PURPOSE

The following standards are meant to assist faculty members in preparing their annual self-evaluation and report to the Dean and to assist the Dean of the Law School in evaluating the performance of faculty members for the purposes of awarding merit increases in salary. The standards are not meant to replace or alter standards specifically directed at tenure and promotion, nor are they meant to change the Faculty Handbook in any way. If these standards are inconsistent with the individual rights of any member of the faculty, the Faculty Handbook controls.

Additionally, these standards are meant to be consistent with Point 4 of the Action Plan for Annual Objective 5 of the University Strategic Faculty Salary System, which was adopted unanimously by the University Planning Team on May 19, 1999, which provides:

The university will establish a faculty salary raise account that will be funded each year for a period of five years with funds equal to the percentage of the salaries of all full-time faculty equivalent to 2 percentage points over the rise in the Consumer Price Index, assuming university revenues are sufficient to permit such funding. Salary raises for the university full-time faculty as a whole will be made from this account at least at the level of the rise in the Consumer Price Index. All monies remaining in this account will roll over to the following year to be added to the funding of the account in that year with the express purpose of developing resources for recognizing and rewarding merit.

Ordinarily, satisfaction of the standards set forth herein should result in a faculty member receiving a salary increase at least equal to the increase in the Consumer Price Index during the previous calendar year. Satisfaction of the standards set forth herein means that a faculty member is expected to achieve for the evaluation year a rating of “satisfactory” or better in each category. However, higher ratings in the prior two academic years can be considered in mitigation of an unsatisfactory rating assigned in that category for the evaluation year. Faculty performance at a level above these standards or below these standards may result in an appropriate modification upward or downward of the salary increase.

EVALUATION

The Faculty Handbook identifies three areas in which faculty members are to perform: teaching, scholarship, and service. The Handbook mandates a fair evaluation of a faculty member’s performance balanced among these areas. For example, in the section directed at advancement to the rank of professor, the Handbook provides:
The application of these norms to an individual is a matter of collective judgment of his or her peers. No one person need excel equally in each norm; rather the relative weights accorded to the norms may vary depending upon the qualities of the person, the nature of the field, the needs of the department and College, and the goals of the University.

Norms can only serve as guidelines for what will always remain fallible human judgment. It is expected that those responsible for making such judgments will exercise prudence in evaluating the suitability of the faculty member as a professional colleague, the promise of making a long-term contribution to the academic field and his or her ability to move the University toward its goals and educational ideals.

Faculty Handbook, at 4-5. Further, in the evaluation process, consideration of an activity in one area, such as service, shall not limit the consideration of the same activity in other areas, such as teaching and scholarship.

In performing an annual evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service, the Dean shall consider the academic year for which the evaluation is being performed, as well as the faculty member’s performance in the prior two academic years, so as to get a complete picture of the faculty member’s recent activities.

TEACHING

Professors in the Law School shall strive to be excellent teachers. A professor’s overall goals in teaching should include significantly enhancing a student’s understanding of the law, the legal process, legal analysis, and the lawyer’s professional role.

The Loyola Faculty Handbook requires the following of professors in the area of teaching:

high standing among colleagues and students in classroom performance, as evidenced by (but not limited to) student and peer evaluations based on personal observations and not hearsay; clear evidence of excellence in instruction, which implies, first of all, the exercise of sound scholarly judgment regarding what is and what is not academically appropriate for inclusion in a particular field of study. This may imply the continuing use of current textbooks or it may imply the use of older, more classical works when their excellence has not been surpassed. In either case, it is sound scholarly judgment that is called for. Evidence of excellence in instruction may also include the creation of new courses, original either in subject matter or in the treatment of old subject matter. It may involve the adoption of new methods of teaching, the creation of new and original teaching devices and the utilization of computers in instruction, or it may involve a reasoned preference for and adoption of older, more traditional methods
of pedagogy. In either case, again, it is the subject matter and the demands of sound scholarly judgment that should dictate what is called for.

Faculty Handbook, at 4-3. In addition to the above, an evaluation of excellence in teaching shall include consideration of the professor’s own statement of pedagogical goals and methodologies.

Further, the Handbook requires that each faculty member observe regulations concerning such matters as “the cancellation of scheduled classes, . . . grades, current syllabi, teaching assignments, [and] contact hours. . . .” Faculty Handbook, at 7-2.

In determining whether a faculty member should receive a rating of “outstanding” in teaching, the following factors may be considered together with the factors considered for a “satisfactory” rating: a) whether the faculty member has prepared and used innovative instructional materials, has created significant course materials, or has used innovative teaching techniques; (b) whether the faculty member has provided significant academic counseling or advising to students; c) whether the faculty member has created a new course, original either in subject matter or in the treatment of old subject matter; d) whether the faculty member has received special recognition of creativity or excellence in teaching by an external group of legal professionals; and (e) whether the faculty member has received student evaluations on instructor’s overall effectiveness that place the faculty member in the top 50% of student-evaluated faculty members or evaluations of 4.0 or higher on a 5.0 scale on instructor’s overall effectiveness.*

In determining whether a faculty member should receive a “satisfactory” rating in teaching, the following factors should be considered: a) whether the faculty member has shown sound scholarly judgment in the selection of course materials, evaluation methodologies, and teaching methods, including the use of technology, when appropriate; b) whether the faculty member has kept current in his/her areas of teaching; c) whether the faculty member is teaching a course for the first time; d) whether the faculty member has i) received student evaluations on instructor’s overall effectiveness that place the faculty member in the top 75% of student-evaluated faculty members; or ii) received evaluations of satisfactory or higher on instructor’s overall effectiveness; or iii) received written evaluations indicating a teaching performance of acceptable or better from a three-person committee made up of law faculty members, two members to be appointed by the Dean of the Law School and one member to be selected by the faculty member; e) whether the faculty member has regularly met scheduled classes and has consistently scheduled make-up classes to replace canceled classes; f) whether the faculty member has submitted grades to the Dean’s office by the grading deadline; and g) whether the faculty member has been available to students for discussion outside of class.

A faculty member ordinarily should receive an “unsatisfactory” rating in teaching if

---

*“Instructor’s overall effectiveness” shall be based on the higher of the following: the answer to question 13 on the evaluation form, which expressly asks students to evaluate overall effectiveness, and the average of the responses to all 14 questions on the evaluation form.
he/she has failed to meet the standards necessary for a “satisfactory” rating. Should a faculty member receive student evaluations on instructor’s overall effectiveness that place the faculty member in the bottom 25% of student-evaluated faculty members and receive student evaluations below satisfactory on instructor’s overall effectiveness, the Dean of the Law School shall appoint a three-person committee made up of law faculty members, two members to be appointed by the Dean of the Law School and one member to be selected by the faculty member, to evaluate the faculty member’s teaching before rendering a final evaluation of the professor’s teaching. The committee shall evaluate on an unannounced basis a minimum of four classes in each course by the faculty member. The evaluation shall take place during the first half of the semester. The committee’s report shall be reviewed and discussed by the committee members and the Dean with the faculty member to assist the faculty member in improving his or her teaching. All reports issued during this process will remain confidential and will not be distributed to anyone other than the committee members, the faculty member, the Dean, and, in appropriate cases, the Rank and Tenure Committee.

SCHOLARSHIP

Professors in the Law School shall strive to make scholarship a regular part of their professional lives. Through their scholarship, professors demonstrate their commitment to the thoughtful and critical study of the law. Further, through scholarship they serve the broader legal community and provide evidence of their personal professional growth.

The Loyola Faculty Handbook requires of professors the following in the area of scholarship:

- Each faculty member shall engage in research and develop personal scholarship. These activities should, however, reinforce and vitalize teaching; they should not supercede or exclude it.

- Each faculty member shall maintain an active scholarly interest in his or her professional field in order to stimulate and challenge students in the classroom. This scholarly interest may be evidenced by such activities as attendance at professional conferences, reviews of professional literature and other professionally related activities.

Faculty Handbook, at 7-2.

The Handbook distinguishes between formal research and scholarship and other research and scholarship that directly supports teaching.

A certain level of scholarship is required of all faculty members; however, a distinction must be made between research in direct support of classroom teaching and original, exploratory work in some special fields of interest. It is expected that some but not all faculty members will engage in formal research
and scholarship. Research efforts for general course preparation do not warrant workload reduction; however, it is the University policy to adjust workloads to permit faculty members to pursue formal research.

Faculty Handbook, at 7-4 (emphasis added).

In the Law School, formal research and scholarship includes, but is not limited to, articles published in learned journals, published books or book chapters, and published papers read to learned and professional societies. Publication shall include print and electronic formats. A faculty member ordinarily should receive an “outstanding” rating on scholarship if he/she has provided evidence of formal research and scholarship.

In some cases, depending on the length and/or quality of the work, the following may be considered formal research and scholarship deserving of an “outstanding” rating: published editorial work; articles published in bar journals or professional newsletters; published commentary on legislation and judicial decisions; published essays and book reviews; and production in innovative media, including video and computer materials adopted for use by other law schools, professional organizations, or libraries. In extraordinary circumstances, a faculty member may receive an “outstanding” rating for significant research and scholarship that does not qualify as “formal research and scholarship.”

Other work to be considered when evaluating scholarship by members of the Law Faculty includes, but is not limited to: drafts of work in progress; appellate and trial briefs; unpublished materials compiled for classroom teaching; significant drafting of legislation or law reform work; continuing legal education presentations with accompanying outlines or materials; and unpublished papers read to or speeches presented to learned and professional societies.

A faculty member should ordinarily receive a “satisfactory” rating on scholarship if he/she has provided evidence of significant active research and scholarship that does not warrant an “outstanding” rating. The significance should be evaluated in terms of the quantity and quality of the work.

A faculty member should ordinarily receive an “unsatisfactory” rating on scholarship if he/she has not provided evidence of “satisfactory” research and scholarship.

When evaluating faculty scholarship, the professor’s total portfolio of work should be considered – both formal research and scholarship as well as other research and scholarship conducted over the past three years, including the evaluation year.

SERVICE

Professors in the Law School shall strive to serve the legal profession, the community, the University, and/or the Law School.
The Loyola Faculty Handbook requires of professors the following in the area of service:

Each faculty member shall be expected to contribute to the general welfare of the community as well as the University through such activities as working on committees, serving as advisor for student organizations, active involvement in civic and cultural life, cooperation in student recruitment, and active participation in professional societies.

Each faculty member shall be responsible for regular academic advising and guidance of students, shall maintain scheduled office hours, and shall be familiar with academic regulations and the curriculum of his or her College.

Faculty Handbook, at 7-2 to 7-3.

In determining whether a faculty member should receive a rating of “outstanding” in service, the following service activities should be considered together with the factors considered for a “satisfactory” rating: a) pro bono legal representation and legal assistance; b) service as an advisor for student organizations or groups; c) participation in recruiting activities; d) organization of and presentations at professional conferences or seminars; e) service with professional organizations, including, but not limited to, bar association activities; f) membership in a professional capacity on public, service, or corporate boards; g) teaching continuing legal education courses; h) media appearances to discuss the law; and i) participation in law reform efforts.

To receive a “satisfactory” rating in service, it is expected that a faculty member has regularly attended faculty meetings, has regularly attended formal academic ceremonies, has actively participated on University and Law School committees, and has regularly been available as an academic advisor to students.

A faculty member ordinarily should receive an “unsatisfactory” rating on service if he/she has failed to meet the standards necessary for a “satisfactory” rating.