

Guidelines for Promotion of Full-Time Clinical Faculty
(Supplement to the College Tenure and Promotion Policy)
College of Education

Approved by FPC on March 14, 2011

Overview

Full-time clinical professors in the College of Education at the University of Florida share all of the rights and responsibilities of tenure track faculty members, but are not eligible for tenure. Clinical professors will perform teaching, scholarship, and service functions associated largely, but not exclusively, with schools, grants, or programs. Faculty in this line should have assignments in at least two of the three areas to varying extents depending on the roles to which they are assigned. (Rule #6C1-7.003; <http://regulations.ufl.edu/chapter7/7003-June2009.pdf>). Clinical faculty are expected to engage in scholarship which may include the scholarship of teaching and service. This document is intended to supplement College Tenure and Promotion policies and procedures (http://education.ufl.edu/administration/files/2011/01/UF-Rule-7_019.pdf) to provide clarification regarding criteria and procedures for promotion of full-time clinical faculty.

Guidelines for tenure and promotion at the University of Florida state that criteria for promotion “shall be relevant to the performance of the work that the faculty member has been employed to do and his/her performance of the duties and responsibilities expected of a member of the university community”. Clinical faculty in the College of Education are typically assigned duties in at least two of three areas: teaching, scholarship, and professional service (a portion of which may include program administration). Clinical faculty will be evaluated for promotion based on their specific assignments.

The performance of promotion candidates requires *distinction* in the area or areas of primary assignment and at least satisfactory performance in any other assigned areas. The school director will determine ‘primary assignment’ in consultation with the promotion candidate. *Distinction* is characterized by performance that is well above the expected, typical performance of a candidate of similar rank and assignment in the candidate’s field. Furthermore, activities that contribute to the mission of the College and the advancement of the candidate’s discipline are important considerations. Promotion candidates will show evidence of scholarship which may include the scholarship of teaching or service.

Different criteria are applied depending on the level of the promotion involved. An individual applying for promotion from assistant to associate clinical professor is expected to have demonstrated distinction in the primary assigned duties, and at least emerging leadership with respect to assigned duties. A candidate applying for promotion from associate to full clinical professor is expected to demonstrate a continuing level of productivity that merits distinction in the primary assignment, as well as a high level of leadership in the primary area(s) of assigned duties (i.e., teaching, research and scholarship, and/or professional service [including administration]).

Promotion procedures for full-time clinical faculty parallel those for tenure-track faculty. Candidates complete the university's standard promotion packets and follow the university's promotion guidelines. Candidates determine the timing of promotion applications in collaboration with their school director or the Dean of the College. Accomplishments required for promotion are typically achieved across six or more years of continuous, in-rank, full-time service, similar to promotion of tenure-track faculty.

Criteria for Promotion for Clinical Faculty

I. Overall Criteria

Promotion of clinical faculty is based on demonstration of distinction in the area of primary assignment and acceptable performance in all other assigned areas. *Distinction* is characterized by performance that is well above the expected, typical performance of a candidate of similar rank and assignment in the candidate's field. Clinical faculty are expected to engage in scholarship which may include the scholarship of teaching and service. Quality of performance will be judged more important than quantity in evaluating contributions.

A. A candidate applying for **promotion from Assistant to Associate Clinical Professor** is expected to have demonstrated distinction in the primary assigned area, and at least emerging leadership with respect to assigned duties.

B. A candidate applying for **promotion from Associate Clinical Professor to Clinical Professor** is expected to demonstrate a continuing level of productivity that merits distinction in the primary assignment, as well as a high level of leadership in the other area(s) of assigned duties.

II. Major Sources of Evidence

Teaching

Depending on the nature of the candidate's teaching assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate distinction in teaching may include, but are not limited to:

- Evidence of self-reflection, study, and development/improvement of teaching performance.
- Publications related to teaching and professional practice.
- Student, peer and chair evaluations of teaching and advising indicating exemplary performance.
- Nomination or receipt of awards for teaching and/or advising.
- Evidence of exemplary development of new courses, instructional materials, technological innovations, and syllabi.

- Evidence of providing exemplary professional development for practicing professionals with appropriate follow-up support beyond delivery of professional development.
- Exemplary contributions or leadership on committees related to teaching.
- Evidence of exemplary collaboration with UF faculty to translate traditional university-based coursework to apply to job-embedded programs.
- Evidence of professional mentoring of students, novice or developing teachers, graduate students, and/or colleagues.
- Evidence of leadership roles related to teaching in one's discipline.

Scholarship

Depending on the nature of the candidate's research assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate *distinction* in scholarship may include, but are not limited to:

- Supervisor evaluations or other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in research/scholarship.
- Leadership roles in appropriate research-oriented professional associations.
- Evidence of development of research line.
- Established regional/national/internationally reputation based on research and/or expertise.
- Awards for scholarly activity.
- Publications that are appropriate to the candidate's field, such as, articles in peer reviewed periodicals, books, monographs, chapters, bibliographies, catalogs, abstracts, reviews, media releases, creative works, activities, patents, or copyrights, and other miscellaneous publications (e.g., non-refereed publications).
- Lectures, speeches, workshops, or papers presented at state, regional, national, or international meetings.
- Documented leadership roles (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-Investigator, Director, Coordinator, Co-Author, Project Manager) on grant proposals submitted and grant proposals funded.

Service

Depending on the nature of the candidate's service assignment, possible sources of evidence to demonstrate *distinction* in service may include but are not limited to:

- Program evaluation reports, technical reports, monographs, accreditation reports.
- Presentations/publications about service activities or programs.
- Supervisor or peer evaluations or other evaluative evidence indicating exemplary performance in service.
- Evidence of efforts for continued professional development and improvement in service/administrative performance.
- Awards for service.
- Evidence of exemplary service or consultation to public schools, department, college or university committees; community-based organizations, and the profession.

- Leadership roles in shaping educational policy at the local, state, and/or national level.
- Leadership roles in professional organizations as evidenced by election or appointment to offices or committees.
- Demonstrated service in an editorial capacity for the profession (e.g., journals, textbooks).

Procedures for Promotion of Clinical Faculty

Promotion procedures for full-time clinical faculty parallel those of tenure-track faculty. Candidates determine the timing of promotion applications in collaboration with their school director or the Dean of the College. Accomplishments required for promotion are typically achieved across six or more years of continuous, in-rank, full-time service, similar to promotion of tenure-track faculty.

1. Similar procedures apply to clinical faculty seeking promotion as for any tenure track faculty seeking promotion to the next rank. University procedures as specified in university guidelines, including packet preparation and deadlines, are followed with exceptions noted in this document.
2. Clinical faculty seeking promotion will present a case using the University of Florida tenure and promotion packet. While all sections of the packet must be completed, the assigned activities of the faculty member dictate the criteria applied and which portions of a packet receive greatest attention.
3. Percent assignments shown in the packet should accurately reflect the candidate's actual assignments and activities over the period of employment. For example, a candidate may be assigned to teach, advise, develop courses, administer the clinical portion of a program, and engage in faculty governance activities. The assignment, therefore, should not be shown as 100% instructional if, in fact, service (governance, administrative, or other) was assigned. If the assignment has been 100% instructional, then one should indicate "Not Applicable" (not 0%) on the summary table in the areas of research and service.
4. Letters of evaluation by faculty of superior rank in the candidate's field are required for the promotion of clinical faculty:
 - a. The College expects 5 (five) letters of evaluation. For promotion from Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor, the letters may come from internal and/or external (i.e., outside the College) sources. For promotion to Clinical Professor, external letters must be included. The candidate may suggest writers of evaluation letters, but the final selection is determined by the school director or Dean.
 - b. The school director or Dean will follow the same guidelines for soliciting evaluation letters and preparing bio sketches of the reviewers as is done for tenure track faculty.

- c. Evaluators should be informed about the candidate's primary assignment duties and the College's criteria for clinical faculty.
 - d. Evaluation letters should provide an assessment of the candidate's accomplishments in the primary area) of assigned responsibility (i.e., teaching or research).
 - e. All letters received will be used in the packet.
5. Peer evaluation(s) of teaching, including visitations to classes and review of syllabi, examinations and other instructional materials are required for candidates with a teaching assignment. Frequency of peer evaluation(s) should be determined by chair based on teaching assignment of faculty member.
6. College and school policies regarding mentoring programs shall also apply to clinical faculty.
7. Annual evaluation of clinical faculty should occur by the school director. Additionally, a mid-cycle review (or pre-promotion review) should occur toward the end of the third or fourth year using the same process as pre-tenure reviews to provide the clinical faculty member with feedback about progress toward promotion.
8. Faculty voting on promotion of clinical faculty:
- a. Faculty voting on promotion of Clinical Assistant Professor to Clinical Associate Professor will be by faculty of superior rank in the unit, i.e., Senior and Master lecturers, Associate and Full Scholars, and Associate and Full Professors.
 - b. Faculty voting on promotion of Clinical Associate Professor to Clinical Professor will be by faculty of superior rank in the unit, i.e., Master lecturers, Full Scholars, and Full Professors.
 - c. Senior faculty members are defined as any faculty of a higher rank than the candidate.
9. Clinical faculty promotion cases may be discussed at the same faculty meeting in which other tenure and promotion cases in the school unit are discussed and voting by secret ballot may proceed in the same way.
10. Clinical faculty promotion cases shall be forwarded to the COE Promotion and Tenure committee for review.

Effective: March 14, 2011