A. GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Lecturer Appointments. Lecturers are non-tenure track, full-time or part-time faculty appointments that support the teaching mission of the School. Lecturers are responsible primarily for teaching and the scholarship of teaching. They are also expected to provide service that supports the academic mission of the School. They entail a significant and potentially long-term commitment of School resources based on expertise and experience that augments the tenure-track professoriate. Lecturer appointments may be appropriate for individuals whose career paths result in specialized pedagogy relevant to the instructional needs of the School.

The ranks of lecturer include Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. At the entry level, Lecturers will have completed an appropriate advanced degree or have credentials appropriate to the course(s) for which they are responsible. Senior lecturers will meet the entry level requirements and will have demonstrated excellent teaching and at least satisfactory performance in service related to teaching.

Clinical Appointments. Clinical ranks are non-tenure track, full-time or part-time faculty appointments that support the teaching and service missions of the School. Clinical appointees teach and practice full-time in the clinical professional setting. Clinical appointments are appropriate for those with significant professional experience in areas related to the mission of the School. Clinical appointees contribute to the teaching mission of the School by contributing their professional experience and expertise to the professional preparation and development of the School’s students. Clinical appointees contribute to the service mission of the school through continuing service contributions in their areas of professional expertise and by establishing and maintaining linkages between the School, its students, and the professional communities associated with their respective fields. They may contribute to the research efforts of the School through their professional work, but they are not expected to do individual research. Continued appointment and advancement in rank must be based on performance in teaching and service. Clinical faculty entail a significant and potentially long-term commitment of School resources based on specialized expertise and experience not normally found in the tenure-track professoriate. The expectation is that this experience will be introduced into the classroom setting, will benefit students through advising, and will benefit the School through the individual’s service activities, both university and public.

The ranks of clinical appointments include Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Clinical Professor.

B. RECRUITMENT/HIRING
Any tenure-track SPEA faculty member may recommend a candidate for positions in the Lecturer and Clinical tracks. As a general principle, the School is best served when hiring needs are identified through consultation with faculty and program officers, and search and hiring practices proceed in a fashion similar to the recruitment and hiring of tenure-track faculty. It is recommended that these positions should be negotiated, defined, advertised, screened and interviewed just like the hiring of tenure-track faculty. At the request of one or more faculty members, the campus Associate Dean will convene a faculty meeting to discuss proposed appointments and will provide a summary of the faculty comments to the School’s Campus Personnel Committee or Search and Screen Committee and the Dean, who is the final appointing authority.

C. RESPONSIBILITIES OF LECTURER AND CLINICAL FACULTY

Lecturer Faculty

Teaching Loads: The maximum teaching load for Lecturer varies by campus. On the Bloomington campus the maximum course load shall be six three-credit courses (or the equivalent) per academic year while the maximum course load on the Indianapolis campus shall be eight three-credit courses (or the equivalent) per academic year, as established as the policies on the two campuses.

1. The primary responsibility of the Lecturer is teaching, and typically includes the following related responsibilities:
   - Course development and administration
   - Student advising, recruitment and internship placement
   - School Committee work and other service related to teaching

The Senior Lecturer meets the responsibilities of the Lecturer and in addition is expected to provide leadership in teaching and to contribute to service related to teaching such as course and curriculum development. Senior Lecturers may oversee and provide mentoring for full and part-time non-tenure track faculty and associate instructors and may also contribute to campus service or other professional activities.

2. The specific annual balance of duties should be determined in an annual meeting with the chair or dean.

Clinical Faculty

Teaching Loads: The maximum teaching load for Clinical faculty also varies by campus. The maximum for Clinical faculty shall be the same as for Lecturers, calculated according to established methods for determining credit-hour equivalent Clinical faculty effort. Clinical faculty are expected to contribute to teaching through instruction in clinical courses as well as in traditional (non-clinical) courses. Clinical faculty serving in administrative positions may teach less than those in non-administrative positions.
1. The primary responsibility of the Clinical Faculty is teaching and service, and typically includes the teaching responsibilities for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer and public service.

2. The specific annual balance of duties should be determined in an annual meeting with the associate dean or his or her designee.

3. Clinical faculty are expected to contribute to teaching through instruction in clinical/professional courses as well as traditional (non-clinical, non-professional) courses.

D. RIGHTS OF LECTURER AND CLINICAL FACULTY

The academic integrity of the school and its programs ultimately is the responsibility of tenured and tenure-probationary faculty. The rights of lecturers and clinical faculty and the regulations concerning their roles within each school shall be written and available to the school faculty. A copy of all rights and regulations shall be filed with the campus academic officer and with the campus faculty governance body.

Mentorship

New Lecturers and Clinical faculty should be oriented adequately to their responsibilities during their first year in the position. Non-tenure-track faculty will be assigned a mentor from senior members of the School at the time they are appointed. Mentors are responsible for assisting new non-tenure track faculty and preparing them for eventual promotion.

Voting

Indiana University has made a strong commitment to integrate non-tenure-track faculty as completely as possible into the university community. In the spirit of that commitment, lecturer faculty may vote in SPEA faculty meetings on all matters related to teaching and teaching-related service; clinical faculty may vote on all matters related to teaching, service, and research related to teaching and service. In matters of governance, non-tenure track faculty may vote on issues that touch on their responsibilities.

Participation in University and campus faculty governance is governed by the Constitution of the Faculty of Indiana University and the faculty constitutions on each campus. The role of lecturers and clinical faculty in governance within the unit shall be determined by vote of the tenured and tenure-probationary faculty of the unit, provided that where non-tenure track appointees have voting privileges, their voting participation must be structured in a way that reserves at least 60% of voting weight to tenure-track faculty.

Sabbatical-like leaves
Lecturers and clinical faculty are not eligible for University sabbatical leave, but SPEA entertains sabbatical-like leaves based on proposals from full-time non-tenure track faculty. Sabbatical-like leaves for lecturers and clinical faculty are intended to provide opportunities for professional learning and collaboration with colleagues. Sabbatical-like leaves must be justified in terms of the responsibilities of the non-tenure track faculty member applying for the leave. The leave must be reviewed and receive a favorable recommendation from the SPEA Sabbatical Leave Committee. It is expected that leaves will be granted only when the applicant can demonstrate significant benefits to the School. Non-tenure track faculty will be eligible for such leaves every seven years.

**Review of annual reviews and salary decisions**

Lecturers and clinical faculty are expected to follow and be protected by University policies, including those pertaining to faculty hiring and faculty annual reviews. The faculty salary policies of the University, campus, school, and department shall apply to non-tenure track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty have the right to petition the campus faculty board of review.

**Opportunities for contract/consulting work**

Lecturers and Clinical faculty, as with other academic appointments, may engage in professional activities, provided that these activities do not constitute a Conflict of Commitment and comply with all other applicable University policies. The total amount of time devoted to outside work shall not exceed an average of one day a week (20%) during the period on the payroll.

Lecturers and Clinical faculty may buy out of courses to do research or contract work pertaining to teaching, teaching-related service and public service (clinicals only). Grant requests must be approved by the campus associate dean.

**Academic administrative appointments**

Excepting senior lecturers, lecturers are (not) eligible for academic administrative appointments. Clinical faculty are not eligible for administrative appointments involving final responsibility for evaluating tenure-track faculty, including faculty chairships and deanships. Clinical faculty and senior lecturers may serve as program directors and fill other administrative positions. Lecturers and clinical faculty are not eligible for academic administrative appointments at or above the associate dean level.

**E. EVALUATION OF LECTURER AND CLINICAL FACULTY**

**Lecturer Faculty**
The Lecturer and Senior Lecturer are to be evaluated annually, chiefly on the basis of their contributions to the teaching mission. Appropriate evidence to demonstrate teaching and service achievements may include:

- Student and peer evaluation of classroom teaching
- Review of classroom materials
- Demonstrated student learning
- Teaching and mentoring awards
- Review of instructional innovation
- Presentations at conferences and workshops
- Publications dealing with teaching
- Participation in conferences and workshops relevant to teaching
- Mentoring of other non-tenure track faculty and associate instructors (Senior Lecturer)
- Involvement with entry-level students in courses to assist them in transitions to the university
- Recruitment, advising and mentoring of students
- Placement and supervision of internships
- Participation in grants that fund the scholarship of teaching
- Contributions to School committees (Lecturer), university committees (Senior Lecturer), and other assigned service in support of teaching

Lecturers and senior lecturers will be evaluated according to guidelines at the two campuses.

**Clinical Faculty**

Clinical appointees are to be evaluated annually, chiefly on the basis of their contributions to the School’s teaching and service missions. Appropriate evidence to demonstrate teaching and service achievements may include those listed for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer and additional professional-client service achievements that may include:

- Service on public and non-profit boards and committees
- Contributions to School committees
- Contributions to university committees
- Curricular administration and/or development
- Publications related to professional and public service
- Other activities in support of public service
- Participation in conferences and workshops related to professional and public service

**F. LEVELS OF NON-TENURE-TRACK APPOINTMENTS IN SPEA**
The proportion of full-time-equivalent Clinical and Lecturer faculty positions relative to full-time tenure-track faculty shall not exceed 33 percent on each campus.

G. CONTRACTS, DISMISSAL, AND PROMOTION FOR LECTURER AND CLINICAL APPOINTMENTS

Lecturer and clinical faculty appointments during the probationary period shall be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during the probationary period. Initial Lecturer and Clinical appointments should be at the level appropriate to the experience and accomplishments of the individual and approved by the faculty of the unit. Lecturers and Clinical faculty are not eligible for academic administrative appointments at or above the associate dean level.

Lecturer and clinical faculty shall be given long term contracts after a probationary period of not more than seven years. Lecturer and Clinical appointees in the sixth year of their probationary periods shall be considered for reappointment to long-term contracts. Such contract shall be not be less than five years or be some equivalent, such as a rolling three year contract. The steps for review of candidates for reappointment to long-term contracts and promotion shall follow those for review of tenure and promotion. Standards for reappointment to long-term contracts and promotion are described below.

Candidates in the sixth year of the probationary period who do not receive appointment to long-term contracts will not be eligible for reappointment. In the event of non-reappointment, faculty in their first year as Lecturer or Senior Lecturer must be given notice not later than February 1. During the second year of service, notice must be given not later than November 15. During the third and subsequent years, at least twelve months notice must be provided.

Clinical appointees are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as clinical faculty shall be given long-term contracts after a probationary period of not more than seven years. The exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the dean and the faculty governance body within each school using clinical appointments and be approved by the chancellor, but the mechanism should be a long-term contract of not less than five years or be some equivalent, such as a rolling three year contract. The criteria for granting long-term contracts after a probationary period shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that clinical faculty shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts or their equivalent.

Clinical faculty appointments during the probationary period shall be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment,
and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during the probationary period. After the probationary period, dismissal of a clinical faculty member holding a longer term contract which has not expired may occur because of closure or permanent downsizing of the program in which the faculty member teaches and serves; otherwise, dismissal of such clinical faculty shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, or financial exigency. Nonreappointment of clinical faculty to a new contract term may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the clinical program. Nonreappointment decisions regarding clinical faculty holding a long-term contract after the probationary period must be made with faculty consultation through processes established by the school's faculty governance institutions. The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance institutions includes cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of clinical faculty.

Lecturers are not eligible for tenure; however, in order to protect their academic freedom, individuals appointed as lecturers shall be given long-term contracts after a probationary period of not more than seven years. The exact mechanism for this shall be determined by the dean and the faculty governance body within each school using lecturer appointments and be approved by the chancellor, but the mechanism should be a long-term contract of not less than five years or be some equivalent, such as a rolling three year contract. The criteria for granting long-term contracts after a probationary period shall be analogous to the criteria for granting tenure, except that lecturers shall earn the right to a long-term contract on the basis of their excellence only in those responsibilities that may be assigned to them. Each school will establish procedures and specific criteria for review of individuals concerning the renewal of long-term contracts or their equivalent.

Lecturer appointments during the probationary period shall be subject to the same policies and procedures with respect to appointment, reappointment, non-reappointment, and dismissal as apply to tenure-probationary faculty during the probationary period. After the probationary period, dismissal of a lecturer holding a longer term contract which has not expired may occur because of closure or permanent downsizing of the program in which the faculty member teaches and serves; otherwise, dismissal of such lecturer shall occur only for reasons of professional incompetence, serious misconduct, or financial exigency. Non-reappointment of lecturers to a new contract term may occur for the foregoing reasons or may occur as well for reason of changing staffing needs of the academic unit's program. Non-reappointment decisions regarding lecturers holding a longer term contract after the probationary period must be made with faculty consultation through processes established by the school's faculty governance institutions. The jurisdiction of campus faculty grievance institutions includes cases of dismissal and non-reappointment of lecturers.

H. STANDARDS FOR PROMOTION AND LONG-TERM CONTRACTS

Reappointment of Lecturers to long-term contract and promotion to Senior Lecturer must be based on excellence in teaching and satisfactory service related to teaching, and shall
only be granted to colleagues who have demonstrated a commitment to continued professional growth and currency with pedagogical developments in their fields.

Reappointment of Clinical faculty to long-term contract and promotion must be based on at least satisfactory performance in both teaching and service AND excellent performance in teaching or service. While clinical faculty are encouraged to contribute to the conduct of research, research cannot be included as a basic category of evaluation for promotion or reappointment to long-term contract.

1. Standards for Teaching – Lecturers and Clinical Faculty

Teaching encompasses a wide range of activities related to the instructional mission of the University. There are at least three dimensions to teaching: instruction in the classroom, laboratory, and field setting; mentoring and advising; and contributions to pedagogy.

a. Evidence of Teaching Quality.

i. Instruction. Formal instruction takes place in a variety of settings, including classrooms, laboratories and in the field and may be in the context of a class, workshop, short-course or retreat. It also may involve management of multi-section courses or team-taught courses. The evaluations--and the evaluation instruments-- should be sensitive to the context of the instruction and to what is being assessed--for example, quality of the instruction provided by the faculty member versus quality of the course organization or management. The size and the nature of the audience--e.g. undergraduates, graduate students, professionals, colleagues, or lay--as well as the subject matter--are also relevant factors in interpreting the evaluations.

The primary evidence of instructional quality includes: (a) student evaluations of teaching (as well as commentary of program administrators putting those evaluations in context); (b) peer observations/evaluations of teaching; (c) letters from students, particularly unsolicited ones; and (d) teaching awards and other recognition for outstanding teaching. Where management of multi-sectioned courses or team-taught courses are involved, the student evaluations should differentiate between the quality of the course organization and the actual instruction provided by a specific faculty member. The relative contributions of the various instructors should be ascertained, and colleague and co-instructor evaluations can be particularly helpful.

In considering student evaluations of teaching, particularly the standard course evaluative instruments, the nature of the instruments and their potential limitations/weaknesses should be kept in mind. Among other things, it will commonly be the case that even the best instructors may receive unfavorable commentary or evaluations from some students and that instructors performing at an unsatisfactory level may be able to point to positive commentary or evaluation from some students.
ii. Mentoring and advising. This category includes: academic advising and mentoring; supervision of internships, laboratory work, and field work; supervision of independent study; and advising masters and doctoral students concerning their research and theses. Non-tenure-track faculty and or other appointments can advise graduate students as long as they are members of the university graduate faculty. However, their term of advising/appointment to the graduate faculty shall be for a term not to exceed their employment contract. The opportunities, as well as the demands, for faculty mentoring and advising varies substantially among academic fields, between different levels of students, and among campuses. While quantitative measures can be informative as to the time and effort the faculty member has invested in these activities, particularly those that are part of being a good academic citizen, it is important, where possible, to develop an assessment of the quality of the advising and mentoring provided by the faculty member. Letters from students as well as observations/evaluations from peers can be helpful. Where products, such as theses, papers, presentations, joint-publications, and reports, arise out of the interaction with the faculty member, they should be noted and assessed.

iii. Contributions to pedagogy. This category includes: course development; curriculum development; and the development of teaching materials and techniques. Assessment of the quality of these activities focuses primarily on those that go beyond the basic level of academic citizenship (such as the development of syllabi and notes for teaching assigned courses and participation in faculty and committee meetings concerning teaching and curriculum issues). Peer assessment of the contributions to pedagogy, and their impact, is particularly desirable and should be part of any asserted claims of excellence.

In assessing course development, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: the receipt of grants to develop new courses or revise old ones; teaching awards and other recognition attributable to the course preparation; articles in peer-reviewed journals about the new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them; and presentations at conferences about the new courses or techniques utilized in teaching them.

In assessing curriculum development, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: leadership and/or major contributions to the development of new degrees, programs of study, certificates, and areas of study; articles in peer reviewed journals about the curricular development; and presentations at conferences about curricular development.

In assessing the development of teaching materials, the evaluation should focus on, among other things: the quality, innovative nature and impact of textbooks, instructor’s manuals, student guides, web sites and other teaching media; articles in peer-reviewed journals about innovative teaching methods or materials; and presentations at conferences about innovative teaching methods and materials. Having the benefit of peer evaluation (internal and external) of asserted innovative materials and methods is especially desirable.

b. Criteria for Assessment of Teaching Quality.


i. **Excellence.** The evidence demonstrates that the candidate has carried a reasonable teaching load (considering the number of courses taught, the size and nature of the classes, and the number of different preparations) and establishes strong performance across the three dimensions of teaching: instruction, mentoring and advising, and contributions to pedagogy. Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, support the conclusion that the instructor is well above average and students are generally very positive about course organization and teaching effectiveness. Unvoluntary student letters, as well as peer evaluations, attest to teaching effectiveness. The candidate makes a strong contribution to student advising and demonstrates exceptional mentoring. He/she also has made exceptional contributions to course and/or curriculum development and/or to pedagogy recognized beyond the campus. In the case of pedagogical contributions, peer assessment confirms the excellence of the contributions. The faculty member should demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in teaching.

ii. **Satisfactory.** Student evaluations, in both the quantitative and open-ended responses, confirm that the faculty member is performing the instructional responsibilities at a clearly acceptable level. Students generally are comfortable with the organization of courses and with the effectiveness of the teaching. Teaching effectiveness has generally improved over time and, where particular problems have been identified, the faculty member has taken steps to address them and assess the effectiveness of the changes. Peer evaluations also support a conclusion that the instructional effectiveness is at a clearly acceptable level. The faculty member has demonstrated the ability to take on the development of new course preparations and to craft and deliver reasonably acceptable courses. The faculty member willingly contributes his/her share of the advising and makes the normally expected contributions to student mentoring, curriculum and course development, and pedagogy.

iii. **Unsatisfactory.** The evidence does not demonstrate that the contributions to the instructional mission are at the acceptable level. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

- The student evaluations generally indicate that the faculty member is not an effective teacher and/or there are significant student complaints about course organization, delivery and/or teaching effectiveness.

- When problems have been identified, the faculty member has been unwilling or unable to craft responses to address the problems and there is a discernable lack of improvement over time and/or an inability to bring the teaching up to a clearly acceptable level on a regular basis.

- Peer evaluations do not confirm that the faculty member is teaching at a clearly acceptable level.

- The faculty member does not make the normally expected contributions to student advising, has not demonstrated the ability to be an effective mentor and/or does
not make effective contributions to course or curriculum development or pedagogy.

2. Standards for Service – Awarding Long-Term Contract and Promotion from Assistant Clinical Professor to Clinical Associate Professor

Service is the effective application by faculty members of knowledge, skills, or expertise developed within their discipline or profession as a scholar, teacher, administrator, or practitioner. A distinction is made between general civic or parenting responsibility and the application of one’s professional skills. It is the latter that delineates contributions in the area of service. Clinical faculty are expected to make specific contributions to public service.

Research in the sense of performance in the area of research and creative activity is not considered when awarding long-term contracts and promotion. However, what can be considered as service activity is very broad and can encompass a wide range of things that in other instances might be included as research. Publications, including refereed journal articles, can be considered as contributions in service as long as the publication seems at all applied. For example, clinical faculty participating in clinical trials and having publications relating to such work report those as service. Similarly, contracts and grants, such as the grants for clinical trials, with any sort of applied or service-oriented connection are included as performance in the area of service.

a. Evidence of Service Quality

i. Public Service. Service to the community involves activities that contribute to the public welfare beyond the academic community and call upon the faculty member’s expertise as a scholar, teacher, administrator or practitioner. Consistent with the School’s public affairs orientation, service activities may be in the public, non-profit and/or private sectors and may either be paid or unpaid. The professional nature of the activity is the critical aspect. It is expected that all faculty members will engage in some public service activity within their areas of expertise.

The professional engagement involved in public service involves application of specialized professional knowledge or skills in a variety of forums and includes: advising or consulting with private, public and non-profit organizations; providing public policy analysis or technical expertise for local, state, regional, national or international agencies or entities; writing technical reports or other materials prepared specifically in conjunction with service activities; serving as an expert witness or providing legislative testimony; serving on boards, commissions or review panels; evaluating policies, programs, or personnel for agencies; assisting agencies with development activities; and communicating in popular, non-academic publications and other media such as television or radio.
The indicators on which the assessment of the quality of the service record will be based include:

*The quantity of service.* Considerations include: the number and range of the activities; the nature of the faculty member’s involvement in each activity; the commitment of time required; and, whether the faculty member participated regularly. Documentation of the involvement in minutes and reports sometimes can be useful.

*The quality of the service.* As with research, it is particularly important to ascertain the quality and impact of the service. Considerations include: the evaluations of colleagues, committee chairs and other administrators as to the quality of institutional service; evaluations by professional colleagues as to the quality of professional service; and evaluations by colleagues, clients, stakeholders and peer reviewers (internal and external) as to the quality of public service; indications that the faculty member has been asked to continue the service or has been sought out by others as a result of the service; and receipt of competitive grants, awards, honors or other recognition for the service activity.

*Outcomes and impacts of the service.* Another important indicator in assessing service activities is tangible evidence of the significance of the service and its effectiveness/impact, including evidence of outcomes such as letters of accreditation, reports and technical documents, changes in policies, implementation of new programs or measures, and statements from stakeholders.

*Leadership.* Demonstration of leadership is particularly important to an assertion of excellence in service. The evidence includes appointments, nominations or elections to leadership positions as well as an evaluation of the leadership by colleagues, peers or, as appropriate, clients, and stakeholders.

**ii. School and University Service.** The overall functioning and self-governance of the university is dependent upon the academic citizenship of its faculty, and institutional service involves activities that help sustain or lead academic endeavors. Every faculty member is expected to contribute a certain amount of service to the School such as regular attendance at faculty meetings and participation in committee assignments. The nature and level of service may vary according to the particular needs and missions of the campus where the faculty member is resident as well as on the interests and special contributions the faculty member may be able to make.

**iii. Service to the Profession.** Service to the profession involves activities that enhance the quality of disciplinary or professional organizations or activities. Clinical faculty are encouraged, but not required, to contribute to the following types of categories:

*Professional Development:* service that is essential for development of one’s profession such as reviewing manuscripts for professional journals or proposals for funding agencies, moderating sessions or serving as a discussant at professional conferences, serving on committees, or participating in professional societies or
organizations and participation in accreditation or establishing professional or academic standards.

*Professional Leadership*: assuming a leadership role in advancement of one’s profession through activities such as editing a journal, serving on an editorial board, organizing symposia, conferences or workshops, editing proceedings, or serving as an officer of a professional society

b. Criteria for Assessment of Service Quality.

*i. Excellence*. The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through his/her service activities (especially his/her public service), provides effective leadership on significant activities and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and confirm its impact. The faculty member has received external awards, honors or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to obtain grant or contract support--or to develop other support for service activities. The faculty member’s activities contribute beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Typically, service excellence must be premised on more than outstanding service to the School, University and profession and must include significant public service. The faculty member should demonstrate a record of publicly disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in the area of service.

*ii. Satisfactory*. The evidence establishes that the faculty member is a good academic citizen and contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions. The faculty member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School.

*iii. Unsatisfactory*. The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member is a good academic citizen who contributes constructively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

- Failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University;
- Failure to demonstrate more than minimal contributions to the public service mission of the School;
- Irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings;
- Failure to participate in disciplinary conferences or meetings;
- Generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions.
3. **Promotion to Clinical Full Professor.**

*i. Excellence.* The evidence demonstrates that the faculty member is making an outstanding contribution to the mission of the School through his/her service activities (especially his/her public service), provides effective leadership on significant activities, and has made a significant impact in highly visible or important areas. Colleagues and other knowledgeable observers/evaluators of the service activities assess the service in highly favorable terms and corroborate its beneficial impact. The faculty member has received external awards, honors or other recognition for some of the service. Where appropriate the faculty member has demonstrated the ability to obtain grant or contract support—or to develop other support for service activities. The faculty member’s service activities contribute well beyond the norm to the reputation of the School and University. Typically, service excellence must include significant public service. The faculty member should demonstrate a record of sustained, nationally and/or internationally disseminated and peer reviewed scholarship in the area of service.

*ii. Satisfactory.* The evidence establishes that the faculty member is a good academic citizen and contributes effectively and beyond the minimum expected for an associate clinical professor to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. The faculty member serves on a reasonable number of committees, dutifully fulfills the responsibilities involved, and receives generally favorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions. The faculty member has demonstrated the willingness and ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School.

*iii. Unsatisfactory.* The evidence fails to establish that the faculty member is a good academic citizen who contributes well beyond the minimum and effectively to the mission of the School and University through his/her service activities. An unsatisfactory record typically would be characterized by one or more of the following:

- Failure to provide a reasonable amount of service to the School or University;
- Failure to demonstrate the willingness or ability to contribute to the public service mission of the School;
- Irresponsible service, including the failure to complete assignments or attend meetings;
- Generally unfavorable reviews from colleagues and administrators for his/her contributions or collegiality.