

**Recommended by University Senate to Interim Provost for Adoption and Implementation
University Wide 2/22/24: Loyola Rank and Tenure Process at Colleges with fewer than 3
Tenured Faculty**

Loyola Rank and Tenure processes are specified in the Faculty Handbook, Chapters 4 and 5, and the provisions of those Chapters are binding on all colleges in the University. Other Handbook chapters specify faculty grievance processes, faculty rights and responsibilities, contractual rights and termination of tenured faculty appointments. In recent years, Loyola has lost tenured faculty in many disciplines, and hired new tenure track faculty in colleges that have fewer than 3 tenured faculty. This policy is proposed to be consistent with Faculty Handbook provisions concerning rank and tenure and to ensure an equitable and fair process for all tenure track faculty at Loyola.

**POLICY TO BE FOLLOWED AT LOYOLA IF FEWER THAN 3 TENURED FACULTY AVAILABLE TO
SERVE ON COLLEGE, UNIT, OR DEPARTMENTAL RANK AND TENURE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Generally, best practices for rank and tenure processes suggest that a minimum of 3 faculty (tenured and at rank) should be involved in the rank and tenure review committee. To that end, Loyola colleges, units or departments with fewer than 3 tenured faculty should ask the respective college/unit/department head to identify the discipline(s) most similar to the tenure track candidate's and identify several tenured Loyola faculty in that discipline to serve on the review committee. In addition, they should ask the tenure track candidate to identify the discipline(s) most similar to their own and identify several tenured faculty in that discipline(s) to serve on their review committee. Both the respective head and the tenure track faculty member should agree or reach consensus on the composition of the review committee. Faculty agreeing to serve on such a review committee must familiarize themselves with the norms for the tenure track candidate's discipline and college/unit/department.

For a college that has no tenured faculty or college rank and tenure committee, the head and tenure track faculty member should identify the Loyola college most analogous to the discipline of the tenure track faculty, and that college rank and tenure committee should follow their process, in conjunction with the process specified above.

**GENERAL PRINCIPLES THAT APPLY TO LOYOLA RANK AND TENURE PROCESSES - CLARITY,
TRANSPARENCY & CONSISTENCY**

Norms for rank and tenure should be developed and adopted by tenured and tenure track faculty and they must be in writing and approved by the Provost.

Norms for faculty evaluation should be developed and adopted by all full-time faculty.

Norms and guidelines should be fair, inclusive, equitable, clearly written, organized effectively, and consistent with Faculty Handbook provisions.

Norms should clearly describe criteria and methods for evaluating scope, significance, and impact of faculty activities.

Norms should provide a clear methodology to account for differences in workload allocations including course loads, releases, administrative assignments, overloads, and other exceptional circumstances.

Norms should provide examples that illustrate achievements in each area of review.

Norms should detail requirements for meeting expectations in each of the areas of review (for example, exceeds, does not meet, unsatisfactory).

Norms/guidelines should clarify how evaluations relate to the rank and tenure process.

Norms/guidelines for external reviewers/reviews of research/scholarship/publication (or discipline equivalent) including the process for selecting reviewers and rank/education level of reviewer should be clear.

Norms/guidelines for peer review of teaching should include a statement of how they will be used to evaluate faculty, the purpose of the evaluation, who is eligible to evaluate faculty at various ranks, and how peer observers are selected.

Norms/guidelines should specify how student evaluations will be used to evaluate faculty. Student evaluations may never be the sole or primary determinant of faculty teaching performance.

Guidelines should clearly specify the process for developing action plans for faculty who earn ratings of "does not meet expectations" or "unsatisfactory."

Norms should make clear what happens if a candidate submits materials after the tenure application has been submitted. Generally, Chapters 4 and 5 of the Handbook specify that a candidate for promotion or tenure may submit materials "on or before November 1" of the academic year in which they are up for promotion or tenure. Faculty Handbook at 4-7, 5-2.

Norms should make clear when an evaluator serves at more than one level of review, including deans, associate and assistant deans. Deans, associate, and assistant deans should not serve on College Rank and Tenure Committees. Plainly, only tenured faculty may serve on College Rank and Tenure Committees, and only tenured faculty in rank may vote on a promotion to that rank.

Norms should make clear that evaluations at any stage of the tenure track and promotion process are communicated to the candidate in writing by the person or committee making the evaluation. To the extent required, the anonymity of the reviewer (particularly with external peer reviews) may be preserved.

Additional Resources:

<https://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Good%20Practice%20in%20Tenure%20Evaluation.pdf>

[https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/tenure-promotion-and-the-publicly-engaged-academic-historian-\(2017\)](https://www.historians.org/about-aha-and-membership/aha-history-and-archives/historical-archives/tenure-promotion-and-the-publicly-engaged-academic-historian-(2017))

https://www.insidehighered.com/news/faculty-issues/diversity-equity/2023/09/21/psychology-faculty-color-barriers-tenure-promotion?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=881441894b-DiversityMatters_COPY_02&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-881441894b-236146033&mc_cid=881441894b&mc_eid=72c7e55b21#