



Faculty Workload and Annual Performance Review Policy

Loyola University Chicago emphasizes the importance of teaching and student engagement, intellectual contributions, and faculty service for all members of the faculty. The purposes of this policy are to set parameters for how these important dimensions are distributed within each faculty member's workload and to provide guidance for reviewing faculty performance on an annual basis. The annual review process is intended to be both evaluative and developmental. Carefully executed, it will promote continuous improvement among the faculty and contribute to Loyola's excellence as an institution.

Section I: Workload

For tenure-track faculty, the university reaffirms its commitment to the principles and normative guidelines for faculty instructional responsibilities, as articulated in the [Faculty Instructional Responsibilities Document](#) of October 2009. This document calls for a 3/2 course load as the norm for tenure-track faculty and includes an expectation that all tenure-track faculty make contributions in teaching and student engagement, intellectual contributions, and faculty service. Further, the university commits to a flexible approach that recognizes differences in faculty interests and rewards contributions across all dimensions of faculty contributions. As well, the different circumstances of non-tenure-track faculty are taken into account and expectations regarding their workloads and performance reviews are to be clarified at the unit level.

A. Tenured Faculty

1. Teaching and Student Engagement and Intellectual Contributions
 - a) Tenure-track faculty are categorized according to their emphasis on teaching and student engagement and intellectual contributions.
 - b) Each academic unit will develop guidelines regarding expectations for contributions in three categories – teaching-intensive, research-active, and research-intensive – consistent with the parameters shown below.
 - Teaching-intensive:
 - Regular scholarly contributions, but with less frequency or of a different character than necessary for research-active status.
 - Three-three teaching
 - Research-active:
 - Sustained intellectual output that is recognized by the profession. Depending on the unit, this might be defined by the number of outputs, quality of outputs, or both.
 - Three-two teaching
 - Research-intensive:
 - In accordance with Loyola guidelines, research-intensive faculty “must engage in a pattern of research that is exceptional by departmental standards (i.e., beyond that expected of tenure-track faculty at the various ranks).”
 - Two-two teaching
 - c) Each academic unit will develop a process for making category assignments, with the process beginning with the individual faculty member. That is, each faculty member will request a category consistent with his/her recent record and work with the dean or dean's designee to finalize a category assignment. Typically, category assignments have a three-year term, though the dean has discretion to make changes before the term is up. The category assignment process is distinct from the annual performance review process in that the former sets expectations, whereas the latter reviews the past year.



- d) The workload of faculty on Performance Improvement Plans (see page 5) may be different. The purpose of a Performance Improvement Plan is to move faculty toward higher achievement.

2. Service

- a) Service is generally understood as a set of contributions to the university, academic unit, or profession other than intellectual contributions or teaching and student engagement. Occasionally, a faculty member may have reason to contribute more or less to internal or external service for a period of time. Under such circumstances, and with agreement from the dean or dean's designee, service contributions may be emphasized more or less, with commensurate adjustments in expectations regarding teaching and student engagement and intellectual contributions.

B. Untenured Tenure-Track Faculty:

1. Untenured tenure-track faculty must be assigned to the Research-Intensive category until the mid-probationary review. After the review, they must be assigned to either the Research- Intensive or Research-Active category, with the corresponding workloads as described above.
2. Service Contributions: Untenured tenure-track faculty are expected to engage in minimal service at the beginning of their pre-tenure period and to assume somewhat greater responsibilities as they near the tenure decision year.

C. Faculty Holding Endowed Chairs or Professorships

1. The workloads and expected contributions of endowed chairs and professors are established by the Dean, in consultation with the Provost.

D. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Each academic unit should develop guidelines regarding non-tenure-track faculty workloads based on their contributions. The guidelines should address expectations for teaching loads and professional development activities, as well as service contributions, if any. Ordinarily, the teaching load for non-tenure track faculty should not fall below seven courses per year.

Section II. Annual Performance Review

The primary purpose of the annual performance review is to provide information to assure continuous professional development among faculty. During years when a raise pool is available, reviews also inform the allocation of raises across faculty.

A. Required Documentation

1. Annual Faculty Performance Review Report: Each faculty member must submit data for the annual report through the Interfolio F180 system, which is accessed through [Interfolio F180](#). F180 is used to generate the Annual Faculty Performance Review Report that forms the basis for the review.
2. Self-Assessment: Each faculty member must rate his or her performance on each dimension using the 5-point scale described below.
3. Other: Academic units may require additional documentation, such as an up-to-date CV.

B. Review Process

1. Each annual review covers the 12-month period of July 1 through June 30. All on-load teaching is included in the year in which the course ends. Each academic unit should decide whether off-load teaching will be included.
2. The process begins within the academic unit and is completed in the Provost's office, following the steps shown in Table 1.
3. Raises, if any, are effective in the January pay period.



C. Steps of the Review Process:

1. The faculty member initiates the annual review process by entering all information into F180 and submitting all required documentation, except the annual report, to the party responsible for the first stage of the review process.
2. An authorized administrator accesses F180 and sends them to the responsible party. At the discretion of the academic unit, the responsible party might be the department or division chair or a faculty committee.
3. The responsible party assesses each faculty member's performance using the 5-point scale described below and offers to meet with each faculty member to discuss the review. The responsible party then informs the dean of the recommendations for each faculty member.
4. The dean or dean's designee assesses each faculty member's performance using the 5-point scale described below, calculates aggregate scores, and then informs each faculty member of the final review. The dean submits each faculty member's final review and recommendations regarding raises to the Provost.
5. The Provost reviews all materials and makes final determinations regarding raises.

D. Review Criteria

1. Faculty performance on the dimensions of teaching and student engagement, intellectual contributions, and service should adhere to generally accepted practices for the discipline and should be consistent with the mission and values of Loyola University Chicago. Each academic unit will develop and adopt metrics or guidelines to: (i) clarify what constitutes satisfactory performance on each dimension; and (ii) provide indicators of better-than-satisfactory and worse-than-satisfactory performance. These guidelines must be communicated to the provost.

- a) Teaching and student engagement: The teaching rating is based on several factors, including [SmartEvals](#) course evaluations, deployment of appropriate and innovative pedagogical tools and methods, appropriate and innovative use of technology, peer evaluations as appropriate, number of course preparations, appropriate incorporation of mission-related activities in coursework, and engagement with students outside of formal courses (e.g., advising, internships, independent studies, or thesis or dissertation supervision), as well as a recognition that some courses take greater effort than others (e.g., large sections, writing intensive courses, or online courses). If the faculty member provides full information on all aspects of teaching and student engagement through the F180, the weight given to SmartEvals would ordinarily not exceed 50%.

Intellectual contributions: The standard for intellectual contributions is quality of output. The key metric for quality is peer review. The primary consideration in the evaluation of intellectual contributions is outcome, not effort. Each academic unit will decide the stage in the publication process to recognize journal articles, books and other scholarly output, with the understanding that each publication may be counted only once. For some academic units, the products of intellectual effort include creative work and performance. Those academic units will decide the stage in the production process to recognize such work. Annual reviews should also consider progress in ongoing work. Article submissions, revise-and-resubmit requests, book contracts or creative works submitted but not yet exhibited, are not regarded as favorably as final outcomes.

- b) Service: The standard for service is quality of contribution, rather than number of activities undertaken. For senior faculty, effective leadership is associated with the highest rating. Many activities, such as attending meetings, convocation, commencement and other events, as well as responsiveness to and accessibility for students, are expected as part of a faculty member's contractual obligations and professional responsibilities. See Faculty Handbook for more information.



E. Rating System

1. On each dimension of performance, faculty contributions are rated on a 5-point scale, with corresponding scores:
 - a) Substantially exceeds expectations (5)
 - b) Exceeds expectations (4)
 - c) Meets expectations (3)
 - d) Needs improvement (2)
 - e) Needs substantial improvement (1)
2. Each academic unit should develop general criteria for ratings.
3. The review process is necessarily flexible, as there are no perfect associations of performance of a particular type and particular ratings. Every effort is made to maintain consistency across faculty as well as from year to year.

F. Weights

1. In the review process, the weights for teaching and student engagement, intellectual contributions, and service vary based on faculty category, and perhaps based on circumstances specific to an individual faculty member.
2. Benchmark weights for tenure-track faculty are shown in Table 1. At the discretion of the academic unit, weights for teaching and student engagement and intellectual contributions may vary +/- 15% and weights for service may vary +/- 10% from the benchmarks. The review focuses on outcomes, rather than inputs. Thus, these weights are not intended to reflect the relative amount time spent on any particular type of activity.
3. Each academic unit should develop benchmark weights for non-tenure track faculty.

Table 1: Relative Weighting for Review Purposes

Category	Teaching and Student Engagement	Intellectual Contributions	Service
Teaching-Intensive	50	30	20
Research-Active	40	40	20
Research-Intensive	30	50	20



G. Impact of Reviews

1. Tenure-Track Faculty

- a) When a pool of funds is available for salary raises, deans consider the aggregate scores when determining how to allocate the raise pool, with higher raises typically being allocated to those with higher scores.
- b) When a pool of funds is not available for salary raises, the faculty member's score for the year will be averaged with the score for the next year in which a raise pool is available.
- c) If a faculty member earns a needs substantial improvement rating on any single dimension for two consecutive years, the responsible party must work with the faculty member to develop and execute a Performance Improvement Plan, which includes specific standards for performance.

H. Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

1. When a pool of funds is available for salary raises, deans consider the aggregate scores when determining how to allocate the raise pool, with higher raises typically being allocated to those with higher scores.
2. When a pool of funds is not available for salary raises, the faculty member's score for the year will be averaged with the score for the next year in which a raise pool is available.
3. A faculty member who earns more than two needs substantial improvement ratings within three years on any dimension may not be reappointed.