



**Loyola University Chicago
Faculty Development Leave Program**

1. Purpose of award

- Research or creative activity - This category includes basic research projects resulting in books or articles, creative artistic work (exhibits, works of art, performances, music, or poetry compositions, or the like), or any product which materially and significantly enhances one's field of professional expertise. It can include the generation of research results and artistic endeavor and/or the analysis and presentation of such results or endeavors.
- Faculty professional development - This category includes leaves that would allow faculty to develop additional expertise related to future career plans at Loyola and/or improving particular programs currently offered at or planned for Loyola University Chicago.

2. Eligibility and requirements for the award

- To be eligible for a paid Faculty Development Leave, an individual must have completed a minimum of three full years of service (six semesters) as a tenure-track or tenured faculty member at Loyola between the end of any previous paid (research or administrative) or subvented leave and the anticipated beginning date of the new leave. Department chairs, associate deans, deans, and vice provosts are not eligible. Endowed chairs/professors are not eligible.
- The University Faculty Development Review Committee ("FDRC") will not review proposals requesting paid or subvented leaves for: (a) any activity primarily related to positions other than the individual's current or future professional position at Loyola; (b) performing full-time duties at another institution similar to those performed at Loyola; or (c) completing a doctorate or other terminal degree; (d) primarily visiting various locations of general or professional interest.
- A recipient of a Faculty Development Leave following a Mid-Probationary one-semester paid research leave must have served an additional four years at Loyola (one semester of which may be the Mid-Probationary leave) after that Mid-Probationary Review and before the anticipated beginning of a Faculty Development Leave.
- Faculty Development Leaves shall be granted only in connection with activities that promise to enhance the recipient's professional competence and contributions in accordance with their present or future position at Loyola University Chicago.
- During a leave, faculty will be required to complete all HR compliance training.
- A faculty member who receives a paid leave of absence from Loyola is expected to complete two semesters of service to Loyola following completion of the leave.
- Within 90 days of the completion of a Faculty Development Leave, a report must be filed with the individual's department, college or school, and the Office of Faculty Affairs (March 31 for fall semester leaves and July 30 for the spring semester or academic year leaves). This report should describe the professional activities accomplished during the leave and outline future plans (publications, creative activities, grant applications, curricular innovations, etc.) deriving from leave activities. Please see below for more details.
- Unsuccessful applications will not be automatically rolled over into subsequent competitions. Applications must be re-filed by those who wish to be considered in subsequent years.
- An applicant may request a meeting with the chair of the FDRC (or the chair's delegate or delegates) to receive feedback on how to improve their application for subsequent competitions. This is not an appeals procedure but a means to help faculty improve their submissions in subsequent years.



3. Submission details and deadlines

Please consult your school or college to confirm deadlines for any required preliminary steps. Please consult the application for the required materials. Candidates should upload their materials to Interfolio RPT.

4. School/college-level review

An evaluation of the proposal from the department chair/program director (if applicable), dean of the school/college, and from a college/school-level committee is required. These evaluations should comment on the technical merit of the proposal as well as the importance of the leave for the faculty member's professional development. As applicable, these recommendations should also comment on the importance of this proposed work for the academic program and the University. These recommendations should *each include a score of 1 to 5 based on the language of the rubric* (see end of this file and application). Units may choose to rank applications, but the score must still be included. Letters should be submitted as PDF files on Interfolio RPT. Each letter should contain information about the individual applicant only and should not refer to others scores or applications.

A timeline for these levels of review should be established by the deans' offices, working backward from the deadline for University-level review by the FDRC.

5. University review procedures

Proposals will be reviewed and recommended for funding or non-funding by the FDRC. The reviewers will assess the applications on each of the following categories: (see attached rubric)

- a. This proposal effectively explains the significance of the proposed work; shows promise of attaining goals of value to the relevant discipline; and shows how the work will significantly advance the field;
- b. This proposal demonstrates that the applicant has a grasp of the field and of the associated literature;
- c. This proposal outlines methods or approaches to the proposed work in a way that convinces the reviewer that the objectives of the project will be achieved;
- d. This proposal is written clearly and in a manner that can be evaluated by faculty peers for its scholarship quality;
- e. This proposal makes clear that the applicant has the expertise to carry out the project and that the applicant's research program will be advanced by this award;
- f. This proposal makes clear the extent to which a leave of absence is necessary and/or important to the completion of the project;
- g. This proposal outlines the plan for disseminating the results of this project.

Having considered all of these criteria, the FDRC members will rate the proposal on a five-point scale where five indicates "exceptionally ready for funding," three indicates "ready for funding," and scores below three indicate that the proposal is judged not ready for University funding.

6. Clearances

Applicants are reminded that all projects involving human subjects, biohazards, radiation, or the use of live vertebrate animals require approval by the appropriate oversight committee before they can begin. Please contact The Office of Research Services for further assistance with this process.



7. Final report

Within 90 days of the completion of a leave, a report must be filed with the individual's department, college/school, and the Office of Faculty Affairs (March 31 for fall semester leaves and July 30 for the spring semester or academic year leaves). Unless otherwise instructed by the academic unit, this report should be one-page long, single spaced, and describe the professional activities accomplished during the leave and outline future plans (publications, creative activities, grant applications, curricular innovations, etc.) deriving from leave activities.

8. External applications

When appropriate, applicants are encouraged to submit information about or summaries of identical or complementary proposals to external funding agencies.

Faculty Development Leave Rubric

Rating Categories	Unacceptable for Funding 1	Marginal 2	Adequate 3	Superior 4	Ready for Funding: Exceptional 5
Comprehensiveness of Proposal	Cursory description of project	Brief description of project	Adequate description of project	Detailed description of project	Completely and cogently detailed description of project
Clarity of Proposal	Proposal language is overly discipline-oriented and so unclear to reviewers.	Proposal language is clearer, details are more comprehensible to reviewers.	Proposal language enables reviewers to comprehend the proposal adequately.	Proposal language is very clear and enables reviewers readily to comprehend the proposal.	Proposal is pellucid to reviewers, complementing comprehensiveness, clarity, etc.
Achievable Goals	Goals as specified are unrealistic and unattainable.	Specified goals seem attainable.	Attainment of specified goals is likely.	Specified goals will be attained.	Timetable specifies systematic progression toward clearly attainable goals.
Method for Completing the Project Proposed	No statement provided	Minimal statement	Adequate statement	Method is described in some detail	Steps for completing project are stated in detail.
Description of Expertise of the Researcher	Weak or no description provided	Inadequate description	Adequate description	Expertise is described in some detail	Thorough description of expertise
Project's Impact	Weak or no statement provided	Inadequate statement	Adequate statement	Impact is described in some detail	Thorough description of impact
Dissemination Plan	None stated	Minimal description of dissemination plan	Adequate description of dissemination plan	Dissemination plan is described in some detail	Thorough description of dissemination plan.
References	None included	Some included/dated	Adequate	Detailed listing	Thorough listing of well-qualified references