



MEMORANDUM

To: Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty of Loyola University Chicago
From: Pete Facione, Provost
Date: November 5, 2002
Re: Considerations pertaining to the Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure of Tenure Track Faculty

Several of you have asked that I share the considerations and sources of evidence that I have found to be the most helpful for purposes of evaluating faculty performance in teaching, scholarship, and service. Of course, this is of primary concern to all who may be seeking to earn tenure or to petition for promotion. But, as you all know, as we better integrate our processes of mid-probationary review and annual faculty evaluation with our promotion and tenure process, the same considerations naturally will apply.

Departments and schools have guidelines and standards regarding promotion and tenure, and our University has policies regarding faculty evaluation. Thus, this message, like any message about topics of such centrality and concern, is meant to be understood within the context of existing policy and not as a replacement for departmental guidelines. In order to be sure that the many things addressed and suggested in this message would be consistent with existing policy, earlier versions of this memorandum have been reviewed in detail with the Committee on Faculty Appointments, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Council, and the Provost's Advisory Council. These valuable discussions resulted in many improvements to the initial draft. I am happy to report that there is significant accord and support for what you will read here among those faculty, deans, and other academic administrators who have worked on this memorandum. I want to thank all of these good colleagues for their most helpful guidance and advice to this new Provost in preparing this message.

Considerations and Evidence for Evaluating Faculty Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

Effectiveness in leading students to learn is the most important element in the evaluation of teaching. The more directly the data relates to the achievements of students, the more valuable those data are. Indirect evidence, such as data concerning instructor activities and the quality of the learning materials one has produced, like data regarding student satisfaction, is lesser value. The thoughtful interpretation by experienced colleagues of the quality and effectiveness of one's teaching, when supported by high-quality evidence, is an essential element in the evaluation of one's effectiveness in teaching. It is helpful to remember that even after achieving a reasonable level of proficiency, one's approach to teaching continues to mature over a teaching scholar's professorial career. In addition to listing one's teaching, advising, and student mentoring activities, one should provide direct or indirect evidence of one's teaching effectiveness. This evidence may include:

- Data demonstrating that one's students achieve the learning outcomes of the one's courses.
- Data that one's students experience success in subsequent studies or areas of practice or research.
- Samples of one's course syllabi, learning outcomes, course objectives, exams, and assignments
- A personal statement expressing one's pedagogical approach to one's teaching assignments.
- List of one's teaching development or course development activities.
- Samples of instructional materials produced for one's own use or the use of other faculty.
- Listing of undergraduate and graduate student research projects that one guided or mentored.
- Listing of undergraduate and graduate clinical or internship projects that one guided or mentored.
- List of contributions to program development activities and the campus culture of learning.
- Peer evaluations of one's teaching based on colleagues' observational visits to one's classes.
- Student self-reports of the extent to which they achieved intended learning outcomes.

- Summaries of qualitative and quantitative student course evaluations derived using reliable tools that are valid for the nature and pedagogy of one's discipline. (Unless the tools are valid and reliable, and the data are interpreted wisely, this particular source is of no value.)

Quality is the most important element in the evaluation of scholarship. The best evidence of quality is the informed judgment of one's professional peers and the informed and unbiased opinions of experts in one's specialization with regard to the merits of one's work. Although quantitative thresholds may be established by individual departments and schools for particular evaluation purposes, quantity alone can never substitute for quality. The creation and discovery of knowledge is prized; however no single kind of scholarship is inherently of higher quality than another. The scholarship of application or integration, if done well, is of greater value than the scholarship of discovery done poorly. Success in publication and securing research grant funding, when appropriate, in blind, peer-reviewed, externally competitive venues is a strong indication of the quality of one's scholarship. Works in their final form that have appeared or that have been accepted for publication are given more weight than pre-publication or unpublished works. Works appearing in highly competitive, national level, refereed, juried, blind peer-reviewed venues, or academic law journals, are given more weight than other works. Repetitive publication of very similar or essentially the same work is given less weight than the publication of works that continue to advance one's scholarly program. No greater or lesser weight is attached to collaborative projects or co-authored works; their quality is of paramount importance. Statements describing one's scholarly program and agenda are valuable in assisting evaluators to determine one's progress as well as one's promise in the area of scholarship. A sustained and sustaining program of scholarship that has led to achievements at the national level is a consideration of importance in matters relating to promotion to associate professor and tenure.¹

Dedication, initiative, and useful effort are the most important elements in the evaluation of faculty service. *Dedication* manifests itself in work that advances the purposes, missions, goals, principles, and values of the department, the college/school, the university, the teaching profession, and one's academic discipline. *Initiative* manifests itself in anticipating service needs, in making constructive suggestions, and in taking those actions which actually improve services and programs. *Useful effort* is meaningful and productive time and energy spent working on those faculty service tasks, often unspectacular, which meet the needs and advance the goals of the university, the department, the college/school, the discipline, the department, and the scholarly/artistic, and the social communities within which one lives and works. Significant weight is placed on time and effort devoted to that faculty service that sustains, nurtures, and builds a vibrant, creative, and productive institutional culture of learning. Paid consulting activity or clinical practice for which one receives compensation is not considered faculty service. (Although, up to a point, engaging in paid consulting or in compensated clinical practice may be a positive indication that one is maintaining one's teaching skills.) Work based on one's professional, academic, or clinical

¹ This discussion of scholarship uses relatively traditional "publication" language. But the same principles apply in fields where scholarly productivity takes other forms, such as the fine and performing arts as well as performance-professional fields within the arts and sciences (e.g. film making, creative writing, oratory, design). Quality is the most important factor, along with a sustained and sustaining program of artistic / creative work.

Often the best way of showing one is achieving consistently at a high level is via blind peer review by experts in the field. In the arts these recognitions come by way of participation in reviewed or juried shows and festivals, invited commissions for creative work, competitions won at national quality venues, positive reviews of one's performances or creative work in venues of recognized quality or from critics of repute, and the like.

With some creative work it is possible to assemble a portfolio or album, (e.g. of slides of one's paintings or sculptures, copies of one's poems, short stories, novels, musical scores, screen plays, documentaries, photographs of one's costume designs, CD's of one's musical performances, videotapes of one's acting or dance shows) which might then be submitted for external reviews by those familiar with professional level work by artists in academic institutions. With works that by their nature are not enduring, e.g. dramatic lighting, theatrical directing, choreography, etc. a department chair or dean can invite academics of stature from other institutions to attend the performances and write reviews for purposes of keeping those on file for later use in faculty evaluation, promotion, or tenure.

This use of analogous criteria rooted in the same principles is evident even in defining appropriate credentials. While the Ph.D. is the appropriate "terminal degree" in many fields, there are many exceptions, particularly in artistic and performance fields. Academic leaders must take care to properly appreciate the significance of degrees such as MFA, JD, MD, and the like. [02-28-05]

expertise that advances the good of the community, region, nation, and world is valued to the extent that those services were *pro bono* or uncompensated contributions. A list of one's service or committee assignments is of very little value in the absence of descriptions of, or evidence relating to the useful products and actual improvements that resulted from one's active participation.

Overall Evaluation and Weightings of Categories

One promotes or tenures a person, not a category. This requires a holistic judgment about the totality of a person's accomplishments and promise for the future. And yet, it is often helpful to evaluate faculty achievement qualitatively within the three nationally understood and acknowledged categories of faculty responsibilities known as teaching, scholarship, and service. For purposes of tenure and promotion I begin with the assumption that one's overall evaluation should regard teaching and scholarship, in about equal measure, as the two most important areas of responsibility. Both, then, are more significant in the overall evaluation of an individual than is service.

For purposes of annual evaluations the weightings may be translated into percentages of emphasis. In a university that prides itself on both its teaching and its research, the default for tenured and tenure track faculty would be that one's overall evaluation should be based about 40% on one's contributions in teaching, about 40% on one's scholarly work, and about 20% on one's faculty service. These weightings express the emphasis being placed on the category by virtue of institutional policy; not the actual amount of time that each and every individual is expected to spend engaged in these various activities.

In the matter of annual evaluations weightings may be adjusted by the Dean (on the recommendation of the Chair), assuming that one's teaching responsibilities remain at the level expected of a full time tenured faculty member. A Dean may increase or decrease the weightings by up to 15% for tenured faculty, if such an adjustment is judged to be warranted. For example, the Dean might determine that such an adjustment responded to a strategic need of the school, significantly assisted in the development of a tenured faculty member's career, or responded to necessary changes in the person's faculty duties. Teaching reductions for scholarship or for service result in placing additional emphasis on the quantity of the work expected of faculty in those areas. But teaching reductions do not warrant changes in the weightings of categories; rather teaching reductions are best considered as being in lieu of changes in those weightings. As a matter of justice it is unfair to one's departmental and school that a person not contributing their fair share in service or in scholarship should be assigned the same amount of teaching responsibilities as those who are regularly contributing; thus a tenured or tenure track faculty member whose work is minimal or below expectations in either scholarship or in service should expect to be assigned additional responsibilities in the area of teaching.

Unlike annual faculty evaluations, the mid-probationary review decision, much like the tenure and promotion decisions, cannot be other than a holistic judgment. These decisions are not reducible to formulaic computations. Thus, for purposes of mid-probationary review, tenure and promotion, a record of minimal performance or a work that is below expectations in any one category cannot be remedied by excellence or even outstanding work in other areas.

To help make qualitative terms like "minimal" and "excellence" more understandable as they apply to the work of tenured and tenure track faculty, permit me to share fuller descriptions of how these terms apply in the categories of teaching, scholarship, and faculty service to the work of tenured and tenure track faculty. In my experience these evaluative groupings are of great assistance to candidates and to departmental and school colleagues in understanding the considerations involved in promotion and tenure decisions. This heuristic is likewise of great value for other important evaluative processes, such as mid-probationary reviews and annual evaluations. Correct application of these schema entail sensitivity to the standards of one's discipline or professional field. Using these schema departments and schools can

integrate important disciplinary considerations and peer group expectations with the factors that build highly successful colleges, professional schools, and universities.

In reading and using this schema it is important to note key expressions such as “relative to the time available,” “relative to one’s academic rank,” and “relative to the other duties of one’s position.” These phrases indicate that, for example, the quality and quantity the work being produced might be judged to be outstanding in the case of a person who is more junior in rank but excellent or perhaps only satisfactory for a person who is more senior in rank or who has a set of duties that more amply supports the given kind of work being evaluated.

Teaching 40% (+ / - 15%)	
1 Below Expectations	Problematic classroom performance or sub-standard clinical supervision; unreliable advising; inability or unwillingness to make effective contributions to teaching at both the lower and upper division of the undergraduate curriculum offered by one’s department; or unwillingness or inability to meet departmental teaching standards or curricular goals.
2 Marginal	Carries out all assigned teaching responsibilities to a level of quality that minimally satisfies basic departmental, school, and university expectations for effective teaching; provides acceptable and accurate academic advising; stays up to date in one’s discipline; engages in acceptable levels of curricular or pedagogical development; and behaves toward students in ways that show respect for them as persons and learners.
3 Satisfactory	Given one’s specific instructional assignments, consistently renders solid and effective work in the classroom and / or clinical settings; enjoys success in maintaining or improving one’s teaching effectiveness and /or clinical or professional expertise; provides reliable, accurate, and effective student advising and mentoring; develops useful instructional materials for one’s own courses and students; personifies for students a commitment to disciplined and rigorous inquiry, professionalism, truth-seeking, academic excellence, intellectual integrity, and concern for justice and the common good.
4 Excellent	Satisfactory teaching combined with evidence of successful integration of one’s scholarly work with one’s teaching; successful engagement of students in research or in appropriate professional activities; and contributions that enrichment of the campus culture of learning.
5 Outstanding	Excellence in teaching combined with leadership at the departmental, school, university, regional, or national levels in curricular improvement; and a consistent generosity of spirit in sharing one’s pedagogical expertise with one’s colleagues.

Scholarship 40% (+ / - 15%)	
1 Below Expectations	Lack of productive scholarly activity for one or more academic years relative to the time available for scholarship, or activity of a quality that is below expectations given one’s rank and position.
2 Marginal	The regular production of minimally acceptable amounts of published scholarship of acceptable quality relative to the time available for scholarship, the standards of the department, one’s academic rank, and the other duties of one’s position.

3 Satisfactory	Scholarly activity annually resulting in publications or externally funded research grants of sufficient number and quality as to demonstrate a productive and sustained focus on an area of research appropriate to one's discipline; and evidence of a sustained and sustaining program of scholarship with solid prospects of achieving continuing success. Adequacy of the quantity and quality of the scholarship is judged relative to the time available for scholarship, one's academic rank and the standards of the department.
4 Excellent	Satisfactory scholarship combined with sustained achievement in nationally competitive venues; successful completion of important projects in accordance with long term plans; integration of one's scholarship into one's teaching; evidence, such as citations, of a well-deserved national reputation for one's scholarly work.
5 Outstanding	Excellent scholarship with significant achievements; recognition at the national or international levels for intellectual leadership in one's area of scholarly expertise

<u>Faculty Service – 20% (+/- 10%)</u>	
1 Below Expectations	Lack of initiative, dedication, or effective effort; behavior that impedes the achievement of departmental and institutional goals; or failure to perform one's assigned duties to a minimally acceptable level of quality.
2 Marginal	Minimally useful activity, relative to rank and seniority, in service to the program, department, school, and university; and the consistently acceptable fulfillment of assignments and duties.
3 Satisfactory	Consistently demonstrates initiative, responsiveness, presence, and involvement in rendering beneficial effort and useful contributions, relative to rank and position, toward the achievement of departmental, school, or institutional goals and priorities, in fulfillment of the university's mission.
4 Excellent	Satisfactory service with consistently producing valuable results on projects of importance to the institution or the profession; the uncompensated contribution of one's time and professional expertise for the benefit of society; generosity of spirit and creativity in solving problems.
5 Outstanding	Excellent service combined with consistently effective leadership within the university and at the national level; success in motivating others to work for the common good and to achieve excellence.

Suggestions Regarding the Annual Faculty Evaluation Processes

Asked by many how I might envision annual faculty evaluations, I have been responding that the process should create and reinforce a strong set of mutual expectations for professional excellence, sensitivity to departmental and school standards, and responsiveness to the strategic objectives and Jesuit character of the University. Based on more than thirty years of experience, I have come to value some practices more than others, since they help create and sustain a faculty evaluation process that is developmental, fair-minded, and supportive of strong academic departments. Here are some ideas of how this might look in actual practice.

Each year, at a time set by the Dean or Chair, faculty should provide information concerning their accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service. The kinds of evidence identified earlier in this message would be most appropriate. The Chair (or the Dean in the case of those Schools not organized into departments), working in consultation with two or three senior colleagues (selected in a manner that fits with departmental customs and practices), would then consider the materials presented by the faculty member as well as such other information regarding the person's teaching, scholarship, and service as may be available to them through the exercise of their due diligence. Based on those considerations these persons would then make an evaluation of the person's accomplishments using the terms "below expectations," "minimal," "satisfactory," "excellent," or "outstanding," as characterized above.

The Chair/Dean would then prepare the draft of a short letter to each person who was evaluated in order to communicate the person's evaluation. Typically such a letter would describe the department's evaluation process and name the persons with whom the Chair had consulted in doing the evaluation. The Chair would then write a brief paragraph about each of the three categories for evaluation in which the evaluation is communicated using the terms "below expectations," "minimal," "satisfactory," "excellent," or "outstanding," as characterized above. In each the Chair would offer appropriate praise and perhaps suggest one or two opportunities for continued improvement. The Chair would conclude the letter with an overall evaluation that is derived from the weightings of the three categories (e.g. 40% - 40% - 20%), expressing the weightings being used and the overall evaluation in whatever terms the Chair might deem most helpful and accurate. I know from experience that many Chairs would use one of the same five terms, ("below expectations," "minimal," "satisfactory," "excellent," or "outstanding,").

Often the next step in the process is for the Chair and the Dean to meet to discuss the proposed evaluations and the draft letters of evaluation. This part of the process is often of great help to the Dean in coming to know the faculty of the school. It can also play a useful role in mentoring new department Chairs and in assisting in establishing greater school level consistency in the application of the evaluative terms. Many Chairs and Deans have found these conversations to be valuable in understanding not only the individual faculty of the department, but in planning for the development of the future leaders of the department or in dealing with those one or two particularly vexing situations that a Chair might be facing.

The next step in the process would be to share a draft of this letter with the person being evaluated and to offer to have a conversation about the draft. This conversation can turn out to be the most valuable element in the faculty evaluation process, even if the draft of the letter ends up being revised as a result of that conversation. The Chair would not be changing evaluations in that conversation; but, in rare cases, the Chair might wish to confer with those colleagues who had assisted in the original evaluation to discuss if a change might be warranted in light of something that may have been learned in the conversation with the faculty member regarding the draft letter. In the great majority of cases, however, the conversation relates to the suggestions the Chair may have offered regarding how the person might improve in teaching, scholarship, or service. The Chair would then prepare the final letter of evaluation, provide it to the faculty member, send a copy to the Dean and put a copy in the file.

The rights of a faculty member to appeal his or her evaluation must be preserved. A first informal step in an appeal would be for the person being evaluated to request that the Chair, in consultation with those persons who had originally assisted in the evaluation, reconsider the evaluation. This might occur as a result of the conversation over the draft letter, for example. A second, more formal step would be for the person to appeal to the Dean, who could refer the matter to a school level evaluation appeals committee that had been formed in a manner appropriate to the internal governance of that school. The final step of appeal, should a person wish to pursue the matter to this level, would be to appeal to the appropriate university-wide committee.

The Future of the "Green Sheets"

I strongly encourage schools and departments to craft annual evaluation processes based on the one suggested above and to focus faculty evaluations on the three categories of teaching, scholarship, and service. Those schools and departments that do so are no longer required to use the “Green Sheets.”

Evaluations and Raises

There is no denying that the results of one’s annual faculty evaluations play a part in determining the raise recommendation. That is what a merit-based system intends. However, there are other factors that also influence that raise; and in some situations these other factors can be more influential than the merit evaluation. These factors include first of all the amount of money that is made available in any given year for salary increases. A second additional factor is the principle that persons who are performing at a satisfactory level should, all things being equal, receive a raise that keeps pace with changes in the cost of living. A third element beyond one’s individual merit is the academic marketplace. Market considerations can dramatically influence salary, since the University can ill afford to have the quality of essential degree programs devastated by the loss of our best faculty to more competitive offers from other institutions. Fourth, in the case of groups of persons more so than in the case of individuals, considerations of internal equity can influence salaries. And, fifth, promotions in rank or the achievement of tenure are often occasions for rewarding person with salary increases.

Because so many things in addition to one’s individual merit may affect one’s raise in any given year, it is essential that faculty evaluations be seen as only one among a number of components that bear on recommendations for merit salary increases. For this reason, the evaluation process should be completed at a time and in a manner that sufficiently distinguishes it from the raise recommendation process so that everyone can be assured that the evaluations have integrity in their own right. These annual evaluations play a role in tenure and promotion considerations that come later in one’s career. They must stand, therefore, as the enduring records of the considered judgments of one’s Chair or Dean through the years of one’s career.