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I. Expectations for Tenure & Promotion

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 science majors. Research Assistant Professors (or ranks above Assistant) will be permitted to serve as M.S. thesis mentors with the expectation that service to all Graduate Committee functions will be a requirement of the appointment.

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. Research & Scholarship

1. 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.

2. 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, publication 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.

3. 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, professional presentations, 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.
II. Documentation & Evaluation

A. Teaching

1. **Documentation:** materials to include in Dossier and Appendix

   The Dossier should be as streamlined as possible. The Dossier should contain the text that describes teaching effectiveness. Substantive supporting materials (syllabi, graded materials, etc.) should be included in the Appendix.

   Applicants should use the numbering shown below, matching that of *Guidelines for Preparation of Rank and Tenure Files* (per latest revision August 28, 2013). For items for which the applicant has no relevant information to include, the corresponding number/letter should be skipped. The organization and numbering of the Appendix should match that of the Dossier exactly.

D. Teaching section

1. Teaching statement

   This statement should present an overview of the faculty member’s teaching philosophy, followed by supporting information concerning the following aspects of teaching (guidelines say that not everyone will have something to say about all of these items):

   Teaching methodologies and approaches; significant recent course revisions; new course development; unusual requirements; and teaching innovations, including team-teaching efforts, student-teacher research collaborations, student teamwork projects use, of instructional technology, teaching-related grants, development of pedagogical materials, evidence of encouraging student creativity and independent thinking, quantitative exercises and development course related research projects, presentations, etc.; explain how your course fits into the evolution of the curriculum.

   Documentation placed in the appendix should include course syllabi including—or supplemented by—handouts or statements describing special assignments, reports, term papers, writing enriched components, and laboratory/field trip activities/requirements. Other documentation may include portfolios of student work; graded exams, reports, results of independent course projects; description of review sessions, group reviews, etc.

2. Description of professional teaching development activities: workshops, institutes, research pedagogy, teaching-related publications, certification, report on self-improvement efforts, use of teaching assistants in course work, etc. Summary of long-term and short-term goals to enhance teaching effectiveness.

3. Historical five-year CATS report (provided by the Chair via OPIR)

4. Independent studies

5. Titles and names of student authors of Villanova theses. (Applicants for promotion should denote with asterisks those theses directed since last promotion or receipt of tenure.) Short description of research projects and how they are integrated into overall research program. Summarize the number of proposals submitted (the mentoring of student authored grant applications), seminars, and posters, presented by students. Indication of one's participation in master's or doctoral written/oral exams and related activities. (Applicants for promotion should emphasize activities performed since last promotion or receipt of tenure.)
6. Copies of peer teaching evaluations produced as a result of class visits by faculty colleagues. (Six evaluations are required for tenure applications and optional for promotion applications).

7. Other pertinent evidence of teaching effectiveness, such as teaching-related awards; student surveys that are not official University, College, or departmental documents; etc. Such materials may be placed in the appendix at the discretion of the applicant.

8. Summary of advising activities; accessibility to advisees (office hours, etc.); pre-majors, majors, and graduate students. A description of the approach to advising and evidence of effectiveness as may be available.

9. Discussion of any interdisciplinary teaching, if pertinent (i.e. teaching in other programs or departments).

While not required by the University Rank and Tenure document, candidates have the option to submit to the Biology Chair a list of names of former undergraduate and graduate thesis students (with current mailing addresses) who can be asked to submit a letter of support for a candidate's application for tenure and/or promotion. Faculty will have the option of omitting any names of thesis students from their list. Former students will be contacted by the Chair and they will be asked to comment on the quality and impact of their mentorship experience with the candidate. They will also be assured that their review will be held in strict confidence. Letters will be placed in the candidate's application packet and comments will be available for review by rank and tenure committees. Because this information is optional (University guidelines), the choice by a candidate not to solicit reviews from former students is not a negative reflection of a candidate's mentorship performance.

2. Evaluation

a) Approach and philosophy
The approach to evaluation of teaching efforts and outcomes used by the Department of Biology is represented in the following diagram:

The principles guiding evaluation are that Departmental faculty will consider and evaluate (1) the merits of arguments for quality of teaching performance that cannot be quantified or supported by specific outcomes; (2) the nature and quality of outcomes, presented by the faculty member, that document teaching effectiveness; and (3) arguments and outcomes regarding advising efforts (including mentoring of student research) that support teaching efforts.

Final evaluation will be based on the totality of teaching efforts relating to University and Departmental expectations that are described as “essential” and “positive.” Rather than setting specific thresholds for individual teaching activities, the totality of efforts will serve as a basis for evaluation.

b) Process of Evaluation

(1) Evaluation of merits of arguments for quality teaching that cannot be supported by specific outcomes.

The rationale for this form of evaluation is based on the University’s *Rank and Tenure Policies and Procedures* document (page 5): “Because measuring student growth and development in learning is imprecise and demonstrating the success of many instructional activities cannot be done with certainty (or quantitative precision), it remains necessary for candidates for promotion and/or tenure..."
to provide sufficiently persuasive evidence of their achievements.” With this statement in mind, evaluation of teaching performance will be based, in part, on how effective the candidate is in developing the following arguments (with appropriate documentation) for teaching effectiveness:

- **Linkage.** Is there a clear and rational link between the educational philosophy and goals stated by the candidate and his/her efforts to facilitate learning? Evaluators will examine how teaching efforts and assignments reinforce the stated educational goals of the candidate.

- **Mission Statements and Departmental Expectations.** Does the candidate explain how their teaching efforts support some of the major educational goals stated in the Departmental and University mission statements and are teaching efforts consistent with the “Expectations for Teaching” statement of the Department? Do student and peer evaluations, syllabi, course assignments, and grade history, etc. document these efforts?

- **Strategies to Facilitate Learning.** Are “higher” levels of learning being emphasized (development of written, verbal, analytical, quantitative, and creative skills)? Is there evidence of student-directed learning? Do course syllabi (approaches to pedagogy, etc.), handouts, graded examinations, written assignments, etc., document these efforts?

- **Teaching Development and Innovation.** Does the candidate provide clear evidence of teaching development and innovation? Are new approaches to teaching being used/explored? Do course syllabi show an evolution of topic and pedagogical development over time? Are there changing patterns in course enrollments, course offerings, or team-teaching assignments that reflect professional development? How is new teaching or laboratory development supporting new areas of curricular development? Have educational grants been submitted and/or funded? Professional development: Are previous “problems” (if any, indicated by CATS/peer evaluations) being addressed? Are benefits of workshop attendance, presentations, etc., articulated?

(2) **Evaluation of merits of documented outcomes**

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness documented by tangible evidence of outcomes will center on the following questions:

- Do submitted materials support a cause-effect relationship between efforts to facilitate learning and specific outcomes (student surveys; graded exams, graded papers, data analysis, success in attracting thesis students, etc.)?

- Are CATS scores and in-class peer evaluations indicative of strong teaching performance with respect to individual courses over time, and with respect to Departmental, College, and University comparisons?

- Have the applicant’s teaching efforts been enhanced by application for, and awarding of, educational grants, pedagogical publications, etc.?

- Do Annual Evaluation reports from the Department Chair reflect a record of teaching effectiveness and appropriate professional development with respect to teaching?

(3) **Evaluation of advising efforts and outcomes**

Evaluation of the faculty member’s efforts and accomplishments in academic advising and supervision of student research will focus on the following questions:

- Has the faculty member demonstrated an effective contribution to the Department’s efforts in academic advisement, as evidenced by the number of advisees supervised; knowledge of
academic procedures/policies; availability; and involvement as an advisor for student organizations and activities?

- Has the faculty member developed a record of success in involving students in research, as evidenced by the number of research students supervised and by mentoring of completed theses, student presentations, student grants, publications, awards, etc.?
B. Research and Scholarship

1. **Documentation**: materials to include in Dossier and Appendix

Applicants should use the numbering shown below, matching that of *Guidelines for Preparation of Rank and Tenure Files* (per Dr. Johannes, Sep. 2000). For items for which the applicant has no relevant information to include, the corresponding number/letter should be skipped. The organization and numbering of the Appendix should match that of the Dossier exactly.

E. Scholarship section

1. Research Philosophy of Applicant

   (a) A preliminary statement providing an **abstract** of the philosophy, objectives, and relevance of the research program, explained in language understandable to a general audience.

   (b) An explanatory section elaborating on the structure and operation of the applicant’s research program. This statement should articulate:

   - Guiding questions or topics that motivate the research program, and their relationship to, and importance within, the applicant’s subdiscipline
   - Relationships among separate components (if any) within the overall program, explaining how each contributes
   - Progression over time across the research program, including adjustments or enhancements incorporated to date
   - Expected future direction(s) of research program, and how work currently in progress contributes

   (c) Statement explaining the role of students in the applicant’s research program. This statement should outline the relationship of between the faculty member’s own research activity and student projects (and variation among students in that respect) and the faculty member’s level of direct involvement in components of the work such as project development, data collection, analysis, and publication.

2. List of items of scholarship

   a. Books and monographs
   b. Monographs prepared for government or professional agencies
   c. Refereed journal articles
   d. Book chapters
   e. List of exhibits, theatre productions, etc.
   f. Refereed conference proceedings
   g. Other publications: non-refereed articles, magazine/newspaper pieces, conference abstracts
For each item of scholarship listed above (a. – f.) include also:

- Complete bibliographic information, using a consistent format that includes a listing of full authorship, complete title, and full name of the journal or other outlet (no abbreviations).
- Brief explanation of applicant's role, in cases of co-authorship, that outlines relative contribution to planning, data collection, analysis, and presentation of the research. The significance of the sequence within a list of authors varies across subdisciplines in biology, so applicants go beyond language that refers only to the sequence of authors and avoid terms such as "senior author."
- Indication of items accepted but not yet in print as “in press,” with a copy of the of the publisher's/editor's acceptance letter (translated to English if necessary) included in the dossier.
- Mark with asterisk (*) items for which the research and writing were exclusively or primarily done while the applicant was a Villanova faculty member. Provide additional explanation for research projects where data management, analysis, and writing were completed at Villanova, but for which some or all data collection was completed before applicant joined Villanova faculty.
- Mark with double asterisk items (**) deriving from the applicant's own doctoral dissertation. Because variation exists in the degree to which doctoral research in biology represents scholarship independent of a supervisor's own research program, applicants should explain briefly the relationship between applicant's dissertation and the research and publications of the applicant’s doctoral supervisor.
- For application to Full Professor, mark with plus sign (+) items that formed part of basis for promotion to Associate Professor.
- Indicate whether item was contributed (unsolicited) or invited.
- Documentation/explanation of the significance of each item listed:
  - Nature and relative importance/status in profession of book publishers (if relevant; see Departmental expectations statement about publication of books).
  - Nature of refereeing process: double blind, single blind, editorial board review only, or editor review only.
  - Quality and reputation of the journal: selectivity, prestige, other information pertinent to quality.
  - Statement about appropriateness of the publication outlet for the work in question, based on factors such as audience, subject matter, study organisms, geographic context, etc.
h. List of grants applied for, with successful awards indicated (including dollar amount). This section should include a statement explaining the applicant’s grant-seeking activities in the context of the discipline.

i. Papers presented at scholarly professional conferences. Entries here should indicate the nature and scope (geographic) of the conference at which each paper was presented.

j. List of other scholarly activities.

3. List of awards, special recognition, patents, etc. Documentation may be included in the Appendix if essential to evaluator’s understanding.

4. Section concerning the applicant’s research program, including projects underway
   This section should include:
   
   List of research projects underway. Applicants should identify the relationship of current projects to the overall philosophy and objectives of the research program.

5. Copies of reviews of applicant’s work, and evidence from citation analysis that demonstrates scholarly recognition.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

2. Evaluation

a) Approach and philosophy

Evaluation of the faculty member’s activities and accomplishments in research and scholarship will be conducted using the conceptual framework depicted below:
The principles guiding evaluation are:

(1) The goal of evaluation is to assess whether the faculty member has met the expectations articulated in the Departmental statement. Aspects of scholarship covered by these expectations include an ongoing commitment to research, represented by the candidate’s explanation of philosophy and goals; evidence of defined research program that features the candidate as a Principle Investigator; past and likely future productivity in the form of publications and grant proposals; and recognition among peer scholars in the candidate’s area(s) of study.

(2) Assessment of the degree to which a candidate has met Departmental expectations will be based on both tangible evidence of outcomes, such as publications, and on the candidate’s description of research goals, activities, and outcomes—and on the ways in which these aspects relate to each other and, as a whole, contribute to the research mission of the Department. In cases involving collaboration, the role of the candidate as principal Investigator is important, and documentation supplied by collaborators may provide useful information. The candidate may ask the Department to solicit letters from collaborators; if so, the Department will honor the request.

b) Process of evaluation

(1) Evaluation will focus first on the faculty member’s stated philosophy and goals. Faculty members evaluating the candidates statement will look for evidence of rational and well developed objectives and plans for the research program as a whole.

(2) Assessment of past and current research efforts and outcomes will be based on their sensible relationship to the overall objectives of the research program.

(3) Evaluation of the level of recognition attained will be based on the combination of publication productivity, citations of those publications, reviews of grants and manuscripts, outcomes of grant-seeking activity, external letters from peer scholars, and other evidence of impact among scholars in the relevant area(s) of study. Evaluators will also consider the candidate’s explanation of the level of recognition attained in relation to the practices and norms within relevant subdiscipline(s).

(4) As part of the evaluation process by individual faculty members, each will seek answers (based on the candidate’s dossier and supporting materials) to questions such as the following:

- Does the research address significant questions in biology using appropriate approaches?
- Has the candidate established a publication record that includes both quality and quantity, to a degree that meets Departmental expectations?
- Has the faculty member been effective at involving students in the research program in a manner that both promotes student development and contributes positively to progress within the program as a whole?
- Has the faculty member made a convincing case for the attainment of external recognition commensurate with norms within the relevant area(s) of study?
C. Service

1. **Documentation:** materials to include in Dossier and Appendix

Candidates for tenure and/or promotion in the Department of Biology should document how their particular contributions fulfill a service need at the Department, College, University, professional, or community level. Candidates may find it useful to place their service activities in the context of specific personal interests and goals that may relate to these academic, professional, and community needs. A mere listing of service activities is not sufficient; candidates should describe each specific service need and document their meaningful efforts to address these needs. Full descriptions may be more helpful for activities that may be unfamiliar to evaluating members of the University community. For each activity, the description should include the type of involvement, the dates of involvement, the amount of time invested, and the significance of the service activity. Where appropriate, documentation included in the Appendix may consist of: letters of appointment or commendation, programs listing participants, details of reports authored, etc. The amount of documentation required may be inversely proportional to the level of service activity. Service activities should be described according to the numbering system given below, which corresponds to that given in *Guidelines for Preparation of Rank and Tenure Files*, Dr. Johannes, September, 2000.

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

F. Service section

1. Describe service on University Committees and other University service. Note any special roles played (speaker, moderator) at University functions. Also note participation or positions held in University chapters of scientific or academic societies (Sigma Xi, AED, etc.).

2. Describe service on College committees and other college service. Note any special roles played at College functions.

3. Describe service on Department committees and other Department service (seminar coordinator, van czar, advisor to biology student group, etc.). Note any special roles played at Department functions.

   a. Participation at professional/scholarly meetings other than presentation of papers. The nature of participation (e.g., discussant, session chair, speaker, attendant) is to be specified, as is the type and level –international, national, regional, state, etc.–of the meeting. Documentation may include programs.
   b. Membership in professional societies and associations, and active involvement in them. The nature and extent of involvement, offices held, significance of duties, etc., should be indicated.
   c. Activities as editor of scholarly journals.
   d. Membership on editorial boards of scholarly journals.
   e. Published book reviews other than those listed above in scholarship section.
   f. Service as referee for scholarly journals, as prepublication reviewer for books, or for grant proposals. Indicate number of items reviewed and describe review process.
   g. Service as a referee for tenure/promotion cases at other Universities.
h. Works of translation that do not properly fit into either teaching or scholarship.

i. Include memberships on regulatory or scientific advisory committees for external institutions or companies.

5. Volunteer community service, with special attention to activities that are related to the applicant’s University position and professional expertise.

2. Evaluation

a) Approach and philosophy

Evaluation of the faculty member’s activities and accomplishments in service will be based on the following:

(1) Service activity and effectiveness as well as participation in routine functions of the Department, College, and University will be evaluated.

(2) Service activities are a demonstration of good citizenship and are expected to be approached with a collegial attitude.

(3) The quality and quantity of service will be evaluated.

(4) Service activities should represent a balance of areas of activity that must include significant contributions at the Departmental level.

(5) Professional service should be proportional to the level of professional development of the candidate, and appropriate to the area of expertise.

b) Process of Evaluation

Evaluation of service activities will be based upon arguments made by the candidate detailing specific needs that are met by the candidate’s service to Department, College, University, Profession, and community. Arguments should be based upon:

(1) Linkage of mission statements to needs.

(2) Effectiveness of service activities in meeting these needs.

(3) Relationship of individual goals to service activities.

The Department of Biology has identified some service activities as essential; these must be performed by each candidate. Other activities are expected, and may be chosen by the candidate according to his or her personal interests and talents. Service contributions will be expected to be relatively greater in cases where performance in teaching or research is relatively less, but in no case shall excuse deficiencies in those areas.
III. Appendix: In-Class Peer Evaluation

A. Procedure

Peer Evaluations are designed to examine faculty efforts to facilitate learning in the classroom, laboratory, and field. The Department feels that broader issues of pedagogy and educational outcomes cannot be evaluated with single, random classroom visits. Although it is not a formal part of the peer evaluation process, tenure-track faculty are encouraged to attend the lectures/labs of more experienced faculty members.

1. Purpose of peer evaluations:
   (1) Provide the Department and University with an evaluation resource for tenure applications.
   (2) Provide objective peer evaluations of faculty efforts to facilitate learning.
   (3) Support faculty development by providing peer feedback on observations made in the classroom, laboratory, and/or field.

2. Policies and procedures for in-class evaluations
   (1) Peer evaluations are to remain confidential.
   (2) Faculty members can select at the beginning of each semester the lecture/laboratory topics that they choose to have evaluated.
   (3) Faculty members will have an opportunity to discuss their teaching goals with an evaluator prior to a classroom visit.
   (4) One week notice is given to a faculty member before a visit is made.
   (5) Two visits will be scheduled per semester and at least six evaluations will be conducted during the tenure-track probationary period. More visits may be scheduled as needed or requested.
   (6) Evaluators will include: one member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and one tenured non-FEC faculty member selected by the FEC from a list of three tenured faculty members submitted by the faculty member to be evaluated. A new list of names may be submitted each semester.
   (7) Both classroom and laboratory sessions will be evaluated. Details of laboratory visits can be discussed in pre-visit meetings between faculty members and evaluators.
   (8) Feedback from classroom visits will take the form of (a) verbal debriefings within 24 hours of a visit and (b) written peer evaluation forms submitted to the Department Chair that will be available for review beginning one week following the visit.
   (9) Written self-evaluations of the classroom/laboratory visit will be submitted by the evaluated faculty members after they have discussed their teaching performance with the peer reviewer.
B. Evaluation Form

Name of evaluated faculty member:
Evaluator:
Date of Visit

General Observations

Number of Student:
Type of class or laboratory observed: (undergraduate; graduate; major; non-major; lower division; upper division; etc.):
Educational format: classroom, laboratory, seminar, field trip, etc.:
Presence of Teaching Assistant; role of Teaching Assistant:
Use of teaching technology (if any): overhead projectors, PowerPoint presentations, computer simulations, etc.:
Forms of student-directed learning: group projects/discussions, problem-based learning, open discussions, debates, etc.:
Number of times this course was taught in the past:

Specific Observations

The following list of observations are “prompts” (talking points) for a classroom/lab visit; this list is not designed to be a checklist of observations that will apply to all visits.

Organization

• Were objectives of class well defined?
• Were lectures/exercises focused on major objectives?
• Were objectives presented in a logical sequence?
• Was class time used effectively?

Communication

• Were the “mechanics” of presentation (e.g., voice volume, eye contact, mannerisms) effective?
• Were major objectives developed, illustrated, and discussed or were they simply listed and discussed superficially?
• Did handouts and visual aids help clarify information? Were they descriptive and informative?
• Did instructor provide students with information and or data that would allow them to synthesize concepts or develop new ideas?
• Was the pace of the lecture/instruction appropriate for the students and/or the situation?
• Was the instructor alert to student questions? What was the nature or quality of student questions (if any)?
• Did course materials (syllabus, etc.) provide insights into the topic(s) covered in class or the type of learning experience or learning expectations?
• Were there any faculty-student interactions that influenced the learning experience?

Conclusions from visit

Overall impressions of teaching performance (balance of strengths and weaknesses):
IV. Appendix: Faculty Evaluation Committee

A. Formation
As part of the evaluation process, a 3-member Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) will be elected by the faculty. Each member of the FEC will serve for a 3-year term, with one new member elected by October 1 of every year. Elections will be by a closed ballot vote in which all faculty members who are tenured (with the exceptions of the Chair of the Department and the individual who has just completed a term on the Committee) will be under consideration for nomination. The Chair will then compose and distribute a list of faculty from which each faculty member (tenured, tenure-track, and full-time non-tenure track faculty) will choose three names. The Chair will then tally the votes and the three nominees with the most votes will be placed on an election ballot. All faculty will then vote for one person on the ballot, with the person receiving the majority of votes being elected to the FEC. The FEC will elect a Committee Chair, who is typically the person serving the final year of their 3-year term. A faculty member elected to the FEC is required to serve on the committee unless there are extraordinary circumstances that preclude participation, in which case the person will be replaced by another elected member.

B. Function
The major function of the FEC will be to review the materials submitted to the Department Chair by each faculty member as part of the faculty self-evaluation process. In the event that a faculty member who is not on the FEC wishes to comment on any aspect of another faculty member’s performance, any and all such comments must be directed in writing to the Chair of the FEC with a copy to the faculty member whose performance is being addressed. Components used in the evaluation will be prorated for the period of time since the last evaluation because untenured faculty are evaluated yearly whereas tenured faculty are evaluated every three years.

After examining the self-evaluation materials, the FEC will meet with the Department Chair and will present verbally a report which assesses the strengths and weaknesses of each faculty member as well as perceived areas for potential development. The Department Chair will have an opportunity to take notes during the meeting. The FEC may also review self-evaluations from previous years. A written evaluation of each faculty member will be prepared by the Chair, and the written comments of evaluation will then be reviewed by the FEC. Following review by the FEC, each reviewed faculty member will be allowed to read the Chair’s evaluation and to comment on the evaluation before it becomes an official document. Following FEC and faculty review, the Chair will make final comments of evaluation that will become part of the permanent record. Each faculty member will have the option of submitting written responses to the final evaluation of the Chair that will also become part of the permanent record. The FEC will not be made aware of either the final numerical ranking or the final written evaluations of each faculty member prepared by the Chair of the Department.

A second function of the FEC deals specifically with teaching. The Department Chair may request a classroom visitation to fulfill required in-class peer evaluations or if a particular faculty member’s teaching is deficient in some manner. In addition, a faculty member may elect to invite FEC members to the classroom for any reason. Under either circumstance, the classroom visitation will be conducted by one or more members of the FEC. A faculty member whose class(es) will be visited will have the opportunity to veto one of the members of the FEC from visitation. The schedule for visitation will agreed upon by the faculty member teaching the class and the visiting member(s) of the FEC. All parties will meet to discuss the faculty member’s teaching within one
week after the classroom visitation. The visiting member of the FEC will then prepare a written summary of the classroom visitation, which will be provided to the faculty member being evaluated and the Department Chair as part of the faculty member’s permanent file. The faculty member will also have an opportunity to submit a written response to the evaluation that will also become part of the permanent record.

C. Philosophy of evaluation
The Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) seeks to assess colleagues with regard to their continued progress to meet or exceed a set of standards that define the Department’s vision of a teacher-scholar. Mirroring aspects of the process of evaluating a candidate’s suitability for promotion and tenure, the FEC considers a faculty member’s performance in the three major categories of academic responsibility: instruction, scholarship, and service. While the specific criteria related to each pillar are unique, an overarching theme that pervades the FEC’s assessment is their search for evidence of sustained, progressive improvement as measured by achievement of both short and long term goals. In plain terms, the FEC seeks to ensure that colleagues within the Department are never satisfied with the status quo, but instead constantly strive to better themselves, their studies, and their scholarly communities.

Regarding formal instruction, the FEC looks for evidence of clarity, consistency, organization, and rigor in teaching. It is expected that learning objectives are explicitly defined and that all other aspects of the course (instruction, assignments, and assessments) support or reflect back on those objectives. There should be an indication that faculty members make every effort to provide students with as clear a path as possible to achieve the learning objectives. This means a commitment not only to being organized and fair to avoid obstructing a student’s trajectory, but also to propel students’ understanding by using oral and written communication that distinctively yet unambiguously conveys the essence of the subject matter. Placing a high value of student-centered learning, the FEC specifically seeks evidence that an instructor is attentive to his or her students. Faculty are expected to be approachable and to conscientiously respond to students’ questions and concerns. In the view of the FEC, an effective teacher is one whose courses are constantly evolving to incorporate new information and to respond to constructive criticism. No textbook should ever match the timeliness of an individual faculty member’s version of a course, where late-breaking developments in the field are naturally integrated with each iteration. Whenever possible, research should be intertwined with teaching so that instruction is coupled to active use of the scientific method with the goal of improving students’ skills in observation, analysis, and interpretation.

The FEC recognizes that beyond classroom instruction, faculty are involved in other activities related to teaching that may or may not involve direct student contact. These include serving as a supervisor or advisor for student research, participating in MA comprehensive exam committees, applying for educational grants, attending meetings on teaching methodology, and writing textbooks.

Dynamic, ongoing scholarly activity is expected of all faculty members. In evaluating colleagues in this regard, the FEC seeks evidence of a faculty member’s measurable progression toward building or improving upon a body of work. This is manifest in a consistent and uninterrupted pattern of disseminating new information from one’s studies and an active pursuit of external funding to support those projects. Faculty are expected to remain current in their respective disciplines by regularly attending meetings and to contribute to the current state of knowledge of the field by sharing their work in a public forum. In addition, the FEC assumes that faculty are at all times actively engaged in some phase of the publication process, with one or more manuscripts in preparation, in submission, or under review at peer-reviewed outlets. While faculty are encouraged
to publish their results in high impact journals, the FEC does not assess an article’s length or the faculty member’s position in the author list as a measure of the quality of the publication.

In addition to their teaching and research responsibilities, the FEC expects that faculty are engaged as contributing members both in the local community of scholars (in the Department, College, and University) and among the colleagues in their respective fields outside of Villanova. Faculty service is therefore evaluated according to a three-pronged metric: 1) participation in student advising, 2) service to the University (including service at the Department and College levels), and 3) service to the profession. As advisors to students, faculty are expected to attain a mastery of academic rules, policies, procedures, and course requirements. Faculty should thus be able to effectively assist students in navigating the path to graduation and may impart their generalized advice in the form of handbooks for their students. Along with assisting students with course registration, the FEC acknowledges other advisory duties such as writing letters of recommendation and participating in activities around campus that advance the University’s mission statement. These include but are not limited to regular attendance and participation in Departmental and University activities such as seminars, orientation events, and commencement. For other service activities conducted at Villanova, the FEC expects faculty to participate in various committees at the Department, College, and University levels, making tangible contributions to written reports or other assignments. Leadership positions in these committees are especially valued. Outside of Villanova, the FEC looks for faculty to develop and maintain a strong presence among the contemporaries in their specific disciplines by acting as referees for manuscripts, grants, and textbooks and by participating in activities associated with professional organizations.