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| **CLINICAL PROFESSORS** |

Clinical faculty members are non-tenure eligible faculty who are qualified to engage in, be responsible for, and oversee instructional and/or clinically-related programs and projects within SSFD. In SSFD, Clinical faculty members typically will have the largest proportion of their responsibilities allocated to teaching-and service-related endeavors, but they may also carry research workload allocations. As such, teaching and service- related activities will carry the greatest weight when considering a candidate’s case for promotion, with research activities considered in cases where the candidate has a research workload allocation. Weighting across all domains of a candidate’s workload will be commensurate with the candidate’s average allocation in that domain over the period of time in rank under evaluation, which is understood to vary within and across individuals’ positions and over time.

Promotion of clinical faculty members is warranted only when achievements are tangibly demonstrated. Thus, promotion is based neither on promise nor longevity, but on demonstrated and sustained excellence. It is natural for candidates to vary in the time required to attain the appropriate level of achievement.

In addition to meeting the criteria listed below for promotion from Assistant to Associate level and from Associate to Full level, respectively, there are standard expectations at all levels of clinical professorship within the Sanford School. These include:

* Achievement and maintenance of certification and/or licensure required by state or national regulators for faculty who have clinical responsibilities, as necessitated by the clinical discipline.
* Satisfactory performance (at a minimum) as indicated by the average of all annual evaluation ratings while in rank at ASU.
* Availability to, and professional demeanor and communication with, students, staff, faculty, and administration, as well as individuals external to the University, as applicable to the position.
* Adherence to unit, College, University, and Arizona Board of Regents’ policies and procedures.

**Criteria for Promotion of Clinical Professors**

For teaching, service, and research domains, there are **primary and secondary indicators**. To be considered, a promotion case **must include evidence of each of the primary indicators** (as relevant to a candidate’s workload allocations). In some cases, a candidate’s record in one primary indicator may be stronger relative to their record in another primary indicator. An especially strong record in one or two primary indicators can partially compensate for a weaker record in another primary indicator; still, there must be clear evidence of accomplishment in each primary criterion within a given domain. In the instance that a candidate is on the cusp of meeting the primary criteria within a domain, evidence from among the secondary criteria for that domain will be considered. However, strong evidence of secondary indicators cannot compensate for the absence of evidence in one or more of the primary indicators. Although a promotion case **is not required to include evidence of secondary criteria to be eligible for advancement, evidence of secondary criteria will be considered.**

1. **Clinical Professors: Promotion from Assistant to Associate Level**

It is expected that candidates seeking promotion to Associate rank will typically have a minimum of five years in rank at the Assistant level (or comparable level/position) at ASU and may count the year of application for promotion toward this eligibility requirement. In cases of extraordinary merit or under special circumstances, candidates may warrant earlier consideration as determined in consultation with the Director of the School.

**Instruction**

1.A. For those whose workloads include instruction, a case for promotion should demonstrate significant and substantial contributions to the instructional mission of SSFD.

 ***Primary Indicators***

 1.A.i. Above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by the average of all student-

 reported and peer-observed teaching evaluation ratings while in rank at ASU.

 1.A.ii. Above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by the average of all peer-

 observed teaching evaluation ratings while in rank.

 1.A.iii. Use of high-quality pedagogical techniques (e.g., appropriate and current instructional

 technologies, learning principles, up-to-date/contemporary course materials).

 1.A.iv. Effective mentorship of students as indicated by **at least one** of the following:

a. Coordination and/or supervision of clinical/internship placements of students, as applicable. Factors contributing to the weighting of these activities include, but are not limited to, the success of placements, the number of students supervised/placed, and the amount/level of involvement.

b. Mentorship of students’ learning, progress through a program, professional development, and/or other related activities. Factors contributing to the weighting of these activities include, but are not limited to, the number of students mentored, the impact of the mentoring, and the amount/level of involvement.

 ***Secondary Indicators***

1.A.v. Contribution, coordination, or oversight related to the design, development, or refinement of new or existing courses, curricula, or pedagogies (e.g., textbooks, archival course materials

 2.A.vi. Teaching-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition

1.A.vii. Participation in professional development activities to enhance knowledge as it pertains to instructional capacity. Factors contributing to the weighting of professional development activities include, but are not limited to, evidence that the professional development made a tangible contribution to the candidate’s teaching activities.

**Service**

1.B. A case for promotion should demonstrate significant and substantial contributions to the mission of SSFD.

***Primary Indicator***

1.B.i. Demonstrated use of professional skills to effectively contribute to, manage, and/or develop a program, project, or initiative that contributes to the mission of SSFD.

***Secondary Indicators***

1.B.ii Participation in school level-committees, and/or membership of CLAS and University-level committees.

1.B.iii. Membership contributions to local, regional, state or national boards, committees, councils, or groups.

1.B.iv. Participation in or contributions to project/program, SSFD, College, or University promotional events or press.

1.B.vi. Participation in and/or coordination of outreach efforts, including trainings, consultation, workshops, presentations, conferences, forums and translation of research /or university initiatives and activities to lay or professional audiences.

1.B.vii. Service-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

**Research**

1.C.For cases in which a clinical professor has research as part of the workload percentage, a case for promotion should demonstrate contributions to the research mission of SSFD as proportional to research workload allocation.

***Primary Indicator***

1.C.i. Involvement in SSFD research initiatives and activities (e.g., project/grant execution, data analysis, program development). Factors contributing to the weighting of these contributions include, but are not limited to, candidates’ amount/level of involvement and their successes and achievements stemming from that involvement.

***Secondary Indicators***

1.C.ii. Contributing roles in the preparation and submission of research grant proposals. Factors contributing to the weighting of grant proposals include, but are not limited to, the role of the candidate in the proposals, whether the proposals were funded, and the amount of monetary award.

1.C.iii. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff as it pertains to research and scholarship (e.g., co-authorship of student-led paper, supervision of research assistants). Factors contributing to the weighting of mentorship/supervision include, but are not limited to, the quantity of examples and amount/level of involvement.

1.C.iv. Participation in professional development activities to enhance knowledge as it pertains to research capacity (e.g., grant-writing workshop, training in a specific statistical analysis). Factors contributing to the weighting of professional development activities include, but are not limited to, evidence that professional development made tangible contributions to the candidate’s research activities.

1.C.v. Research-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

1.C.vi. Contribution to the development of scholarly products (e.g., software, measures) and other scholarly activities (e.g., research-related consultation) not covered in 1.A.i. through 1.A.vi. above.

1. **Clinical Professors: Promotion from Associate to Full Level**

A case for promotion must be linked to excellence and will demonstrate the candidate’s leadership in the enhancement of the instruction of students and/or advancement of the goals of SSFD, and must demonstrate a substantial and sustained record of excellent performance since the previous promotion. The majority of that service should be at ASU. At this level of promotion, it is the onus of the candidate to provide evidence from among the Instruction and Service, outlined in sections 2.A. and 2.B. that clearly reflects sustained contributions in each area commensurate with workload allocations, and when warranted, an increase in the breadth, quantity, quality, impact, and/or level of involvement since promotion or appointment as an Associate Clinical Professor in SSFD. Excellence may be demonstrated by multiple examples from among the following:

**Instruction**

2.A. For those whose workloads include instruction, a case for promotion should demonstrate ongoing high-quality contributions to the instructional mission of SSFD. For all indicators, factors contributing to the weighting of activities include, but are not limited to, the quantity of examples and amount/level of involvement.

***Primary Indicators***

2.A.i. Sustained evidence of above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by the average of all student-reported evaluation ratings since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

2.A.ii. Sustained evidence of above satisfactory performance (at a minimum), as indicated by peer-observed teaching evaluations since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

2.A.iii. Sustained evidence of use of high-quality pedagogical techniques (e.g., appropriate and current instructional technologies, learning principles, up-to-date/contemporary course materials) since the time of the candidate’s prior promotion/appointment.

2.A.iv. Sustained evidence of effective mentorship of students as indicated by **at least one** of the following:

 a. Coordination and/or supervision of clinical/internship placements of students, as applicable. Factors contributing to the weighting of these activities include, but are not limited to, the success of placements, the number of students supervised/placed, and the amount/level of involvement.

b. Mentorship of students’ learning, progress through a program, professional development, and/or other related activities. Factors contributing to the weighting of these activities include, but are not limited to, the number of students mentored, the impact of the mentoring, and the amount/level of involvement.

***Secondary Indicators***

2.A.v. Lead or contributing roles in the design, development, refinement, and/or dissemination of new or existing courses, curricula, or pedagogies (e.g., textbooks, archival course materials, or online teaching materials available to others; preparing a face-to-face course for online delivery or vice versa; developing a new course for instruction).

2.A.vi. Teaching-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition at the local, regional and/or national level.

2.A. vii. Participation in professional development activities to enhance knowledge as it pertains to instructional capacity (e.g., attendance at a teaching institute, training specific pedagogical approach).

2.A.viiI. Involvement in other instructional activities not covered in 2.B.i. through 2.B.vii.

**Service**

2.B. A case for promotion must include evidence of sustained leadership contributions to the service mission of SSFD as evidenced by 2.A.i. and by examples from among the remaining indicators 2.B.ii. through 2.A.viii., commensurate with the candidate’s service workload over the period in rank at ASU.

***Primary Indicators***

2.B.i. Demonstrated use of professional skills to effectively manage and/or develop a major program, project, or initiative that contributes to the mission of SSFD.

2.B.ii. Leadership role on SSFD, College, and/or University boards, committees, councils, professional associations or groups.

***Secondary Indicators***

2.B.iii. Leadership role on local, regional, state or national boards, committees, councils, professional associations, or groups.

2.B.iv. Leadership role in and/or coordination of program, SSFD, College, or University promotional events.

2.B.v. Continued engagement in promotional press at the local, regional, or national level.

2.B.vi. Leadership role in mentorship or supervision activities of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff in activities not related to instruction (e.g advising student organizations, advising regarding job or program applications).

2.A.vii. Leadership role in and/or coordination of outreach efforts, including trainings, consultation, workshops, presentations, conferences, forums, invited guest speaker events, and/or translation of research and/or university initiatives and activities to lay or professional audiences.

2.A.viii. Service-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition for leadership in the discipline.

**Research**

2.C. For cases in which a clinical professor has research as part of the workload percentage, a case for promotion should demonstrate *contributions* to the research mission of SSFD as proportional to research workload allocation.

 ***Primary Indicator***

2.C.i. Lead or contributing roles in SSFD research initiatives and activities (e.g., project/grant execution, data analysis, program development). Factors contributing to the weighting of these contributions include, but are not limited to, candidates’ amount/level of involvement and their successes and achievements stemming from that involvement.

***Secondary Indicators***

2.C.i. Lead or contributing roles in the preparation and submission of research grant proposals. Factors contributing to the weighting of grant proposals include, but are not limited to, the role of the candidate in the proposals, whether the proposals were funded, and the amount of monetary award.

2.C.iii. Effective mentorship of undergraduate students, graduate students, and/or employees/staff as it pertains to research and scholarship (e.g., co-authorship of student-led paper, supervision of research assistants). Factors contributing to the weighting of mentorship/supervision include, but are not limited to, the quantity of examples and amount/level of involvement.

2.C.iv. Participation in professional development activities to enhance knowledge as it pertains to research capacity (e.g., grant-writing workshop, training in a specific statistical analysis). Factors contributing to the weighting of professional development activities include, but are not limited to, evidence that professional development made tangible contributions to the candidate’s research activities.

2.C.v. Research-related nominations, honors, awards, and/or other recognition.

2.C.vi. Contribution to the development of scholarly products (e.g., software, measures) and other scholarly activities (e.g., research-related consultation) not covered in 1.A.i. through 1.A.vi. above.