the significance of the contribution as reflected, for example, by reviews and the frequency of citation.

The following is an attempt to clarify a number of specific issues as they apply to the discipline of psychology and to the Villanova University Department of Psychology in particular.

- **Basic versus Applied Research.** Psychology is both a basic and an applied science. Therefore, both kinds of scholarship are respected and accepted. The issue is quality in both cases.

- **Type of Study.** Individual studies reflecting laboratory-based research, clinical research, survey research, and literature-based research (e.g., a review of a literature, or a theoretical paper) are all acceptable. High quality work of each type can make a significant contribution to the field. However, the Department of Psychology expects a body of work to include substantial empirical or theoretical progress.

- **Type of Outlet.** In psychology, the journal article is clearly the most important (and the most common) type of scholarly outlet. Authored books can be highly valued, depending on their quality. However, they are relatively rare throughout the discipline. Conference presentations
are evidence of an active and productive research program. They bolster a faculty member’s case for tenure and/or promotion when combined with high quality publications, but are insufficient, by themselves, to justify either.

- **Journal Quality.** At minimum, high quality journals are those that are peer reviewed by experts in the relevant sub-discipline of psychology. The Department of Psychology knows of no generally accepted rankings of journals. The quality of journals may be judged in terms of their scholarly reputations within the field. Also, some statistics may be relevant such as those reflecting a journal’s selectivity (e.g., acceptance rates) and impact (e.g., ISI Impact Factor). Indicators of journal quality, however, must be interpreted separately within each sub-discipline of psychology. Comparisons across sub-fields in terms of reputation or statistics are largely meaningless. Therefore, the Chair and the relevant committees of the Department of Psychology will provide judgments of journal quality, when appropriate, on a case by case basis that takes into account the available indicators of quality in relation to a particular sub-field of psychology.

- **Foreign Journals.** There are many foreign journals of excellent quality. They are almost all English language journals, however, for which the evidence of quality is similar to that which is available for journals based in the U.S. Foreign language journals should be encountered rarely, but will be much more difficult to evaluate when they are. Regardless, as with other journals, judgments will be made on a case by case basis by the Chair and the departmental committees who are in the best position to make such appraisals.

- **Electronic Outlets.** Electronic journals and books are still new to psychology, and no general evaluation of them as a class is possible. The Chair and the relevant committees of the Department of Psychology will evaluate the quality of electronic publications on a case by case basis.

- **Multi-authored Work.** Collaborative work that leads to multi-authored publications is encouraged in psychology. However, it is important that a faculty member establish his or her own independent scholarly abilities and achievements. Relevant evidence would include single-authored publications, and multi-authored publications for which the faculty member is the primary author. Particular note should be made of the fact that research in many areas of psychology is done collaboratively by faculty and students. Therefore, publications based on a faculty member’s research program for which the only co-authors are students working under his or her supervision provide solid evidence that he or she has established an independent program of research.

- **Order of Authors.** There is no general rule that covers all sub-disciplines within psychology. In many sub-fields, the author who makes the greatest contribution is listed first. However, in some sub-fields, he or she may be listed last. Therefore, an individual faculty member, the Chair, and the departmental committees will have to determine the significance of authorship on a case by case basis that considers the sub-field of psychology that is involved.

C. **Service.** The Department of Psychology generally adheres to the performance standards for service that are delineated in the Villanova University Rank and Tenure Policy. Special considerations for the Department of Psychology are the following:

- All members of the department serve on either the Undergraduate Advisory Committee or the Graduate Advisory Committee. These are very important committees that assist the Chair in the administration of the undergraduate and graduate programs, respectively. Members on these committees perform significant service for the department.
Because the Department of Psychology highly values research, professional service involving scholarly publication deserves special mention. The following are examples of significant service in this domain:
1. Serving as Editor or Associate Editor of a scholarly journal.
2. Serving on the Editorial Board (e.g., Consulting Editor) of a scholarly journal.
3. Ad hoc reviewing for scholarly journals.
4. Serving on review panels for federal, state, and private granting organizations.

Mere participation in community activities (e.g., participating in a youth organization), while laudatory, is not viewed as meritorious service by the Department of Psychology. However, a leadership role in a significant community activity or organization, especially if it is related to one’s professional expertise, may be recognized as quality service. Similarly, talks which are based on a faculty member’s professional expertise and which are given to community groups can constitute credible service.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Preface: This document contains general expectations that will apply to Public Administration faculty. Our department will always seek, in a spirit of collegiality and flexibility, to ensure that each case is judged fairly on its own merits. The Department endorses the principle that tenure and promotion should be based upon a record of achievement and promise of continuing success in all three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Furthermore, in some cases, excellence in one area may compensate for relative weakness in another; but that in no case can a faculty member earn tenure and/or promotion whose performance fails to reach and to continue clearly to promise high quality achievement in both teaching and scholarship. The department will not support a candidate for tenure and/or promotion with a deficient record in teaching or scholarship.

Teaching and Service

When evaluating teaching and service, the Public Administration faculty will follow the measures and expectations defined in the most recent version of the University’s Rank & Tenure Policy.

Scholarship

a. General expectations: We emphasize the development an ongoing program of original research and the publication of the results of such research in peer-reviewed media of quality. Appropriate media include scholarly books and monographs (published by reputable university presses or trade publishers) and articles in peer-reviewed, academic journals. Candidates should inform the Department about the standing and review procedures of the journals and presses that have published their work.

b. Nature of scholarship: The Department will judge scholarship according to the following four-part definition found in the University Rank & Tenure policy:

   a. Basic research, synthesis, analysis, and explication, whose purpose is the discovery of new knowledge for its own sake and for the enlightenment of others. Such research typically results in new data, new understandings, and new interpretations.

   b. Applied research, in which knowledge is brought to bear in new or particularly effective ways on, e.g., physical, intellectual, emotional, social, cultural, or moral problems or conditions to produce new understandings, solutions, technologies, models, materials, or inventions.
c. Rigorous instructional-related research oriented toward discovery of new modes or techniques for facilitating and assessing student learning in a discipline. Such scholarly research is not to be equated with the sort of research that is involved with course and curriculum design, but it may be a precondition to curriculum-related efforts.

d. Depending on their nature, accompanying scholarly annotations, and/or introductory or concluding analyses, works of translation may be considered in one of these three categories. Un-annotated translations, however, generally are considered to fall into the service category, as described below.

c. **Specific expectations:** Quality of research and publication is more important than quantity. The Department does not mandate specific quantitative levels of research and publication for tenure and promotion; however, some rough guidelines for each level are provided.

**For tenure and promotion to Associate Professor:** The candidate should establish an ongoing research program that shows promise of leading to a respected position in the candidate's areas of scholarly inquiry as discussed in the candidate’s letter of application for appointment to the department. The candidate should achieve a record of scholarship that includes at least one peer-reviewed book published with a university press or reputable trade publisher or alternatively includes an equivalent series of articles in peer-reviewed journals or chapters in peer-reviewed, edited books. The record of scholarship may include but clearly extends beyond the candidate’s dissertation work. The record of scholarship may include works that are from the dissertation, works that are revised parts of the dissertation and which represent a fresh perspective and a deepening understanding of the subject, and works that offer a new line of research.

**For promotion to Professor:** The candidate must continue and elaborate on the ongoing research program that has brought the candidate a respected position in his or her area(s) of scholarly inquiry. This is normally demonstrated by a series of publications in appropriate scholarly media, preferably including at least one book or an equivalent series of articles in peer-reviewed journals or chapters in peer-reviewed, edited books since promotion to Associate Professor.

**For promotion to Emeritus Professor:** The Department will follow the standards outlined in the University Rank and Tenure Policy.

d. **Evidence:** Quality in the aforementioned scholarly work can be shown both in the quality of the media used (publisher or journal) as well as in reviews by established scholars in major journals in the author's public administration specialty. We generally expect publications in those public administration journals that address the main groups of scholars in his or her specialty, and that are peer-reviewed by scholars in that specialty. Electronic books and journals are valid media for publication, provided that they are peer-reviewed with the same criteria as print media.

Additional evidence documenting the candidate’s reputation as a public administration scholar may include:

- competitive research grants received
- papers presented at conferences, symposia or seminars
- consulting reports
- invited lectures
- conferences or panels organized
articles written by the candidate in magazines and newspapers relevant to public administration

DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES & LITERATURES

Introduction. As established in 2007 by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and approved by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, and the President of Villanova University, the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures is composed of two distinct and separate divisions: the Division of French/Francophone and Italian Studies, and the Division of Spanish and Portuguese Studies. The two divisions were established, given the special and distinct requisites of Spanish with its large number of undergraduate student population, and its graduate program. It has worked very well during the past five years, and the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department voted in November 2011 to continue having these two divisions in the future. This is especially important for Hiring and for Rank and Tenure.

Thus, while the department is viewed as a unit, the two divisions have their own and separate committees, including the Rank and Tenure committee. Under this unique structure, tenure faculty pertaining to one division do not vote in the hiring of a faculty member that pertains to the other division. Equally, only faculty from the particular division can participate in the process of rank and tenure.

In the case when there are not enough tenured professors to constitute a committee, a qualified member from the other division may be invited to participate in that particular tenure or promotion case.

A. **Scholarship:** The study of languages and literatures includes elements from such diverse areas as rhetoric, linguistics, history, philosophy, aesthetics, and critical and cultural theories, among others.

Any attempt to quantify the amount of scholarly work must include an evaluation of its quality and sustained research and productivity. The assessment will focus on the candidate’s demonstrated merit and perceived potential.

In the field of Romance Languages and Literatures, candidates for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are expected to present a completed monograph, published or under contract in a recognized press, written while at Villanova University. In the case of a monograph based on the doctoral dissertation, at least 1/3 of the rewriting should contain recognizable new additions done while at Villanova. At least four refereed articles, published or accepted by prestigious journals or presses, are also required.

For promotion to the rank of Professor a candidate needs to demonstrate sustained excellence in research, including the publication of an additional monograph, published or under contract with a recognized press, and at least one refereed article or a similar significant publication accepted per year, since his/her promotion to Associate Professor.

These numbers represent neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for a successful tenure or promotion application. Fewer articles of exceptional merit may constitute a credible submission, while six or even more of lesser quality may not prove adequate. Exceptional work has been accepted for publication in journals that are commonly recognized and understood as such by members of the academic community, by the outside reviewers and by the members of the R&T Committee (they are peer-reviewed and with low acceptance rate).

B. **TEACHING**
The evaluation of teaching begins with the candidate’s teaching philosophy, defined goals and degree of familiarity with the most current theories and critical tools of the discipline. CATS scores and grade distributions will be reviewed by the R&T committee and will be combined with a regular program of class visitations and examination of course materials and syllabi. Creativity in teaching, development of new courses, VITAL grants and attendance to workshops on teaching in our discipline will also be considered.

The Department also recognizes the importance of student advising and mentoring, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels (where appropriate).

C. SERVICE

Candidates for tenure and promotion need to demonstrate a degree of collegiality and continued participation in the activities of the department. Such participation may include active service on departmental committees, uncompensated direction of programs, moderation of language clubs, honor societies and any departmental activity requiring significant investment of time and effort. Service to the College and University may take the form of active participation on important committees or in interdisciplinary programs.

Service to the profession in advisory committees, book reviews, editorial boards, reviews of articles for refereed journals, and/or manuscripts for scholarly presses, that show the national and international recognition and dimension of the candidate’s scholarship are encouraged, in addition to any professionally-related service to the academic community. (Last revised by Dept. R&T Committee, Nov., 2011.)
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND CRIMINOLOGY

Preface: This document is intended to assist faculty preparing for promotion and/or tenure and to inform the College and University rank and tenure committees of the criteria used by the Department of Sociology and Criminology.

I. Scholarship and Publications

a. General expectations: The Department believes that what characterizes higher education and separates it from other forms of teaching is the integration of creative teaching and creative scholarship. The department therefore places great emphasis on the development of ongoing programs of original research and the publication of the results of such research in peer-reviewed media of quality such as scholarly books and monographs (a book length study, published by reputable university presses or trade publishers, that makes an original contribution to knowledge in the opinion of the Department), and peer-reviewed scholarly journals relevant to the professor's research.

b. Specific expectations: For purposes of tenure and promotion, quality of research and publication is more important than quantity, bearing in mind that there must be sufficient scholarly output to show that the candidate has a scholarly orientation as well as the focus and ability to contribute regularly over time to the literature in his/her academic discipline. The Department does not mandate specific quantitative levels of research and publication for tenure and promotion; however, some rough guidelines for each level are provided in the following, whereby formal and final written acceptance for publication of a completed scholarly work normally is to be deemed the equivalent of publication, provided the acceptance is by a recognized scholarly or professional journal or publisher and provided the work in question has undergone rigorous peer review.

c. Indicators and evidence: Tenure and promotion requires ongoing development of the candidate’s research agenda, as reflected primarily via peer-reviewed journal publications and scholarly books and monographs. While valued, refereed conference proceedings, chapters in edited books and encyclopedia entries are generally accorded less significance than peer-reviewed books and journal articles.

Although there is no specific numerical guideline, the candidate is expected to produce quality academic publications consistent with those across the department and the productivity of scholars in sociology/criminology departments at peer institutions (those with similar teaching responsibilities and research support). Specifically, the department considers the quantity of peer-reviewed articles and monographs authored, the visibility and selectivity of the journals and/or presses in which the work appears, as well as each article’s or monograph’s substantive contribution to the field. Collaborative work is common in sociology and criminology, and is both appropriate and valued. The department also encourages faculty to show scholarly initiative in conceiving, carrying out, and leading one or more research projects. In cases where an article or book is co-authored, the candidate’s specific contributions must be clearly explained. The department appreciates grant activity and conference participation, although the primary
evaluation criterion remains publication that makes significant theoretical, methodological, empirical, and/or policy contributions. Candidates are also encouraged to articulate a research agenda that shows potential for further publication.

Promotion to full professor requires a continuation and elaboration of an ongoing research program that has brought the candidate a respected position in his or her area(s) of scholarly inquiry. This is normally demonstrated by a series of publications in appropriate scholarly media as described above. The candidate’s record should be consistent with those achieving the rank in the department and the productivity of full professors in sociology/criminology departments at peer institutions (those with similar teaching responsibilities and research support).

II. Teaching

a. General expectations: The Department endorses the principle that the primary task of faculty is to help students cultivate their ability for and appreciation of, discovery and learning. Excellence in teaching is therefore a prime qualification for tenure and promotion. The department expects its full-time members to participate at all levels of higher education, teaching introductory-level, core and advanced elective courses. Candidates are encouraged to engage in formal and informal mentoring, including when appropriate supervising undergraduate independent-study reading, research, or honors theses. It further expects that members will remain current with the development of their discipline and specialty, regularly incorporating advances in knowledge into their teaching. Moreover, the department encourages its members to make use of a wide range of possible ways to enhance the educational process and to participate in ongoing pedagogical development and curricular innovation.

b. Indicators, Examples and Evidence: Excellence in teaching is inherently multidimensional. Candidates for tenure and promotion will present evidence of their teaching in the forms consistent with university policy. These include (1) data on classes taught and enrollments; (2) representative course syllabi, examinations and written assignments; (3) annual evaluation reports of their department chairs; and (4) results of the University-approved instrument for student commentary on courses and teaching. In addition, evaluative material in tenure cases must include regular and systematic in-class evaluations of teaching that take place over at least a six-semester period by department chairs and other suitably selected faculty colleagues. This evidence will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria mentioned in the previous paragraph. Professors may submit anonymous written commentary by students to supplement the quantitative data collected in university surveys. However, if the candidate chooses to submit written comments, all such comments from a given course must be submitted. Additional evidence may include: senior exit survey results; letters from former students; records of participation in teaching workshops; solicitation and receipt of VITAL mini-grants or other teaching-related outside grants to enhance teaching; publication of textbooks or other materials to be used in teaching; and, the winning of teaching awards.

Promotion to full professor requires a continuation and elaboration of successful teaching performance and activities consistent with the criteria mentioned above.

III. Service

a. General expectations: The Department places emphasis upon service to the department, college, university, the profession and community. Service in the broadest sense is
valued as part of the university's mission.

b. Specific expectations, examples, indicators and evidence:

- **Service to the Department, the College and the University:** the department expects each of its members to be good colleagues, playing an active, contributing role in the general affairs of the department, college, and university, and serving on or chairing committees (or in other positions). The department does not expect untenured members to overburden themselves with service activities beyond the department that would interfere with the development of their teaching and scholarship, but it does expect its more senior colleagues to become more involved in College and University level service, and to take on leadership roles in committees, interdisciplinary programs, and other administrative positions when available.

- **Professional service:** many types of professional activities are signs of scholarly reputation, influence, and hard work, including service in professional organizations such as organizing scholarly meetings or panels, editorial work in professional journals, newsletters, or scholarly presses, and participation in the peer reviewing process for publications or grant applications.

- **Community and public service:** the department encourages its members to play an active role in community and public affairs, particularly where such activities entail the dissemination of the results of scholarly research in a form accessible by non-specialists.


**DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND STUDIO ART**

A. **Teaching**

It is essential that the faculty be effective as teachers and that they demonstrate a thorough and contemporary understanding of their fields. The unique challenge and responsibilities of teaching the fine and performing arts compel faculty members to demonstrate artistic and intellectual excellence in the classroom and to create a vital learning environment. Therefore, the department must both seek and nurture faculty innovation, experimentation, and flexibility. Since Theatre faculty teach graduate students, they must manifest the professional standards to which their students aspire. It is essential that they be, or have been, active in presenting their work to the arts community (local/regional/national) as professionals artist and/or scholars. The primary pedagogical aim is the faculty’s expertise, knowledge, and ability to communicate.

In order to strengthen and nurture students’ artistic sensibilities, the faculty must devote significant time to overseeing individual studio work, directing independently study, supervising individual creative and scholarly work, encouraging students’ knowledge and experience of professional work, and helping students to secure internships and professional opportunities in the field.

B. **Scholarship.** While teaching is a prime function of the faculty, both Theatre and Studio Art professors must pursue artistic and research activities. Artistic achievements as an actor,
playwright, director, dramaturg, or designer, or any other performance-related or fine arts creative activities, are the equivalent of scholarly or scientific research and publication in purely academic disciplines, and provide the same basis for advancement in faculty rank and salary. There are a number of professional venues for theatre and Studio Art faculty to present and/or publish artistic and/or scholarly work and research, which include but are not limited to:

1. Association of Theatre in Higher Education
2. American College Theatre Festival
3. Literary Managers and Dramaturgs on the Americas university theatre
4. professional theatre
5. fringe/experimental theatre
6. developmental theatre or developmental program within a theatre
7. multiple-work showing at a gallery or museum (artist submitted, or gallery museum invitation)
8. one or two-work showing at a gallery or museum artist submitted, juried show, or gallery museum invitation)
9. chapter in a book with multiple authors
10. article in edited book
11. article in refereed theatre or fine arts journal

While Theatre and Studio Art faculty present papers and participate in panels at national conferences, publish in journals, texts, and/or other recognized publications, their primary contribution to the body of innovation, achievement, and knowledge in the arts is typically through their creative work. Therefore, in conjunction with the guidelines of professional organizations: NAST and CAA, the department establishes the following equivalents between publishing and creative activities.

### Theatre

To the average theatre viewer one production may appear similar to another. However in professional theatre there are significant, shared distinctions regarding the scope of a project, the depth and breadth of its relevant research, and the preparation time required. Therefore it is incumbent upon the faculty member to provide a clear statement that justifies the ranking of the creative work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATION</th>
<th>CREATIVE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author of a book</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a major production whose excellence can be attested to from top professionals(^6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of a book</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a production whose excellence can be attested for from professional and/or colleagues from other universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^6\) Major implies:

- a work of unique significance and/or challenge that necessitates extended research and preparation, or
- a work at a nationally recognize venue, or
- a work staged at a noted professional or university venue that significantly raise the venue’s aesthetic and/or cultural profile, or
- a world premiere of a play that catalyzes other productions.
Multiple author of a book or colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book publication</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a production that results from highly visible and successful collaboration with members of the production team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of a book</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a production with extended rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of a book</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a production with extended rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article publication</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a production with extended rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter in a book with multiple authors</td>
<td>Direct, design, perform and/or dramaturg a production with extended rehearsal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Studio Art

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATION</th>
<th>FINE ARTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book publication</td>
<td>Multiple-work showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor of a book</td>
<td>Artist submitted showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of a book</td>
<td>Gallery/Museum invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article publication</td>
<td>One or two work showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter in a book</td>
<td>One or two-work showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in edited book</td>
<td>One or two-work showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in a refereed journal</td>
<td>One or two-work juried show</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **Service.** The faculty member must demonstrate a willingness to serve the needs of the department, college, university, and community. While a faculty member can provide service in a variety of ways, the department deems the following areas as strong indicators of service.

1. Chairing a college, university, or national organization committee
2. Chairing a department committee
3. Directing or coordinating a department program: minors, theatre practicum, performance or academic orals
4. Membership on a department, college, university or national organization committee
5. Academic advising for a college or department
6. Coordinating or preparing students for national or international competitions, or professional auditions
7. New student orientation
8. Evaluation of productions at other colleges, universities, or professional theatres or evaluations of art works at other college, universities, galleries, or museums

**DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

*Approved by TRS Faculty on August 29, 2014*

1 **Introduction**

The Department follows the practices and procedures outlined in the *University R&T Policy and Guidelines for Preparation of R&T Files*.

The Department consists of scholars from a wide range of areas and disciplines, including biblical studies; biblical archaeology; biblical theology; historical studies; historical theology; systematic, fundamental, and doctrinal theology; Christian ethics; Christian spirituality; pastoral studies; religious and theological education; and world religions. In their research and teaching,
faculty members use an equally wide range of methods, frequently specific to their area of expertise.

The Department undertakes the work of evaluation collaboratively, with all members of appropriate rank participating in the evaluation process both at the R&T and Third-Year Reviews. Annual and triennial evaluations involve the elected departmental evaluation committee. Such collaborative work allows for comprehensive, constructive, and equitable evaluation of our faculty at every stage of their careers.

1. Teaching

Importance of teaching

The Department faculty takes student learning seriously. Whereas “all faculty have an obligation to teach well, to engage students, and to foster important forms of student learning”, successful teachers will inspire students to become active learners who take initiative in their learning process, not remain merely passive recipients of knowledge. The Department expects practices of teaching and classroom assessment that prompt students to engage in higher order thinking (evaluation, synthesis, analysis, and application). Such practices go far beyond requiring students to recognize facts or comprehend texts and concepts.

The Department values pedagogy that is inspired by the Augustinian vision of transformative learning. Such learning facilitates personal, spiritual, and intellectual development, as well as equips students with the critical thinking skills needed to become members of an educated, responsible citizenry in a pluralistic milieu.

Commitment to teaching

The Department emphasizes faculty commitment to

(a) teaching the CLAS Core Course, THL 1000, on a regular basis,
(b) developing diverse and new undergraduate and graduate courses on a continuing basis, and
(c) offering courses within the Department,

In addition, the Department stresses faculty commitment to

(d) designing syllabi that meet Department and CLAS Core Curriculum goals and objectives,
(e) participating in outcomes assessment, and
(f) revising curricula based on current research about effective teaching strategies in the field.

Evidence of teaching effectiveness

The Department reviews

(a) statement of teaching philosophy,
(b) participation in professional development activities for teaching and learning,
(c) syllabi, in particular, assessment strategies and goals and objectives,
(d) CATS scores, as well as

---

(e) peer and Chair classroom observation reports.

2. Scholarship

Preamble

Department disciplines have their own scholarly methods, but they also borrow methods from other disciplines. In other words, faculty work in “field-encompassing fields” involving much interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary work.

Disciplines that are substantively related to scholarship in Department disciplines will include classical studies, linguistics, rhetoric, history, sociology, literature, anthropology, philosophy, ethics, economics, as well as interdisciplinary area studies such as cultural, gender, or peace and justice studies. Scholarly contributions in these and related fields are recognized and encouraged.

Consonant with the University R&T Policy the Department expects scholarship to clearly extend beyond one’s dissertation, in particular, “works that are from the dissertation, works that are revised parts of the dissertation and which represent a fresh perspective and a deepening understanding of the subject, and works that offer a new line of research.”

The R&T Policy describes “scholarship” to include “the discovery, dissemination, and application of new knowledge, including knowledge of how learning is encouraged and fostered.” The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching fleshes out this definition in its discussion of four areas of scholarship:

(a) scholarship of discovery
(b) scholarship of integration
(c) scholarship of application, and
(d) scholarship of teaching.  

The Department advances and values equally all four forms of scholarship. They are descriptive of individual faculty members’ research trajectories, not prescriptive for all TRS faculty.

Scholarship of Discovery

The Department considers scholarship of discovery to be original, disciplined investigation that contributes to the advancement of human knowledge, usually communicated in one of five forms:

A peer reviewed book, published by an academic or reputable trade press

While the major university presses remain standard marks of excellence in Department disciplines, recent years have seen the development of various reputable trade presses, many specializing in Department disciplines, of a quality as high as, or higher than, some university presses.

The Department is aware of significant changes to the publishing landscape in Department disciplines driven by the digital revolution, in particular, open access approaches to publishing, the consolidation of presses, and the reduction in the number of publications. A growing number of scholarly presses are experimenting with shorter formats, questioning and extending the definition of “book.”

In light of these changes, the Department gives serious consideration to forms of scholarship other than the full-length book: shorter-form work can be serious work. In all cases, it is the task of the Department Chair and the Departmental R&T Committee to clarify the quality of the press and the contribution of the scholarship to the discovery of knowledge within Department disciplines.

**An article published in a peer reviewed journal in one’s discipline**

The Department recognizes that its faculty will publish in a variety of journals and collections of national and international importance.

Journals in Department disciplines do not follow the pattern set by the natural and social sciences in America. All those recognized by the Department as *journals of the highest quality* are refereed, but many, especially the most prestigious European journals, do not use blind referees and regularly invite articles from the most accomplished scholars. Such recognition by the international scholarly community is a sign of the quality of one’s scholarship. Most do not keep records of acceptance or rejection and find the American preoccupation with such matters as unintelligible.

**Electronic journals** in Department disciplines are in their infancy, and thus the Department Chair and R&T Committee must attend to and clarify the particular quality and significance of any electronic publication.

**Citation indexes** are not generally used in Department disciplines. Also, leading professional associations do not provide journal rankings. It is the task of the Department Chair and the Departmental R&T Committee to clarify the quality of journals and the contribution of particular articles to the discovery of knowledge in the various Department disciplines.

**A chapter in an edited book or a contribution to an edited collection of articles**

The Department recognizes that a chapter published in an edited volume by a reputable press carries the same weight as an article published in a top-tier journal.

In Department disciplines, book chapters are solicited commonly by the editor(s), or they may result from invited participation in a scholarly conference. They are peer reviewed by outside referees but also reviewed by the editor(s).

Department faculty frequently publish in *Festschrifths*. Like all invited publications in an edited volume, such published scholarship is normally a sign of international recognition of scholarly accomplishment in Department disciplines.

It is the task of the Department Chair and the Departmental R&T Committee to clarify the quality of a book chapter and the press in which it is published.

**Documentary or critical editions and translations**

In Department disciplines, the publication of critical editions and/or translations of primary sources is a crucial and demanding dimension of the scholarship of discovery, often requiring archival research, manuscript work, computer-assisted text comparison, and more. Such work is among the most rigorous scholarship in the Department and is accorded its due credit.

**Papers or lectures given at scholarly or professional meetings or conferences**

In Department disciplines, scholars compete globally for the opportunity to present their research at scholarly meetings. Some professional societies restrict how often members can present (e.g., no presentations from the same person in two consecutive years). Thus, the Department Chair
and R&T Committee must clarify the frequency of presentations and the nature of professional meetings.

It is normal to see the same topic appear first as a conference presentation, then in a volume of conference proceedings, and finally, in a revised and expanded version, as a journal article. Such a progression is evidence of an advancing and deepening research agenda and is encouraged both within the profession and by the Department.

**Scholarship of Integration**

Scholarship of discovery is closely related to Scholarship of integration. The former reflects the investigative, the latter the synthesizing traditions. It is “serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research.” It includes multi-disciplinary work, “research at the boundaries where fields converge.” It also means “interpretation, fitting one’s own research—or the research of others—into larger intellectual patterns”, to provide a “larger, more comprehensive understanding” of what original research may mean.

Department disciplines reflect such scholarship that is interdisciplinary, interpretive, and integrative. It will include, but is not limited to:

**Review essays of significant books or of articles published in journals of record**

A review essay (in a journal or anthology), unlike a book review, critiques and synthesizes existing scholarship, is published under a separate title, and allows the author to develop his or her own intellectual argument. While usually less weighty than an article, the Department follows the standards set by Department disciplines that consider review essays as contributions to scholarship, not as service to the profession.

**Editorial activities**

Scholarly editorial activity is time consuming and labor intensive work that necessarily requires careful judgment, deep knowledge of one’s field, and a complex skill set. While it certainly is professional service, it is also much more. As such, we recognize and credit scholarly editorial activities in all their forms including, but not necessarily limited to, published volumes of articles, conference proceedings, special numbers of journals, lexica, encyclopaediae, as well as on-going and long-term projects such as journals, book series, and multi-volume works. All of these forms are often points of contact, distillation, and dissemination for new data, methods, and/or schools of thought. Editorial activity contributes to the creativity and critical acumen of all the disciplines in the Department.

**Other forms of scholarship of integration**

Other examples of scholarship of integration are:

(a) Multidisciplinary work  
(b) Annotated bibliography  
(c) Interpretation of scholarly work for the wider public (i.e., published articles in nonacademic publications)  
(d) Articles and reports in trade journals, magazines, and newspapers  
(e) Articles in religious and church-sponsored publications  
(f) Book reviews that integrate scholarship

It is the task of the Department Chair and the Departmental R&T Committee to clarify the quality of scholarship and its contribution to the integration of knowledge within Department disciplines.
**Scholarship of Application**

Scholarship of application is “serious, demanding work, requiring rigor—and the accountability—traditionally associated with research activities.” It applies knowledge to solve consequential problems and serve the interests of the larger community. Here, theory meets practice and one informs and reforms the other. The appreciation of the dynamic, integral relationship of theory and practice in our Department disciplines suggests that new critical scholarly perspectives can and do arise in the very act of “application.”

To be considered scholarship “activities must be tied directly to one’s special field of knowledge and relate to, and flow directly out of, this professional activity.” It is the task of the Department Chair and the Departmental R&T Committee to clarify the relationship of particular applications to integral, rigorous scholarly work.

**Examples**

Scholarship of application will, by definition, change over time, and may include:

(a) Political, public policy, and/or social justice initiatives  
(b) Research that is fundamental to the mission and vision of VU  
(c) Research projects that address issues of local, state, or other need  
(d) Preparation of documents such as briefs, manuals, or other publications based on research for the good of the community (theory into practice) and organizations  
(e) Ecumenical and interreligious dialogue initiatives  
(f) Projects that investigate “not only teacher practice but the character and depth of student learning that results (or does not) from that practice”  
(g) Creating data sets and databases

**Scholarship of Teaching**

The Department recognizes the work of faculty who seek to understand, expand, and enrich teaching in their disciplines. Scholarship of teaching is the place “for questions that allow for more theory-building forms of inquiry, and for the development of new conceptual frameworks.” It involves inquiry and investigation particularly around issues of student learning. However, it is “not synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of ‘going meta,’ in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning—the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it.” As such, “faculty involved in the scholarship of teaching and learning … find ways to explore and shed light on these questions; use this evidence in designing and refining new activities, assignments, and assessments; and share what they’ve found with colleagues who can comment, critique, and build on new insights.”

**Examples**

Scholarship of teaching involves research and other work which focuses on the improvement of teaching and learning. Scholarship of teaching may include a wide variety of forms:

(a) Publishing articles on pedagogy  
(b) Developing new techniques to engage learners and extending them through the academy  
(c) Researching and presenting effective teaching strategies

---

(d) Documenting new approaches to teaching
(e) Demonstrating evidence of innovative classroom practices, including use of technology
However, to be scholarship, the work must meet these criteria:10

(f) The work demonstrates professional expertise.
(g) The work is made public.
(h) The work is available for peer review and critique according to accepted standards.
(i) The work is able to be used by other scholars (disseminated).
Any example of “scholarship” is likely to fall into two or more categories. For example, if a faculty member develops and implements a series of workshops to a scholarly or professional audience, which also leads to the publication of workbooks, manuals, documents, or other public policy documents, the scholarship could well be argued to fall in the categories of scholarship of integration, scholarship of application, and scholarship of teaching.11

3. Service

The Department understands service to be a fundamental and essential responsibility. Tenured faculty are expected to make an increasingly significant contribution. Service includes contributions, both qualitative and quantitative, to the Department, the College, and the University as well as to one’s profession, the larger community, and to the Church. The Department expects faculty to contribute effectively to the welfare and functioning of these constituencies.

The Department follows the University R&T Policy on service but notes the following:

**Department Service**

The Department ascribes special importance to departmental citizenship.

**University Service**

For the Department, service to the University includes initiating and strengthening institutional relationships between the University and church agencies that are specifically engaged in addressing poverty and the struggle for justice. Department faculty involved in such service aim to better understand, identify, and generate opportunities for the University, in keeping with its Catholic and Augustinian mission, to contribute toward building a more compassionate, just, and peaceful global society.

**Professional Service**

Many types of professional activities are signs of scholarly reputation and influence, including

(a) Service in regional, national, and international professional organizations
(b) Organizing scholarly conferences, meetings or panels
(c) Editorial work in professional journals, newsletters, or scholarly presses (see especially section 3.2.2: Editorial Activities)
(d) Participation in the peer reviewing process for publications or grant applications
(e) Service as external evaluator of dissertations (national and international)

**Publications**

Publications that contribute to a candidate’s record of service include

---

10 Shulman 149.
11 See www.bellarmine.edu/faculty/.../scholarshipdefined.
(a) Book reviews that do not fall under the categories of review essay (see 0) or other scholarship of integration (see 0)
(b) Book endorsements
(c) Bibliographies
(d) Other types of reference tools

“Digital age” activities

Doing research in the digital age means new possibilities for using tools like videos, podcasts, slide casts, scholarly blogs, and more. In Department disciplines, such professional activities are becoming increasingly common. Research blogs in particular are motivated by the possibility to share knowledge and to connect with other researchers. They aid scholarly creativity and productivity. In addition, they offer the possibility to reach multiple audiences, which makes them different from other kinds of scholarly communication. In many cases, they are instantaneously peer-reviewed.

The Chair and the Departmental R&T Committee will clarify the quality of digital scholarly activity.

Service to the Church and the Wider Community

As the University does not exist in a vacuum, the Department values faculty contributions to the wider public through the sharing of their expertise with non-academic audiences, in the form of public lectures, workshops, and other venues – political, pastoral, cultural, etc.

The Department also recognizes the importance of placing one’s expertise at the service of the local, regional, national, and worldwide church and other faith communities. Such service is part of the essential nature of the critical vocation of Department members.
VILLANOVA SCHOOL OF BUSINESS

Introduction. The mission statements for Villanova University and the Villanova School of Business (VSB) acknowledge the importance of balance and consistency for its faculty across teaching, research, and service. The guidelines and criteria in this policy statement reflect the importance of these dimensions, while bringing specificity to general assertions and tying requirements to our annual review process. This material will help faculty members understand rank and tenure expectations and measure progress towards these goals as they relate to the third year review, tenure, and promotion. Furthermore, it should bring evenness across academic areas in VSB as to their expectations and requirements.12

A. Teaching. Although the prime indicators of the educational process are favorable results such as students’ ability to reason, comprehend, and analyze, such results are inherently difficult to measure. Evidence to support candidates’ contributions to the educational process can be provided in several ways.

• Applicants for Tenure and Associate Professor:

The following will be considered:

1. The candidate’s own teaching dossier—data on courses taught (number of courses, principles or advanced courses, graduate or undergraduate), enrollments, sample syllabi and exams, and other information the candidate believes will help in the evaluation process.
2. CATS summary reports—candidates are strongly advised to include all individual students’ CATS forms for the past three years.
3. Course and curriculum development products published and available to the academic community such as case studies, critical incidents, books, and education-related research.
4. The academic area or its equivalent Rank & Tenure Report.
5. The academic area Chair’s or his/her equivalent report on the candidate, including annual evaluation reports.
6. Formal classroom visitation reports required by VSB policy (both faculty committees and the Chair’s). Individual Committee members will not perform informal peer reviews of the candidate’s teaching performance.
7. Other information deemed relevant in order to have a complete and fair evaluation of the candidate. This could include (but is not restricted to) evidence of: student teamwork, development of student communication skills, curriculum revisions designed to advance College objectives (e.g., cross-functionalization, current professional developments), effective use of appropriate technology, teaching awards, and external teaching evaluations (in Continuing Professional Education courses, executive training, educational workshops).
8. Evidence of the candidate’s out-of-class availability. The candidate should be reasonably accessible to his/her students to address issues related to classroom activities, projects and assignments, course expectations, and grading. Additionally, the candidate should be

---

12 Third year reviews also are part of the evaluation and professional development process for faculty hired on traditional six-year-to-tenure appointments and will be conducted by the VSB Rank and Tenure Committee. These reviews closely follow tenure reviews, requiring each faculty member to produce a similar dossier. Department committees are formed to evaluate faculty members and to make recommendations to the dean. The primary differences between the tenure and the third year review are: (1) no external letters are solicited, (2) works in process are included in the dossier, (3) the review ends with the VSB dean’s decision for renewal or nonrenewal, and (4) feedback and recommendations are provided to faculty members for their professional development. In addition, if there are gaps in dossiers related to administrative actions (e.g. courses taught, committee assignments), recommendations are made to department chairs.
accessible to students during the regular semester advisement period to offer advice on curriculum and career opportunities. Evidence for this criterion will be found in the student course evaluations and the annual reports of the academic chair.

9. Evidence that the candidate is collegial. The candidate is expected to be so in the sense that he/she shows willingness to assist in meeting the needs of the academic area. This would include being flexible with respect to the courses taught, the time and place courses are offered, the depth and breadth of coverage, implementation of innovative approaches to learning, and assisting others in developing current and new courses. Evidence for this criterion will come from the annual evaluation reports of the academic chair.

- **Applicants for Full Professor.** For the rank of full professor, the candidate must demonstrate continued, distinguished fulfillment of the teaching requirements over a period of several years. This includes but is not limited to effective use of technology, development of course materials and teaching pedagogy, and student mentoring. The teaching guidelines listed above for associate professor are equally applicable.

**B. Scholarship**

While acceptable quality and quantity are both important in the evaluation of a candidate’s research record, quality carries more weight than quantity. Expectations and evaluation criteria are presented for each rank.

- **Candidates for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor**

  **Quality of Scholarship:** the successful candidate will provide evidence that his/her research is of high “quality.” The single most important indicator of quality is publication of research in major peer-reviewed journals as identified by academic areas and VSB. The candidate’s research must have the following characteristics:

  1. *Research is rigorous and analytical.*
     - Uses up-to-date methodology appropriate to the discipline.
     - Adds significantly to existing literature and knowledge.
     - Employs original data analyses or develops new methodological, theoretical, or conceptual frameworks.
     - Reviews literature so as to add new knowledge or new conceptual frameworks to the field. (Literature descriptions, opinion pieces, and book reviews are insufficient.)

  2. *Research clearly indicates the faculty member’s independent abilities.*
     - The candidate must provide evidence that his/her published research has moved beyond the dissertation stage.
     - The candidate must demonstrate leadership in a significant portion of his/her published research. In general, “leadership” is indicated by responsibilities associated with project design and/or development of new methodological or theoretical frameworks. This is typically indicated through sole-authored research papers and/or co-authored research papers on which such leadership is indicated by footnote and/or by the discipline’s convention.

---

13 Candidates must state explicitly their relative contributions to authored work. For example, if the convention is that authors are listed alphabetically, candidates should explain their roles in various aspects leading to the completion of such publications. If authors are listed in order of contribution, it is incumbent upon candidates to clarify this procedure in their written materials.
3. A substantial portion of the candidate’s body of research is published in peer-reviewed journals appropriate to the faculty member’s field, area of specialization, or discipline of business.

Primary indicators of quality are the stature of the peer-reviewed journals and citations by other scholars in high quality outlets.

Secondary indicators of quality can include research presentations at conferences appropriate to the candidate’s field and the receipt of internal and external research grants.

**Evaluation Criteria:** The following guidelines will be used to assess scholarship quality:

- Journal lists developed by academic area colleagues and VSB.
- The historical stature of other journals (as indicated, for example, by published surveys of journal quality, composition of the editorial review boards, and years of publication).
- The informed perceptions of academic area and VSB peer evaluators.
- The informed perceptions of external peer evaluators charged with judging the overall importance and quality of the faculty member’s complete body of work. It is appropriate for external evaluators to comment on already published as well as works-in-progress.
- The number of citations to the candidate’s published research, with an emphasis on high-quality journals.
- The nature of participation in conferences at which the candidate’s research is presented.
- The use of the candidate’s research in academic programs around the world as well as clear measures of its influence on practice and public policy.

**Quantity of Scholarship:** The successful candidate for tenure and/or promotion to associate professor will provide documented evidence that his/her scholarship is of acceptable “quantity.” The following guidelines can be used in assessing quantity:

1. Candidates must produce a consistent stream of research throughout the evaluation period.

2. Candidates should frequently present their research at national or international conferences appropriate to their field or area of specialization.

3. As a general guide, faculty members on a six-year timetable will publish a minimum of 5 peer-reviewed articles and have at least one article from the A lists in their disciplines and three in the A- lists in their disciplines. In some cases, publishing work in equivalent journals in other areas may substitute if strong evidence is provided. Additionally, specialized journals associated with the candidate’s fields of research with an impact score of 1.0 or higher may substitute for an A level journal, and journals with an impact score of .50 to .99 may substitute for an A- journal if agreed upon by their academic areas.\(^\text{14}\)

- **VSB Candidates Applying for Tenure Who Were Hired at the Associate Rank without Tenure**

  All the preceding guidelines for tenure/promotion to associate professor hold. Regarding the

\(^{14}\) The impact factor is computed by calculating the average number of citations in all journals published in a given year for articles appearing in the focal journal over the previous two years. See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_Factor](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Impact_Factor) for more details.
expected quantity of scholarly output, an appropriate expectation level will be set forth upon
the initial appointment of the candidate by the dean of VSB in consultation with the
appropriate leadership and with input from senior members of the candidate’s field(s). Such
expectations are based, in part, on the number of years of creditable service determined at
the time of the candidate’s initial appointment.

- **VSB Candidates for Promotion to Full Professor**

  **Quality of Scholarship:** Beyond meeting the quality requirements for promotion to
associate/tenure, the candidate for full professor must provide clear evidence that his/her
research is recognized nationally/internationally by leading scholars. This level of
accomplishment may be supported by the following:

1. Significant publication history in academic area and/or VSB journal lists.
2. Historical stature of the journals in which the research is published.
3. Evaluations offered by informed and independent external reviewers.
4. The quantity of citations to the candidate’s body of work, with an emphasis on high-
quality journals.
5. Distinguished or invited research lectures and seminars.
6. Authored or edited scholarly books that contain many significant references to scholarly
peer-reviewed journals.
7. Significant and documented impact upon practice or public policy.
8. Editorial positions on peer-reviewed journals.

  **Quantity of Scholarship:** For the assessment of quantity, the following guidelines can be
used:

1. The candidate must provide clear evidence of continuing scholarship as demonstrated by
ongoing publication in peer-reviewed journals for a period of generally four years after
promotion to associate professor or joining the VSB faculty. Publication of scholarly
books (edited books) supports, but does not replace, the need to continue publishing in
peer-reviewed journals.

2. As a general guide, faculty members seeking full professorship will publish 20 or more
peer-reviewed articles, with a minimum of three articles from the A lists in their
disciplines and seven in the A- lists in their disciplines. In some cases, publishing work in
equivalent journals in other areas may substitute if strong evidence is provided.
Additionally, specialized journals associated with their fields of research with an impact
score of 1.0 or higher may substitute for an A level journal, and journals with an impact
score of .50 to .99 may substitute for an A- journal if agreed upon by their academic
areas.

- **VSB Candidates Applying for Promotion to Full Professor Who Were Hired at the
  Associate Rank with Tenure**

  All the preceding guidelines for promotion to full professor hold. The successful candidate
will have significantly augmented his/her stream of research with quality published research
while a faculty member at Villanova.

**C. Service**

The Committee recognizes that the types and level of service contributions of candidates may
vary significantly over the course of academic careers. This is reflected in the following.
Applicants for tenure and associate professor

In general, faculty at this stage of their careers are expected to make important service commitments while recognizing their contributions in the areas of teaching and research are valued more highly in terms of professional development and accomplishment of the strategic goals of VSB and the University. Service will be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Active involvement in committees: Candidates are expected to have served the needs of their individual units in terms of committee assignments. Likewise, candidates are expected to have made important contributions to the success of at least one committee at the VSB or University level.

2. Involvement in professional activities: Noteworthy service would include participation in professional meetings as a discussant, session chair, track chair, or conference organizer. Likewise, important contributions can be made in reviewing papers both for conferences and journals.

3. Active participation in organizational affairs: Service contributions would include cooperation in serving needs such as advising students, addressing curriculum issues, providing relevant information to chairs as needed, recruiting, and representing the academic area at functions such as open houses for prospective students, alumni events, and industry functions.

* Applicants for Full Professor.

Fulfillment of the service criterion for this rank requires a higher level of sustained commitment and contribution than associated with lower ranks. Candidates for this rank must provide evidence of significant external service to their profession, as well as meaningful internal service to VSB and University. Outstanding internal service will not suffice as a substitute for external service. Similarly, outstanding external service will not suffice as a substitute for internal service.

Service at this level will be evaluated using the following criteria:

1. Roles in committee leadership: Candidates will be expected to provide evidence of leadership on committees at both the VSB and University level. Leadership roles include the assuming of important duties and substantive contributions as participants on committees. This includes, but is not limited to, the chairing of VSB and University committees.

2. Service to the profession: Successful candidates will provide evidence of a high level of commitment and contributions to their professions. Examples of such service would include journal editorship, chairing of national meetings or important committees within national associations, conference and workshop organizing, and review board memberships.

3. Leadership roles within VSB: Evidence should be provided that candidates have assumed leadership roles in organizational affairs. Examples would include providing guidance and consultation to junior faculty in research and teaching, addressing major curriculum issues, and curriculum development.
A. Teaching. The College of Engineering follows the practices and procedures outlined in the various University Rank and Tenure documents.

B. Scholarship

- **Research Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor**

  Scholarly research includes discovery, dissemination, and application of new knowledge. This scholarship involves research, analysis, and explanation of intellectual concepts. Because research has multiple goals and values, basic research, applied research, and educational research would fulfill the scholarship criterion for promotion and tenure.

  All members of the College faculty are expected to conduct sustained, high-quality original research beyond the dissertation as a part of the scholarly activities. This work should be capable of presentation at appropriate specialist conferences and publication in recognized scholarly media. The evidence of scholarship is typically documented in refereed publications appropriate to the field of research for each candidate.

  When evaluating a candidate's research the following measures shall be applied:

  **Peer Reviewed**
  1. Peer-reviewed publications, including journal articles, book chapters, and monographs
  2. Peer-reviewed conference publications and other peer reviewed publications

  **Non Peer Reviewed**
  1. Successful proposals and project reports for external support of research activity
  2. Development of special facilities to support research activity: A significant lead-up time is required for the experimentalist to design, implement, and validate their test set-up and procedures before research begins.
  3. Publications in the form of book chapters and monographs and non-refereed conference publications

  Candidates for promotion should classify their publications according to the degree of peer review that has been undertaken and the degree of contribution in collaborative research. Since engineering research tends to be quite wide ranging archival journals and referred conferences articles present a good yardstick of research significance.

  Overall, the department is responsible for providing adequate guidance, in accordance with the University policy and this document, to the individual regarding his or her requirements for scholarship activity and achievement. Ultimately, the responsibility for understanding and fulfilling the requirements for tenure and promotion must rest with the candidate. Successful candidates in the past have published, on average, one paper per year, some of which have been high quality, peer reviewed journal articles.

- **Research Guidelines for Promotion to Full Professor**

  Promotions are based solely on merit and not upon seniority or length of service. For promotion to Professor, the candidate is expected to be widely accepted as a scholar by peers in the technical profession. The candidate must have a sustained research record, as judged by the quality of refereed publications. The candidate's research record must also be consistent
with the description of scholarship in the Villanova University Rank and Tenure Policy, pages four through six.

In all cases, promotion to Professor requires that the individual demonstrate through his/her dossier and external letters that the candidate has achieved a high level of achievement in his/her areas of research as demonstrated by a record of scholarly publications beyond the Associate Professor level.

When evaluating a candidate's research the following measures shall be applied:

**Peer Reviewed**
1. Peer-reviewed publications, including journal articles, book chapters, and monographs
2. Peer-reviewed conference publications and other peer reviewed publications

**Non Peer Reviewed**
1. Successful proposals and project reports for external support of research activity
2. Development of special facilities to support research activity: A significant lead-up time is required for the experimentalist to design, implement, and validate their test set-up and procedures before the research begins.
3. Publications in the form of book chapters and monographs and non-refereed conference publications

The candidate's total scholarly record can also be measured by citations of the candidate's work, by other scholars in the field, in addition to honors and awards for scholarship and invited talks and presentations.

Candidates for promotion should classify their publications according to the degree of peer review that has been undertaken and the degree of contribution in collaborative research. Since engineering research tends to be quite wide ranging archival journals and referred conferences articles present a good yardstick of research significance.

Overall, the department is responsible for providing adequate guidance, in accordance with the University policy and this document, to the individual regarding his or her requirements for scholarship activity and achievement. Ultimately, the responsibility for understanding and fulfilling the requirements for tenure and promotion must rest with the candidate. Successful candidates in the past have published, on average, one paper per year, some of which have been high quality, peer reviewed journal articles.

C. **Service.** The College of Engineering follows the practices and procedures outlined in the various University Rank and Tenure documents.
Villanova University College of Nursing

Rank and Tenure Committee

Statement on the Scope of Scholarship in Nursing

Igniting the Heart. Inspiring the Mind. Illuminating the Spirit, the Strategic Plan of Villanova University, emphasizes that achievement of the mission, goals and objectives of the institution depends on disciplined inquiry, scholarly research and academic discourse. Our Augustinian heritage creates an imperative for scholarship at the highest plane to engage contemporary issues and needs…(Villanova University, 2009).

Nursing is an applied discipline that values translational science and evidence-based practice. The Faculty of the College of Nursing subscribes to Ernest L. Boyer’s (1997) definition of scholarship, which best recognizes the full range of activities comprising their role in teaching, research and service. Further, the research conducted by faculty is compatible with and supports the mission of the University and has a focus on nurturing of patients, families, and communities.

A wide variety of quantitative and qualitative methods and field-related topics are appropriately found within the realm of nursing research. Appropriate categories include but are not limited to:

- Studies and scholarly analyses that are descriptive of health and illness experiences of patients, families, and populations, as well as the experiences of providers of nursing and health.
- Research on methods of practice and the delivery of care with a focus on present and future health care needs and health care policy.
- Historical studies analyzing the development of nursing, the evolution of nursing practice, the impact of health care policy, and trends within nursing education.
- Theoretical work focused on concept development and analysis that leads to theory generation.
- Philosophical and ethical analysis of the multiple dimensions of professional nursing practice and nursing education.
- Pedagogical studies that focus on the improvement of teaching and learning with the ultimate goal of addressing present and future health care needs (e.g., simulation, interprofessional education, on-line teaching approaches).
- Interdisciplinary and interprofessional initiatives to improve health and education.
- Methodological research including psychometrics (e.g., instrument development)
- Research that focuses on evaluating systems for the delivery of services with enhanced quality and/or economy.
- Outcomes research which focuses on direct patient care, health workforce training, patient education and prevention strategies, health programs, health care delivery systems, and health policy.
- Secondary analysis of established, credible databases.
- Evaluation research to establish efficacy of practices, protocols, programs and policies
- Synthesis studies (e.g. meta-analysis) to determine best practices.
- Publication of the “state of the science,” or theoretical reviews.
The College of Nursing places value on the competency and preparation of the investigators to carry out their particular studies, and on the quality of the resulting scholarship. Individual, team, and interdisciplinary authorship are appropriate, depending on the topic under investigation and the scale of the project. Collaborative research does not deny the contributions of individual investigators.

Appropriate outlets for the publication of nursing research and scholarship include, primarily, peer-reviewed journals within nursing and other related biomedical and social science disciplines, scholarly books and book chapters, as well as peer-reviewed electronic publications and peer-reviewed conference proceedings.

Factors considered in the review of the scholarship portion of tenure and promotion applications include: external reviews by experts in the field; the appropriateness of outlets in relation to one’s nursing specialty (e.g., an historian or ethicist might best write a book whereas most other research will be published in peer-reviewed journals); the nature of the journals, including type and focus, audience, and how the journals relate to the individual’s body of research; frequency of citation of the individual’s published work; and whether or not the person is a single-, primary- or secondary author and the applicant’s relative contribution to the publication.
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Guidelines for Evaluation of CON Faculty Scholarship

3rd year review criteria for continuing:

- Evidence of efforts to obtain funding to support research
- Publication or notice of acceptance of several peer-reviewed data-based manuscripts per year in high-level disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or specialty journals or peer-reviewed data-based scholarly books
- Positive internal review of scholarly work

Promotion to associate professor

- Evidence of successful research support and continuing efforts to secure increasingly competitive funding
- Consistent publication or notice of acceptance of peer-reviewed data-based manuscripts per year in high-level disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or specialty journals or peer-reviewed data-based scholarly books
- Positive internal and external review of work with evidence of contribution of scholarship to field
- Recognition as regional or national participant in scholarship related to research focus

Promotion to full professor

- Evidence of successful research support from major recognized funding sources and continuing efforts to secure competitive funding
- Consistent publication or notice of acceptance of peer-reviewed data-based manuscripts per year in high-level disciplinary, interdisciplinary, or specialty journals or peer-reviewed data-based scholarly books
- Positive internal and external review of work with continuing evidence of contribution of scholarship to field
- Evidence of continuing contribution of research and scholarship to discipline
- Recognition as national and/or international leader in scholarship as evidenced by citations, awards, invited presentations, invited participation on expert panels and invitation to join scholarly professional societies, etc.