

**UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER
WARNER SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

**Proposal for a Clinical Faculty Track
(Approved by Board of Trustee in June 2004)**

Contents:

1. Rationale and Objectives of the Proposal
2. Clarification of Terms
3. The Warner School Mission and its Implications for Faculty
4. General Principles and Premises
5. Clinical Faculty Roles and Responsibilities
6. Clinical Faculty Titles and Terms of Contract (including a Summary Table)
7. Process to Decide on New Faculty Positions
8. Criteria for Hiring, Re-appointing and Promoting Clinical Faculty at Various Ranks
9. Hiring Process for Clinical Faculty
10. Re-appointment Process for Clinical Faculty
11. Promotion Process for Clinical Faculty
12. Principles and Processes for Changing Track
13. Role of Clinical Faculty in the Hiring, Reappointment and Promotion Cases of Tenure-track Faculty

Appendix:

- (a) Criteria and indicators for evaluating minimum expectations common to all clinical faculty
- (b) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local community” for Teaching
- (c) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local community” for Clinical Scholarship
- (d) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local community” for Practice towards improving educational policies and practices
- (e) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance” for Service

1. Rationale and Objectives of the Proposal

Along with most of the other professional schools within the University of Rochester, we have come to realize that the mission of a professional school within a research university today is so complex and diverse that it requires a more diverse faculty than in the past. The current university-wide criteria for tenure – and, thus, expectations for tenure-track faculty – are often too narrow to recognize and reward the variety of tasks and responsibilities that professional research schools of education like ours are called to perform in order to be successful and competitive.

As a result, over the past twenty years we have hired a number of faculty through non-tenure-track contracts to perform a number of important functions needed to pursue our mission. These faculty members are not simply “adjunct professors” teaching isolated courses or supervising internships. With a few exceptions, they have not been hired to cover the responsibilities of a tenure-track faculty on leave or who left their position temporarily vacant; rather, they have been hired to perform functions that complement those of our current tenure-track faculty and that will continue to be needed overtime. As such, they have much in common with the “clinical faculty” in schools of medicine and nursing – both within this university and across the country. However, because the Warner School has not had an official “clinical track” option for its faculty so far, there is some lack of clarity about the status of this faculty, as well as their titles, hiring, re-appointment and promotion.

This document is intended to resolve this confusion by articulating clear definitions, expectations, criteria and processes for “clinical faculty” within the Warner School.

This document will be reviewed by the faculty, and modified as needed, within the next three years based on the results of its first implementation, and on a regular basis thereafter.

2. Clarification of terms

Before proceeding further in this document, it is important to clearly articulate what “clinical faculty” at the Warner School are NOT intended to be and how they are different not only from tenure-track faculty but also from the following other non-tenure-track faculty positions:

- o **Adjunct faculty:** These are individuals that have their primary appointment *outside* of the Warner School, and are hired to play very specific and time-limited functions for less than 50% of the time -- such as teaching a specific course in a given semester or supervise internships for a given academic year. Their appointment is usually by semester or academic year (although it may be renewed and, in fact, we always try to develop long-term relationships with our best adjunct instructors). Adjunct faculty members have no involvement in the governance of the Warner School (i.e., they are not part of elected faculty committees, do not participate or vote in faculty meetings, etc.).
- o **Visiting faculty:** These are individuals that are hired for a short period of time to fill in “gaps” created by faculty on leave or on grants, tenure-track or clinical faculty positions left vacant but that cannot immediately be filled, experimental new program expansions, etc. Their appointment is usually for one or two years, and can be made at the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Full Professor depending on the individual’s qualifications. They have no involvement in the governance of the Warner School, although they are expected to participate in department and faculty meetings (without voting privileges).
- o **Research faculty associate:** These are individuals with faculty qualifications but that are hired with specific duties in conjunction with a specific project (usually externally funded). Their appointment is linked to the duration of the project. They have no involvement in the governance of the Warner School.
- o **Teaching faculty associate:** These are individuals with qualifications comparable to clinical faculty but that are hired to perform only specific duties in the preparation of entry-level practitioners. Their appointment is annual and it can be renewed. They have no involvement in the governance of the Warner School.

This document does not address any of these additional types of non-tenure-track faculty.

3. The Warner School Mission and its Implications for Faculty

Any definition of faculty roles and responsibilities should be informed by the mission of the institution, as ultimately the faculty as a whole is responsible for accomplishing such a mission. Therefore, in this section we report our mission statement and use it to derive the set of functions that Warner faculty are expected to perform “as a whole.”

In 2002, the Warner School adopted the following mission statement:

“At the Warner Graduate School of Education and Human Development, we believe that education can transform lives and make the world more just and humane. This vision informs our teaching, research and service as a research school of education, as we strive to:

- o PREPARE PRACTITIONERS AND RESEARCHERS who are knowledgeable, reflective, skilled and caring educators, who can make a difference in individual lives as well as their fields, and who are leaders and agents of change;
- o GENERATE AND DISSEMINATE KNOWLEDGE leading to new understandings of education and human development, on which more effective educational policies and practices can be grounded;
- o COLLABORATE – across disciplines, professions and constituencies – TO PROMOTE CHANGE that can significantly improve education and support positive human development.

Our diverse work in each of these domains is informed by the following underlying beliefs: the improvement of education is in pursuit of social justice; development and learning shape and are shaped by the contexts in which they occur; the complexity of educational problems requires an interdisciplinary and collaborative approach; and best practices are grounded in research and theory, just as useful theory and research are informed by practice.”

Accomplishing this ambitious mission translates in the following major roles and responsibilities for the Warner School faculty as a whole:

1. Teaching:

- o Preparing entry-level practitioners (usually Master students) -- involves teaching courses, organizing and supervising internships, doing admission interviews and evaluations, advising, supervising independent studies and thesis, “managing” programs (i.e., participating in their on-going maintenance, review, and improvement) including maintaining accreditation if applicable
- o Preparing advanced practitioners (usually Ed.D. students) -- involves teaching courses, supervising field-based projects, doing admission interviews and evaluations, advising, supervising independent studies, mentoring Ed.D. dissertations (as a committee member or Chair), “managing” programs
- o Preparing researchers (usually Ph.D. students) -- involves teaching courses, organizing and supervising research apprenticeships, admission responsibilities, advising, supervising independent studies, mentoring Ph.D. dissertations (as a committee member or Chair), “managing” programs

2. Scholarship:

o (a) Research Scholarship:

- o Engaging in research studies that create new theories, explanations and understandings about human development, education, educational institutions, and educational policy.
- o Analysis and synthesis of research for research audiences
- o Disseminating own research results to research audiences (mostly through articles in peer-reviewed research journals and books in research series)

o (b) Clinical Scholarship:

- o Evaluating/studying the effects of innovative policies and practices with the goal of identifying and refining best policies and practices, and making more explicit their connection to existing theories
- o Disseminating the results of own studies of innovative policies and practices to peers as well as practitioner and policy-making audiences (through the appropriate outlets, which may include articles in peer-reviewed practitioner journals, books, reports, presentations, videos or other multi-media materials)
- o Disseminating results of existing research to practitioner and policy-making audiences (through the appropriate outlets, which may include articles in peer-reviewed practitioner journals, books, reports, presentations, videos or other multi-media materials)
- o Contributing to the identification of questions and issues worth researching because of their potential impact on policies and practices

3. Practice towards improving educational policies and practices:

- o Developing and/or modeling exemplary practices through own practice (ex: by continuing to practice as a teacher/administrator/counselor/etc., as a teacher/counselor/administrator/etc. educator, as a professional development provider or program evaluator, etc.)
- o Empowering other practitioners to improve their practices (ex: by offering specific professional development opportunities, by engaging in one-on-one collaborations with practitioners, by doing program evaluations, etc.)
- o Participating in projects aiming at developing and/or implementing innovative practices and policies (ex: reform projects supported by grants; etc.)
- o Participating in policy-making

It is also important to recognize that, in addition to the specific goals identified in our mission, our faculty also needs to ensure the successful functioning of the institution (i.e., the Warner School and the University of Rochester more generally) as well as of the professional fields they are associated with. One could argue that specific responsibilities within each of these areas may be considered embedded, at least to some extent, in the functions necessary to accomplish each of the mission's three main goals, as articulated above. However, since it is common in most universities (including the University of Rochester) to consider these responsibilities under the

separate category of “service” when it comes to faculty evaluation and promotion cases, we decided in what follow to list them separately in a forth category named “Service.”

4. Service:

- o **(a) To the institution:**
 - o Contributing, as needed and appropriate, in various aspects of the Warner School life and functions (ex: contributing to student recruitment, fund-raising, specific initiatives, etc.)
 - o Participating in WS and UR governance (ex: as member of standing committees and task-forces, as Senate representative, by participating in program areas and faculty meetings, etc.)
 - o Taking on specific administrative responsibilities and/or positions (ex: program director, chair, associate dean, etc.; organizing and overseeing specific student services, etc.)
- o **(b) To the profession:**
 - o Participating in professional organizations (ex: as member, officer, serving on specific committees/task forces, participating in meetings, etc.)
 - o Reviewing journal articles, grant proposals, etc.
 - o Organizing conferences and similar activities

While the Warner faculty as a whole is expected to perform ALL the functions identified in this section, we believe that it is impossible for any one faculty member to have the time and expertise to do them all well. This is especially true for current tenure-track faculty: since the university-wide expectations for tenure are articulated essentially in terms of teaching, research scholarship and service alone, faculty seeking tenure need to focus first on these aspects of the mission and can attend to the other aspects only if they have time to spare (which is rarely the case, given the high standards set for tenure at the University of Rochester!). Yet our engagement and contributions in the areas of clinical scholarship and practice towards improving educational policies and practices are also very critical to our success as a professional research school of education – as they can contribute to our visibility and credibility in the field of education, and hence our ability to attract students, to secure external funding, to establish collaborations that enrich our students’ internships and provide research sites, etc.

In sum, we believe that accomplishing the Warner School mission will not be possible unless we develop a more “differentiated” faculty body, where different individuals are committed to, and best qualified for, pursuing specific sub-sets of the mission, and get recognized and rewarded accordingly.

4. General Principles and Premises

In addition to the basic premise, articulated in the previous section, that a professional school needs a more “differentiated” faculty body, our proposal for a “clinical faculty” track at the Warner School has also been informed by the following principles:

- o Accepting the reality of current university practices, where tenure is granted based mostly on excellence in teaching and national recognition in research, we recognize the need to distinguish between faculty who will pursue these goals as part of their “job portfolio” (tenure-track) versus faculty who will pursue a different subset of goals (non-tenure-track/clinical). At the same time, we want to publicly acknowledge that the success of the Warner School’s mission will depend on the contributions of ALL faculty and, therefore, clinical faculty should not be considered inferior or superior to tenure-track faculty – although their roles and responsibilities, as well as terms of contract, will be different.
- o As clinical faculty will not be eligible for tenure, their term of contract will necessarily be for a specified number of years. However, we recognize that the effectiveness of these faculty members and, therefore, their contributions to the Warner School mission, would be greatly diminished without some long-term commitment on their part as well as on the part of the institution.
- o Since all faculty – tenure-track and clinical – contribute in necessary and substantial (although different) ways to accomplishing the Warner School mission, they should all fully participate in the well-functioning and governance of the Warner School.
- o We recognize the need for differentiation not only between tenure-track and clinical faculty, but also within clinical faculty, as different individuals may bring expertise that is more appropriate to fulfill a different set of goals within the Warner School mission. At the same time, clinical faculty should be responsible for doing their share of service for the institution and their profession and also have some minimum involvement in all the three prongs of the Warner School mission – i.e., teaching, scholarship and practice towards improving educational policies and practices.
- o We recognize that individual faculty will perform best if they have clear expectations and well-articulated promotion criteria. In this document, we have tried to articulate expectations and promotion criteria for clinical faculty based on (a) our analysis of the specific functions required to accomplish the Warner School’s mission (as articulated in the previous section) and the identification of which sub-sets of these functions will be among the main responsibilities of clinical faculty, (b) the identification of minimum expectations common to all clinical faculty as well as acceptable variations in roles and responsibilities across individual clinical faculty members, (c) the identification of what constitutes “excellent” and “outstanding” performance in specific tasks that clinical faculty may be expected to address, and (d) the identification of what level of performance, and in which tasks, is expected at various ranks.

- o In articulating the various processes for hiring, reappointing and promoting clinical faculty, we have tried as much as possible to use the same principles and practices currently used for tenure-track faculty, while making the needed adaptations when called for because of the different scope of the positions and of their term of contract.
- o While recognizing the importance of clinical faculty and the critical role they can play in accomplishing the Warner School mission, we also want to state our continuing commitment to remaining a research school of education. This will require ensuring that the addition of new clinical faculty positions will not occur at the expense of existing tenure-track lines.

5. Clinical Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

A “clinical faculty” at the Warner School is a faculty member whose role addresses a **combination** of the following functions needed to accomplish our mission (as articulated earlier in section 3 of this document):

1. **Teaching** – Preparing *entry-level and/or advanced practitioners* (i.e., Master and/or Ed.D. students) -- involves teaching courses, organizing and supervising internships, admission responsibilities, advising, supervising independent studies and thesis/dissertations, “managing” programs (including maintaining accreditation as needed)
NOTE 1: Because of university-wide regulations, only clinical faculty member with a doctoral degree is eligible to be a member in a dissertation committee (Ed.D. or Ph.D.) consistent with our internal rules for the constitution of doctoral dissertation committees.
NOTE 2: While clinical faculty may contribute to the preparation of Ph.D. students in various ways, this is not one of their main responsibilities and they will not chair Ph.D. dissertation committees (exceptions will require special approval)
2. **Clinical scholarship** – *through one or more of the following activities:*
 - o Evaluating/studying the effects of innovative policies and practices with the goal of identifying and refining best policies and practices, and making more explicit their connection to existing theories
 - o Contributing to the identification of questions and issues worth researching because of their potential impact on policies and practices and helping other educators find, analyze and translate research into practice.
 - o Disseminating the results of own studies AND/OR of existing theories and research to peers as well as practitioner and policy-making audiences (through the appropriate outlets, which may include articles in peer-reviewed practitioner journals, books, reports, presentations, videos or other multi-media materials)
NOTE: This does not preclude a clinical faculty member’s involvement in research, rather it does not require it.
3. **Practice toward improving educational policies and practices** – *through one or more of the following types of practices:*
 - o Developing and/or modeling exemplary practices through one’s own practice (ex: by continuing to practice as a teacher/administrator/counselor/etc., as a teacher/counselor/ administrator/etc. educator, as a professional development provider, etc.)
 - o Empowering other practitioners to improve their practices (ex: by offering specific professional development opportunities, by engaging in one-on-one collaborations with practitioners, by providing feedback and evaluation, etc.)
 - o Participating in collaborative projects aiming at developing and/or implementing innovative practices and policies (ex: reform projects supported by grants; etc.)
 - o Participating in policy-making

4. **Service – to both institution and profession**, i.e.:
 - o Providing service (beyond what done to contribute to fulfilling the Warner School mission through one’s teaching, scholarship and practice), as needed and appropriate given one’s expertise, to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of the Warner School and the University of Rochester
 - o Providing service, as needed and appropriate given one’s expertise, to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of one’s profession

While we would expect each clinical faculty member to **provide some contribution in each of the four areas** and to **do his/her own share of service** like any other faculty member at the Warner School, we also expect that each clinical faculty member will identify **two primarily areas** among Teaching, Clinical Scholarship and Practice as their focus. The two primary areas will be determined at the time of hiring, based primarily on the need of the Warner School but also taking into consideration the individual’s interests and qualifications; expectations in terms of what percentage of effort should be devoted to each area will also be identified at the time of hiring. Subsequent changes in the definition of primary areas and/or time distribution across areas should be approved by the Dean in consultation with the Chair/Director of the unit the faculty is associated with and recorded in writing.

Despite the considerable differences among the set of responsibilities to be performed by specific clinical faculty members, depending on their primary areas and assigned duties, the following list captures some essential characteristics that we expect ALL clinical faculty to demonstrate (although each individual faculty may do so at different degrees/levels depending on their “primary areas”):

1. A clinical faculty member regularly interacts with local educational, clinical and community institutions and local professionals, is current on the issues and problems facing these institutions/professionals, and works with them on significant matters (e.g. significant leadership issues, administrative issues, practice issues, etc.)
2. This work is relevant to and informs what the clinical faculty member teaches. A clinical faculty member is, thus, an effective teacher who can improve the professional practice of Warner students.
3. A clinical faculty member discusses and analyzes in an informed way the issues and problems being wrestled with by local, regional and/or national institutions, bringing to bear relevant current research.
4. A clinical faculty member is familiar with promise and limits of research and in light of that knowledge suggests interesting lines of future research (ex: by suggesting hypotheses worth further investigation) that they as well as other researchers (including Warner students) could undertake.
5. A clinical faculty member has the capacity to identify what is and is not “quality” research and “wisdom of practice” relevant to specific contexts and goals and as such

helps Warner students, as well as other educators and helping professionals, find, analyze and translate research into practice.

6. A clinical faculty member offers insights and generalizations about their own experiences in a way that is relevant to and useful for other professionals in the field and to university based researchers.
7. A clinical faculty member effectively relates to two audiences – professionals in the field and university based researchers – and communicates to these audiences through the appropriate media (oral, written, multi-media).
8. A clinical faculty member seeks and obtains external funding, if and as needed to fulfill their responsibilities.
9. A clinical faculty member develops concrete products (such as curricula, materials, models, applications, projects, conferences, organizations and/or collaborations) that influence educational policy and practice on a regional, state and/or national level.

6. Clinical Faculty Titles and Terms of Contract

Consistent with current practices in the School of Medicine and School of Nursing at this university, we propose that clinical faculty be appointed at one of the following ranks:

- o Instructor
- o Assistant Professor
- o Associate Professor
- o Full Professor.

The title will be the same as for tenure-track faculty at the same rank (i.e., Instructor/ Assistant Professor/ Associate Professor/ Full Professor of Education); whenever it is necessary to make a distinction between the two tracks, this title will be followed in parenthesis by “(tenure-track)” or “(non-tenure-track”).

A doctorate is required for Assistant, Associate and Full Professors, but not for Instructors.

Clinical faculty appointments could be full-time or part-time. If part-time, the appointment needs to be for at least 50% of the time. Any changes in percentage of time need approval of the Dean, in consultation with the Chair(s)/Director of the unit the clinical faculty is associated with and the faculty, and will take place at the time of reappointment or renewal unless Dean, Chair and faculty member agree otherwise.

As consistent with current university-wide regulations, hiring decisions will be made by the Dean in consultation with all the existing faculty, following the process articulated later in the document (see section 9); for hiring at the Associate and Full Professor, Provost’s approval must also be obtained.

As mentioned earlier, clinical faculty terms of appointment will always be for a specific number of years (from a minimum of 2 up to a maximum of 5). The first one or two appointments will always be for a specified (“fixed”) number of years. However, after 4-8 years of service and at least one or two successful “re-appointment reviews” (see below), the clinical faculty member will usually be on a “3-year rolling appointment” – i.e., a 3-year appointment renewable on an annual basis, so as to guarantee a minimum of two additional years of employment even if the appointment were to be terminated.

Regardless of the type of appointment, a major “re-appointment review” will take place every 3-5 years, and at least one year before a contract is expected to expire. As explained in more detail later in the document (see section 10), this review will require the faculty member to prepare and submit a “case” for reappointment, to be reviewed and evaluated by clinical faculty at rank and above with input from the rest of the faculty. The final decision about re-appointment will be made by the Dean pending Provost’s positive review of the process followed (as consistent with current university-wide regulations and practices).

Annual renewals (as required for 3-year rolling appointments or 1-2 year appointments) will be made by the Dean in consultation with the faculty member’s supervisor (i.e., the Chair of the faculty member’s program area/department and/or the Director of the Warner Center, depending

on which Warner School unit the faculty member is affiliated with), in conjunction with the annual faculty evaluation. (NOTE: In the case of 3-year rolling appointments, if the annual renewal decision is not favorable, the faculty member will be expected to go through a major re-appointment review the following year – i.e., the year before the contract may be terminated – to ensure a thorough review including input from the faculty before a final decision to terminate the contract is made).

Promotion decisions (for Associate and Full Professor) will be made by the Provost upon recommendation by the Dean, following the process articulated later in this document (see section 11). This process will include soliciting evaluations and recommendations from Warner clinical faculty at rank and above and from some external reviewers, as well as gathering feedback from other faculty, students and staff. In the rare cases when an Instructor will be considered for promotion to Assistant Professor, a similar process will be followed, but in this case the decision will take place at the Dean’s level (with Provost’s review of the process) and will not involve external reviewers.

Given that tenure is not available and part-time is an option, the notion of “maximum time at rank” is not applicable in the case of clinical faculty – with the only exception of Instructors, since this title cannot be held for more than three year as per university-wide regulations.

The following table summarizes all the key elements introduced in this section.

Clinical Faculty Summary Table

	Instructor	Assistant Prof.	Associate Prof.	Full Professor
Title	Instructor of Education	Assistant Professor of Education	Associate Professor of Education	Professor of Education
% of time	At least 50%	At least 50%	At least 50%	At least 50%
Term of contract	“Fixed” 2-5 years; renewable (w/ review one year before end of contract) OR 3-year “rolling appointment” (w/ major review every 3-5 years)	“Fixed” 2-5 year, renewable (w/ review one year before end of contract) OR 3-year “rolling appointment” (w/ major review every 3-5 years)	“Fixed” 2-5 year, renewable (w/ review one year before end of contract) OR 3-year “rolling appointment” (w/ major review every 3-5 years)	“Fixed” 2-5 year, renewable (w/ review one year before end of contract) OR 3-year “rolling appointment” (w/ major review every 3-5 years)
Minimum credentials	Master’ degree	Doctorate	Doctorate	Doctorate
Maximum time at rank	N/A	N/A (although FT faculty will usually be considered for promotion to Associate no later than 7 years).	N/A	N/A
Appointment process (assuming that the position has been approved)	Appointed by Dean based on a search and in consultation w/ faculty (see section 9 for details)	Appointed by Dean based on a search and in consultation w/ faculty (see section 9 for details)	Approved by Provost on Dean’s recommendation, based on a search and in consultation w/ faculty (see section 9 for details)	Approved by Provost on Dean’s recommendation, based on a search and in consultation w/ faculty (see section 9 for details)
Process for re-appointment at same rank (assuming continuation of the position)	Re-appointed by Dean in consultation w/ Chair	Re-appointed by Dean in consultation w/ faculty and w/ Provost’s review of process (see section 10 for details)	Re-appointed by Dean in consultation w/ faculty and w/ Provost’s review of process (see section 10 for details)	Re-appointed by Dean in consultation w/ faculty and w/ Provost’s review of process (see section 10 for details)
Promotion process (to that rank)	N/A	(rare) Approved by Dean w/ input from faculty and w/ Provost’s review of process (see section 11 for details)	Approved by Provost and Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Dean and input from faculty (see section 11 for details)	Approved by Provost and Board of Trustees, upon recommendation of the Dean and input from faculty (see details 11 for details)

7. Criteria for Hiring, Re-appointing and Promoting Clinical Faculty at Various Ranks

As stated earlier, a clinical faculty member's responsibilities include:

- o Doing one's share of Service to the institution and the profession
- o Engaging in all three areas of Teaching, Clinical Scholarship and Practice at least to some extent, so as to satisfy the nine elements articulated in section 5 as minimum common expectations for ALL clinical faculty
- o Choosing two areas among Teaching, Clinical Scholarship and Practice as their "primary areas of focus"

Depending on his/her rank, the level at which a clinical faculty member is expected to perform these responsibilities varies, as summarized below:

- o Instructors are expected to satisfactorily fulfill their assigned responsibilities with some support.
- o Assistant Professors are expected to satisfactorily fulfill their assigned responsibilities independently.
- o Associate Professors are expected to satisfactorily fulfill their assigned responsibilities and also to demonstrate and maintain "excellence" (as defined later in this section) in their two primary areas of focus as well as service.
- o Full Professors are expected to satisfactorily fulfill their assigned responsibilities and also to demonstrate and maintain (a) "outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level" (as defined later in this section) in at least one of their primary areas of focus, (b) at least "excellence" (as defined later in this section) in their other primary area of focus and (c) "outstanding contributions" (as defined later in this section) in service.

Hiring, re-appointment and/or promotion at each rank will require an evaluation that these expectations are met. Below we have identified key criteria that define "excellence" and "outstanding performance" in the areas of Teaching, Clinical Scholarship, Practice and Service. In Appendix, we have further identified indicators for each of these criteria as well as for evaluating achievement of the minimum expectations for all clinical faculty identified earlier in section 5.

Teaching

Criteria for "excellence" in this area:

- o Excellence in teaching courses that are central to the preparation of the assigned entry level and/or advanced practitioners
- o Excellence in supporting students' internships and other experiences in the field
- o Excellence in working one-on-one with students
- o Has developed an attitude of inquiry towards his/her own teaching practice that leads to continuous reflection and improvement
- o Effective and pro-active participation in the management of relevant programs for the preparation of entry level and/or advanced practitioners

Criteria for "outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level" in this area:

In addition to meeting all the "excellence" criteria listed above, the clinical faculty member also demonstrates:

- o Exceptional record of preparing high quality practitioners
- o Reputation as an outstanding teacher beyond the local level
- o Evidence of influencing curriculum and/or teaching practices of other higher education teachers beyond the Warner School

Clinical Scholarship

Criteria for “excellence” in this area:

- o Has a coherent and worthwhile plan that guides his/her scholarly efforts and contributions
- o Sustained engagement in worthwhile studies contributing to the identification and refinement of best policies and practices in education
- o Record of efforts aiming at the identification of questions and issues worth researching because of their potential impact on policies and practices and at helping other educators find, analyze and translate research into practice
- o Established record of dissemination efforts in outlets that are appropriate given the purposes of the study and the audiences one is trying to reach
- o External validation of the value of these contributions for improving educational policies and practices

Criteria for “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the “excellence” criteria listed above, the clinical faculty member also demonstrates:

- o A strong record of scholarly output that has provided significant contributions to the improvement of educational policies and practices beyond the local level
- o National recognition of being an expert in the field
- o Record of substantial external funding (only when relevant/applicable)

Practice towards improving educational policies and practices

Criteria for “excellence” in this area:

- o Excellence as an experienced practitioner in the chosen type of practice
- o Local reputation as an excellent practitioner
- o A strong record of providing opportunities for other practitioners to learn from one’s innovative practice
- o Evidence of having contributed to improving educational policies and/or practices through one’s practice
- o Ability to self-support one’s practice

Criteria for “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the “excellence” criteria listed above, the clinical faculty member also demonstrates:

- o Reputation as an excellent practitioner beyond the local level
- o Evidence of having contributed to improving educational policies and/or practices beyond the local level

Service:

Criteria for “excellence” in this area:

- o Sustained record of being a productive, constructive and valued member of the Warner School community

- o Evidence of having made some substantial contributions to the Warner School “as an institution” (i.e., beyond contributions to specific components of the Warner School mission made through one’s teaching, scholarship and/or practice)
- o Sustained record of participation in activities that are needed to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of one’s profession

Criteria for “outstanding performance” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the excellence criteria listed above, a clinical faculty member also demonstrates some of the following:

- o Evidence of some participation in the life of the university beyond the Warner School
- o Sustained record of having made major contributions to the Warner School and/or the University of Rochester “as an institution” (i.e., beyond contributions to specific components of the Warner School mission made through one’s teaching, scholarship and/or practice)
- o Record of some leadership role in activities that are necessary to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of one’s profession at and beyond the local level

Relevant accomplishments achieved prior to employment at the Warner School or as part of the clinical faculty member’s activities outside their Warner School appointment (ex: part-time clinical faculty members who are “practicing” or participating in other relevant educational initiatives during the time not devoted to the Warner School) will be counted as appropriate towards achievements in the areas of Practice, Clinical Scholarship and/or Service to the profession.

The thresholds established for hiring, promotion and re-appointment at each given rank are no different for part-time or full-time clinical faculty. However, it is to be expected that part-time faculty will usually need more time than full-time faculty before they can achieve the same thresholds.

Length of service, by itself, is not a sufficient justification for promotion.

8. Process to decide on new faculty positions

Final decisions about faculty positions – i.e., whether a position will be continued and/or a new one created, the definition of the position (i.e., field of specialization and scope), and whether it will be tenure-track or non-tenure-track – has so far been made by the Dean, with the approval of the Provost, and we expect that to continue to be the case as this is indeed one of the major responsibilities of the leadership of the Warner School and the University as a whole.

At the same time, we want to ensure that this decision will be made in consultation with the faculty so as to ensure that their knowledge and input can be taken into full consideration in making these critical decisions. We believe that the following process will help considerably in addressing this goal:

- A meeting open to all faculty will be held at least once a year to discuss current faculty lines, needs for new faculty and/or plans for adding new faculty lines (/tenure-track and/or clinical). This discussion will involve gathering and sharing data about student numbers and other relevant information, as well as Chairs' and individual faculty's opinions about the future directions of the Warner School. Written comments will be solicited from faculty members who may not be able to attend the meeting.
- Whenever there is the need and/or opportunity to define a new faculty position – either because one has been left vacant and/or there is the need and opportunity to add a new position -- a proposal for that specific position (including its “field of specialization” and whether it should be tenure-track or clinical) will be developed by the Dean in consultation with Chairs and faculty, and then presented to the Provost for approval.

9. Hiring Process for Clinical Faculty

(NOTE: This process assumes that a decision has already been made about the nature and availability of the clinical position to be filled)

The process we propose to employ for the hiring of clinical faculty at all ranks has been designed to parallel as much as possible our current practices in the hiring process of tenure-track faculty, and consists of the following main steps to ensure maximum opportunities for the entire Warner faculty to provide input in the final decision:

- o An ad is placed in the Chronicle of Higher Education and other relevant publications and/or electronic list-serves
- o A search committee is appointed by the Dean to oversee and manage the hiring process. The search committee usually comprises of the Chair/Director of the unit where the position is mainly located (whether tenure-track or clinical), another clinical faculty from that unit and a clinical faculty from a different unit. The members of the search committee are selected among the Warner faculty that can best inform the selection for that particular position (and, therefore, will likely include mostly clinical faculty members). Tenure-track faculty with expertise in the area of the new faculty position may be asked to serve as an ad-hoc advisor to the search committee.
- o The search committee reviews the applicants' files and identifies a first "short list".
- o The entire faculty is invited to review the applicants' files (knowing what the recommended "short list" is, but also having access to the other applicants' files if they wish to review them as well) and meets with the search committee and the Dean to provide input about which applicants should be invited for a campus visit. NOTE: whenever an applicant requests confidentiality, the faculty will be informed of the request and bound to it.
- o After the meeting with the faculty, the search committee discusses with the Dean who should be invited for a campus visit and a joint decision is reached.
- o Each campus visit will include at least the following elements:
 - o a colloquium by the applicant, focusing on the applicants' professional activities, scholarly interests and/or plans for the position
 - o a group interview of the applicant by all faculty in the unit, focusing on the applicant's teaching and service qualifications and interests
 - o an individual interview with the unit's Chair/Director
 - o an individual interview with the Dean
 - o (as time permits) selected one-on-one meetings with individual faculty
- o After all campus interviews have been completed, the entire faculty is invited to provide their feedback in a meeting with the search committee and the Dean where all finalists are reviewed and discussed (faculty who cannot attend are invited to provide written feedback to be publicly shared at the meeting).
- o The search committee makes a recommendation to the Dean that includes (a) an analysis of perceived strengths and weaknesses of all finalists, (b) which applicants seem viable for the position and (c) the committee's ranking of the finalists.

- o The Dean makes the final decision (to be approved by the Provost if the appointment is at Associate or Full Professor rank).

10. Re-appointment Process for Clinical Faculty

As articulated earlier in section 6, we suggest that all clinical faculty, regardless of their term of appointment, receive a “major re-appointment review” involving the Warner School faculty every 3-5 years. At the same time, there may also be the need, in-between these major reviews, to evaluate whether a 1-2 year appointment or a 3-year rolling appointment should or should not be reviewed. In this section, we describe separately the processes that will be followed in these two different situations.

(a) “Major” reappointment review

- The clinical faculty member prepares his/her “case,” which includes:
 - CV
 - Personal statement
 - Evidence of scholarly work
 - Evidence of teaching accomplishments (including syllabi and teaching evaluations for all courses taught, and/or other data as appropriate to document other kinds of teaching responsibilities)
 - Evidence of practice towards improving policies and practices
 - Other relevant documents/artifacts as appropriate to provide supporting evidence for the Personal Statement
- An ad-hoc re-appointment committee is appointed by the Dean to manage the re-appointment process and provide a written recommendation to the Dean. The re-appointment committee comprises of three Warner clinical faculty members at rank or above, and an additional tenure-track faculty member at rank or above as a non-voting member. Usually the re-appointment committee is chaired by the Chair/Director of the unit the faculty member is affiliated with, and includes at least another faculty from that unit and a faculty from a different unit.
- All Warner School faculty, staff, and students in the program, as well as selected community members who have worked with the candidate, are invited to send letters providing relevant insights and feedback about the candidates (to be added as documentation to the other materials put together by the candidate)
- Additional input is sought through a meeting led by the ad-hoc re-appointment committee to which all faculty at rank or above (clinical and tenure-track) are invited to come and discuss the candidate’s work and contributions to the Warner School
- All clinical faculty members at rank and above are invited to write their evaluation of the case, stating their recommendation to the re-appointment committee and the Dean. (NOTE: if any faculty member requests confidentiality, the Dean will not forward his/her letter to the re-appointment committee).
- Based on all these information, the reappointment committee prepares a written recommendation for the Dean
- The Dean reviews the case and the committee’s recommendation, and makes the final decision, pending Provost’s positive review of the process

(b) Annual “renewal”

- o The process takes place in conjunction with the faculty annual evaluation.
- o No additional documentation is required from the clinical faculty member beyond what expected for their annual evaluation.
- o The Dean solicits faculty input by asking if anyone wishes to share any concerns about the renewal of this appointment and/or the value of continuing it; confidentiality of these communications will be guaranteed.
- o The Dean discusses the case with the Chair/Director of the unit the faculty is affiliated with.
- o The Chair makes a written recommendation to the Dean of whether the appointment should be renewed or not, including a brief rationale addressing both the faculty member’s performance and the value of the position for the department.
- o The Dean makes the final decision about renewal and communicates it in writing to the faculty member

NOTE: If the decision is that the contract should NOT be renewed, then a major re-appointment review will be scheduled for the following year (since it will correspond to the last year prior to the expiration of the clinical faculty member’s contract); this will provide an opportunity for the entire faculty to examine the case and provide input before any final decision is made to terminate the appointment.

11. Promotion Process for Clinical Faculty

The process we propose to employ for the promotion of clinical faculty at all ranks has been designed to parallel as much as possible our current practices in the promotion process of tenure-track faculty, and consists of the following main steps:

- The clinical faculty member prepares his/her “case,” which includes:
 - o CV
 - o Personal statement
 - o Evidence of scholarly work
 - o Evidence of teaching accomplishments (including syllabi and teaching evaluations for all courses taught, and/or other data as appropriate to document other kinds of teaching responsibilities)
 - o Evidence of practice towards improving policies and practices
- Other relevant documents/artifacts as appropriate to provide supporting evidence for the Personal Statement
- An ad-hoc promotion committee is appointed by the Dean to manage the promotion process and provide a written recommendation to the Dean. The promotion committee comprises of three Warner clinical faculty members at rank or above, and one additional tenure-track faculty member at rank or above as a non-voting member, all chosen among the Warner faculty who are best qualified to evaluate the faculty member’s qualifications and performance. At least one of these individuals must be outside the unit the faculty member is affiliated with.
- The promotion committee selected a number of experts in the faculty member’s field as external referees, and solicits their written evaluation of the case (*not required in the case of promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor*)
- All Warner School faculty, staff, and students in the program, as well as selected community members who have worked with the candidate, are invited to send letters providing relevant insights and feedback about the candidates (to be added as documentation to the other materials put together by the candidate)
- Additional input is sought through a meeting led by the promotion committee to which all faculty at rank or above (clinical and tenure-track) are invited to come and discuss the candidate’s work and contributions to the Warner School
- All clinical faculty members at rank and above are invited to write their evaluation of the case, stating their recommendation to the promotion committee and the Dean. (NOTE: faculty writing these letters may request confidentiality, in which case the Dean will not forward their letter to the re-appointment committee).
- Based on all these information, the promotion committee prepares a written recommendation for the Dean
- The Dean reviews the case and the committee’s recommendation, and makes a written recommendation to the Provost, who makes the final decision (*not required in the case of promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor, where instead the Dean makes the final decision, with Provost’s review of the process*)

12.Principles and Processes for Changing Track

We recognize that some faculty members may realize in the early course of their career that their interests and strengths may be better aligned with a different kind of position or track.

Therefore, we want to ensure that our system allows some flexibility to accommodate such changes – provided that the change is both in the interest of the individual faculty and in the interest of the Warner School. At the same time, we also want to make sure that changes of this kind will continue to ensure the highest quality in our clinical and tenure-track faculty and will not be an occasion to “erode” tenure lines. The processes articulate below for what have identified as to possible scenarios try to address these competing goals.

(a) Current faculty in a tenure-track position or clinical position who are interested in applying for a new opening in the other “track” are welcome to participate in the search without prejudice and without any risk of losing their current position in the event they were not selected.

(b) In some special cases, it is possible that the particular expertise and interests of a tenure-track faculty member may suggest the creation of a new clinical faculty position that could best capitalize on this capacity for the benefit of both the Warner School and the individual faculty member. If this is the case (i.e., the faculty member has expressed in writing his/her desire for such a position), and the Dean evaluates that it is financially feasible to fund the new clinical position while maintaining the original tenure line, the proposal for the new clinical position will be brought for discussion to the entire faculty (following the process articulated in section 8 for any new faculty position). In addition, in this discussion the faculty will also be asked to consider whether there should be an open search for the position or whether the current tenure-track faculty member should be simply re-assigned to the new position; an open search will be avoided only if the majority of the faculty supports the re-assignment. If the re-assignment is approved, or after the new clinical position has been filled, the faculty will then discuss the best use of the tenure line left vacant after the department has made a case about its needs. As for any other new positions, final decisions for the new lines will be made by the Dean with Provost’s approval.

13. Role of Clinical Faculty in the Hiring, Reappointment and Promotion Cases of Tenure-track Faculty

The proposed roles of clinical faculty in the hiring, reappointment and promotion of tenure-track faculty, as articulated below, are consistent with our belief that while it will be valuable to *gather input* from all faculty in these processes, only faculty at rank or above in the same track would have the necessary expertise to *evaluate* their colleagues. We have also tried to be consistent with the principle stated earlier that the processes of hiring, reappointment and promotion of tenure-track and clinical faculty should be as similar as possible.

Hiring:

As it has been our practice so far, a search committee is appointed by the Dean to oversee and manage the hiring process. The search committee usually comprises of the Chair/Director of the unit where the position is mainly located (whether tenure-track or clinical), another tenure-track faculty from that unit and a tenure-track faculty from a different unit. The members of the search committee are selected among the Warner faculty that can best inform the selection for that particular position. Clinical faculty with expertise in the area of the new faculty position may be asked to serve as an ad-hoc advisor to the search committee. Clinical faculty will participate along with tenure-track faculty in providing input throughout the hiring process.

Re-appointment to Assistant Professor:

- Re-appointment committees for tenure-track faculty will comprise of three tenure-track Warner faculty at rank of Associate Professor or above, and an additional clinical faculty member at rank of Associate Professor or above as a non-voting member (i.e., will not participate in the writing nor sign the committee's recommendation to the Dean).
- As it has been our practice so far, clinical faculty – along with all other Warner School faculty, staff, and students in the program, as well as selected community members who have worked with the candidate -- are invited to send letters providing relevant insights and feedback about the candidates (to be added as documentation to the other materials put together by the candidate)
- Clinical faculty members at rank of Associate Professor or above will participate in the meeting led by the ad-hoc re-appointment committee where all faculty at rank of Associate Professor or above (clinical and tenure-track) discuss the candidate's work and contributions to the Warner School, so as to ensure an important opportunity for dialogue and learning between the two tracks.
- Clinical faculty will not provide a written evaluation of the re-appointment case.

Tenure Cases

Since the tenure decision is specific to tenure-track faculty, only tenured faculty will participate in the evaluation and discussion of tenure cases.

As it has been our practice so far, clinical faculty will be invited -- along with Warner School faculty at all ranks, staff and students -- to send letters providing relevant insights and feedback

about the candidate (to be added as documentation to the other materials put together by the candidate).

Promotions not involving tenure decisions:

- The ad-hoc promotion committees for tenure-track faculty will comprise of three tenured faculty at rank or above, and possibly an additional faculty at rank or above from the clinical track faculty member at rank or above as a non-voting member (i.e., will not participate in the writing nor sign the committee's recommendation to the Dean).
- As it has been our practice so far, clinical faculty – along with all other Warner School faculty, staff, and students in the program, as well as selected community members who have worked with the candidate -- are invited to send letters providing relevant insights and feedback about the candidates (to be added as documentation to the other materials put together by the candidate)
- Clinical faculty members at rank or above will participated in the meeting led by the ad-hoc promotion committee where all faculty at rank or above at the Warner School faculty at rank or above (clinical and tenure-track) discuss the candidate's work and contributions to the Warner School, so as to ensure an important opportunity for dialogue and learning between the two tracks.
- Clinical faculty will not provide a written evaluation of the promotion case.

APPENDIX

(a) Criteria and indicators for evaluating minimum expectations common to all clinical faculty

1. A clinical faculty member regularly interacts with local educational, clinical and community institutions and local professionals, is current on the issues and problems facing these institutions/professionals, and works with them on significant matters (e.g. significant leadership issues, administrative issues, practice issues, etc.). *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Record of participation in some projects, meetings and/or other initiatives involving local institutions and education professionals (required minimum)*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that provide anecdotal evidence of the faculty member's understanding of local educational issues and their contributions.*
 - o *Relevant testimonials by local education professionals.*

2. This work is relevant to and informs what the clinical faculty member teaches. A clinical faculty member is, thus, an effective teacher who can improve the professional practice of Warner students. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Record of some kind of involvement with Warner students that contributed to their preparation (required minimum)*
 - o *Course syllabi and/or descriptions of major assignments, projects or class activities that show how the clinical faculty member capitalizes on his/her practical knowledge and experiences.*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that provide anecdotal evidence of how the faculty member has capitalized on his/her practical knowledge and experiences in teaching courses and/or supervising internships.*
 - o *Relevant testimonials by Warner students.*

3. A clinical faculty member discusses and analyzes in an informed way the issues and problems being wrestled with by local institutions, bringing to bear relevant current research. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that illustrate how the faculty member has analyzed current educational issues in light of relevant research.*
 - o *Relevant testimonials by local education professionals and peers.*

4. A clinical faculty member is familiar with promise and limits of research and in light of that knowledge suggests interesting lines of future research (ex: by suggesting hypotheses worth further investigation) that they as well as other researchers (including Warner students) could undertake. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Record of participation with this role in projects, meetings and/or other initiatives involving education researchers.*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that provide anecdotal evidence of the faculty member's contributions of research questions and ideas.*
 - o *Relevant testimonials by doctoral students, tenure-track faculty and/or other education researchers.*

5. A clinical faculty member has the capacity to identify what is and is not “quality” research and “wisdom of practice” relevant to specific contexts and goals and as such helps Warner students, as well as other educators and helping professionals, find, analyze and translate research into practice. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Relevant presentations, publications and/or unpublished written work.*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that provide anecdotal evidence of the faculty member’s activities and contributions in this area.*
 - o *Relevant testimonials by doctoral students and/or other educators/helping professionals.*

6. A clinical faculty member offers insights and generalizations about their own experiences in a way that is relevant to and useful for other professionals in the field and to university based researchers. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that provide anecdotal evidence of the faculty member’s activities and contributions in this area.*
 - o *Relevant testimonials by students, educators/helping professionals and/or education researchers.*

7. A clinical faculty member effectively relates to two audiences – professionals in the field and university based researchers – and communicates to these audiences through the appropriate media (oral, written, multi-media). *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Record of at least some workshops, presentations, publications and/or unpublished written work (required minimum)*
 - o *Self-reports and/or artifacts that provide anecdotal evidence of the faculty member’s activities and contributions in this area.*
 - o *Testimonials by education researchers and/or educators/helping professionals.*

8. A clinical faculty member seeks and obtains external funding, if and as needed to fulfill their responsibilities. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Records of having attempted to secure external funding (which may include private practice) OR compelling explanation of why seeking external funding was not needed/appropriate given one’s areas of focus*
 - o *Quality of proposals and/or letter of inquiries prepared by the faculty member (whether successful or not).*
 - o *Record of externally funded projects the faculty member contributed in securing.*

9. A clinical faculty member develops concrete products (such as curricula, materials, models, applications, projects, conferences, organizations and/or collaborations) that influence educational policy and practice on a regional, state and/or national level. *This can be documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - o *Records of “products” produced, along with an explanation of their potential contributions*
 - o *Evidence of the influence of these products on educational policies and/or practices.*

(b) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local community” for Teaching

Main functions to be performed (if chosen as a primary area):

- o Preparing entry-level and/or advanced practitioners (i.e., Master and/or Ed.D. students) -- involves teaching courses, organizing and supervising internships, admission responsibilities, advising, supervising independent studies and thesis/dissertations, “managing” programs (including maintaining accreditation as needed)

Criteria for “excellence” in this area (if chosen as a primary area):

- o Excellence in teaching courses that are central to the preparation of the assigned entry level and/or advanced practitioners, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Long-term record of teaching key courses in the relevant program(s) for preparing entry level and/or advanced practitioners.*
 - *Innovative course syllabi, reflecting state-of-the-art knowledge and research in the field, capitalizing on one’s own expertise as a practitioner, and meeting expectations set by relevant professional organizations and/or accreditation agencies.*
 - *Evidence of using effective and innovative teaching practices in one’s courses, including instructional technology as appropriate to enhance students’ learning opportunities.*
 - *Positive feedback received from students taking the course (as provided in standardized course evaluation forms and individual students’ testimonials), peers, alumni’s employers, etc.*
- o Excellence in supporting students’ internships and other experiences in the field, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Long-term record of engaging successfully and creatively in the organization and/or supervision of student internships.*
 - *Evidence of paying attention to individual students’ needs and circumstances, and being able to recognize and seize opportunities to maximize their learning.*
 - *Evidence of using effective mentoring practices in supporting students in their internships, including how one capitalizes on own experiences as an expert practitioner.*
 - *Positive feedback received from the interns supervised, site-supervisors, peers, alumni’s employers, etc.*
- o Excellence in working one-on-one with students, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Consistent record of successfully advising Masters’ and/or Ed.D. students, overseeing independent studies and/or supervising Master thesis/Ed.D. dissertations.*
 - *High quality of the work produced by students under one’s supervision.*
 - *Evidence of using effective mentoring practices in the above situations.*
 - *Positive feedback received from the students one has worked with and peers.*

- o Has developed an attitude of inquiry towards his/her own teaching practice that leads to continuous reflection and improvement, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evidence of reflection on one's practice.*
 - *Evidence of changes taking place in one's syllabi, practices, etc. overtime.*
- o Effective and pro-active participation in the management of relevant programs for the preparation of entry level and/or advanced practitioners, *as demonstrated by:*
 - *Consistent involvement and contributions to program reviews and curriculum development efforts, so as to continually improve our programs.*
 - *Leadership in at least some aspects of the management of relevant programs.*
 - *Consistent involvement and contributions to student recruitment.*

Criteria for “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the “excellence” criteria listed above, the clinical faculty member also demonstrates:

- o Exceptional record of preparing high quality practitioners, *as documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evidence of having contributed to the successful graduation of a large number of students overtime.*
 - *Exceptional achievements of some of the graduates one has intensely worked with and who recognize the influence of the faculty member on their success.*
 - *Sustained leadership role played in the design and management of successful Warner School programs.*
- o Reputation as an outstanding teacher beyond the local level, *as documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Having received competitive higher education teaching awards (outside of the Warner School).*
 - *Invitations by professional organizations and/or other higher education institutions/units to give lectures and/or do consulting about teaching in higher education.*
 - *Teachers from other higher education institutions regularly come to make observations and visits to one's courses.*
 - *Sustained record of attracting students (beyond local area) to the Warner School*
 - *Having been identified as an example of “best teaching practices” by experts in the field beyond the local community (in surveys, publications, studies, etc.)*
- o Evidence of influencing curriculum and/or teaching practices of other higher education teachers beyond the Warner School, *as documented by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Development and dissemination beyond one's unit of innovative teaching practices, activities, syllabi, etc.*
 - *Publication of textbooks and/or other instructional materials.*
 - *Participation in policy-making that affects requirements and/or expectations for programs in higher education.*
 - *Testimonials of other higher education teachers about the faculty's impact on their own teaching practices.*

(c) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local community” for Clinical Scholarship

Main functions to be performed (if chosen as a primary area): A combination of:

- o Evaluating/studying the effects of innovative policies and practices with the goal of identifying and refining best policies and practices, and making more explicit their connection to existing theories
- o Contributing to the identification of questions and issues worth researching because of their potential impact on policies and practices and helping other educators find, analyze and translate research into practice.
- o Disseminating the results of own studies AND/OR of existing theories and research to peers as well as practitioner and policy-making audiences (through the appropriate outlets, which may include articles in peer-reviewed practitioner journals, books, reports, presentations, videos or other multi-media materials)

Criteria for “excellence” in this area (if chosen as a primary area):

- o The faculty member has a coherent and worthwhile plan that guides his/her scholarly efforts and contributions, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *A clear articulation of this plan in the personal statement.*
 - *Overall consistency between this plan and the work achieved to date and planned.*
- o Sustained engagement in worthwhile studies contributing to the identification and refinement of best policies and practices in education, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Sustained record of participation in projects that evaluate/study the effects of innovative policies and/or practices (may involve any of the following: action research studies, case-studies, evaluations of many kinds of innovations – new practices or programs, reform initiatives, etc. –, traditional research studies, etc)*
 - *Evidence of leadership in at least some of these projects.*
- o Record of efforts aiming at the identification of questions and issues worth researching because of their potential impact on policies and practices and at helping other educators find, analyze and translate research into practice, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evidence of collaboration with research colleagues to this effect.*
 - *Participation in research projects as a consultant or collaborator with this role.*
 - *Participation in research panels and/or working groups with this role.*
 - *Relevant presentations to research audiences.*
 - *Record as a reviewer for articles, presentation proposals, grant proposals, etc.*
- o Established record of dissemination efforts in outlets that are appropriate given the purposes of the study and the audiences one is trying to reach, *as demonstrated by:*
 - *Dissemination efforts in the form of presentations at professional conferences, workshops and presentations for various local audiences, organization of conferences and other dissemination events. (NOTE: all these examples involve, “oral” dissemination that requires the direct intervention of the faculty member).*
 - *Dissemination efforts that involve the creation of a “durable product” such as publications in a variety of outlets (examples: articles in peer-reviewed*

practitioner journals, articles in various other kinds of publications, books and chapters in books with a practitioner audience, papers published in conference proceedings, etc.), curriculum/instructional materials (published and unpublished), videos and other multi-media products. (NOTE: all these examples involve “product-based” dissemination, which can be done without the direct intervention of the faculty member, and as such may reach more people for a longer period of time).

- o External validation of the value of these contributions for improving educational policies and practices, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evidence of rigorous review of one’s publications, presentations, proposals.*
 - *Positive reviews of one’s work (unsolicited and published)*
 - *Evaluation of external referees (chosen because they are experts in the field and can speak about the contributions of the faculty member’s work on improving educational policies and practices)*
 - *Testimonials of practitioners and/or policy-makers that have been affected by the faculty members’ scholarly work*
 - *External funding received -- from grants, foundations, school districts, individual donors, etc. -- to support one’s projects (as it demonstrates that the “funder” recognized sufficient value in the work to decide to “invest” in it)*

Criteria for “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the “excellence” criteria listed above, the clinical faculty member also demonstrates:

- o A strong record of scholarly output that has provided significant contributions to the improvement of educational policies and practices beyond the local level, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *A sustained record of publications in peer-reviewed journals and/or book series*
 - *Publications and/or other scholarly products that have reached wide audiences (ex: books that sold a high number of copies; video-documentaries that have been broadcasted on national TV; “tested” curricula that have been adopted at the national level; reports that have been widely distributed and read; studies cited in important policy documents; etc.)*
 - *Evaluation by external reviewers, chosen because they are national experts in the field and can speak about the contributions of the faculty member’s work on improving educational policies and practices*
- o National recognition of being an expert in the field, *as evidenced by:*
 - *Evaluation of external reviewers, selected among national experts in the field*
 - *Other examples of national recognition, which could include any of the following: scholarly awards, invitations to give plenary lectures at national conferences, invitations to present to national professional organizations, being elected/called to leadership positions in influential state and/or national professional organizations, invited participation to influential task forces or policy-making groups at the national level, etc.*
 - *Sustained record of attracting students (beyond local area) to the Warner School because of one’s scholarly reputation*
- o Record of substantial external funding (only when applicable)

(d) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local community” for Practice towards improving educational policies and practices

Main functions to be performed (if chosen as a primary area):

Contributing directly to improving educational policies and practices through one or more of the following types of practices:

1. Developing and/or modeling exemplary practices through one’s own practice (ex: by continuing to practice as a teacher/administrator/counselor/etc., as a teacher/ counselor/ administrator/etc. educator, as a professional development provider, etc.)
2. Empowering other practitioners to improve their practices (ex: by offering specific professional development opportunities, by engaging in one-on-one collaborations with practitioners, by providing feedback and evaluation, etc.)
3. Participating in collaborative projects aiming at developing and/or implementing innovative practices and policies (ex: reform projects supported by grants; etc.)
4. Participating in policy-making

Criteria for “excellence” in this area (if chosen as a primary area):

- o Excellence as an experienced practitioner in the chosen type of practice, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evaluations/testimonials of peers, supervisors and “clients” on the quality of one’s own practice/service (especially relevant for 1 & 2).*
 - *Evidence of using innovative and effective practices, grounded on research and theory (especially relevant for 1, 2 & 3).*
 - *Having received some competitive award (especially relevant for 1 & 2).*
- o Local reputation as an excellent practitioner, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evaluations of external reviewers chosen because they can speak to this point.*
 - *Sustained record of invitations to provide local presentations and workshops, or serve as consultant to local institutions*
 - *Record of invitations to serve on local boards, committees, etc.*
 - *Sustained record of attracting local students to the Warner School*
- o A strong record of providing opportunities for other practitioners to learn from one’s innovative practice, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Sustained record of opening one’s practice for observation.*
 - *Sustained record of mentoring novice practitioners in one’s area (beyond Warner students) (ex: accepting interns – especially relevant for 1 & 2; “apprenticing” novice practitioner – especially relevant for 2, 3 & 4).*
 - *Dissemination of “lessons learned” from one’s practice through a variety of outlets (may include giving presentations about one’s practice, offering workshops, sharing instructional materials one has created, consulting, etc.)*
- o Evidence of having contributed to improving educational policies and/or practices through one’s practice, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evaluations of local external reviewers chosen because they can speak to this point*

- *Evidence of concrete improvements made in educational policies and/or practices through one's activities.*
 - *Testimonials of local practitioners of how the clinical faculty member contributed to improving their practices*
- o *Ability to self-support one's practice (since the Warner School cannot afford to support this component of its mission simply through tuition revenues and current endowment, and because it is another indicator of recognition as an excellent practitioner), as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Success in securing competitive grants and/or contracts (especially relevant for 2 & 3).*
 - *Success in maintaining a successful private practice/consulting business in a competitive environment (especially relevant for 1 & 2).*

Criteria for “outstanding performance with recognition beyond the local level” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the “excellence” criteria listed above, the clinical faculty member also demonstrates:

- o *Reputation as an excellent practitioner beyond the local level, as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evaluations of external reviewers chosen among individuals beyond the local community that can speak to this point.*
 - *Having received some state/national awards.*
 - *Having been selected as a subject for studies of “best practices”*
 - *Having been identified as an example in surveys/publications on “best practices” or by experts in the field beyond the local community*
 - *Record of invitations to provide presentations and workshops, or serve as consultant, at the state/national level.*
 - *Record of invitations to serve on board of directors, advisory boards, committees, etc. at the state/national level.*
 - *Sustained record of serving as reviewer for state/national exams, competitions, grants, etc.*
 - *Sustained record of securing substantial competitive funding in national competitions (as PI)*
 - *Sustained record of attracting students beyond the local area to the Warner School.*
- o *Evidence of having contributed to improving educational policies and/or practices beyond the local level, as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evaluations of external reviewers chosen among individuals beyond the local community that can speak to this point.*
 - *Participation in reform projects and/or policy-making at the state/national level (especially relevant for 3 & 4).*
 - *Evidence of adoption by practitioners beyond the local area of innovative programs, curricula, practices, policies, etc. that one has contributed to develop*

(e) Criteria and indicators for “excellence” and “outstanding performance” for Service

Main functions to be performed (required of all clinical faculty):

- o Providing service (beyond what done to contribute to fulfilling the Warner School mission through one’s teaching, scholarship and practice), as needed and appropriate given one’s expertise, to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of the Warner School and the University of Rochester
- o Providing service, as needed and appropriate given one’s expertise, to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of one’s profession

Criteria for “excellence” in this area:

- o Sustained record of being a productive, constructive and valued member of the Warner School community, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Evidence of on-going participation in the “life” of the Warner School.*
 - *Evidence of taking on one’s share of responsibilities for the functioning of the Warner School, and effectively carrying out those responsibilities (ex: taking on one’s turn in elected/standing committees, effectively completing on-going tasks required for accreditation, serving as outside chair in dissertation committees, etc.).*
 - *On-going collaborative and supportive attitude towards colleagues, staff and students – as recognized by colleagues, staff and students’ testimonials/feedback*
- o Evidence of having made some substantial contributions to the Warner School “as an institution” (i.e., beyond contributions to specific components of the Warner School mission made through one’s teaching, scholarship and/or practice), *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Key role played in some important program and/or school-wide initiatives – such as key committees/task forces, efforts towards accreditation (ex: preparing major reports, developing assessment tools and systems), etc.*
 - *Record of providing specific services of great need and value to the Warner School (ex: participation in student recruiting beyond what is expected of all faculty members; organizing and overseeing “writing support services” or similar initiatives; providing professional development for faculty and/or staff on some specific issues – ex: technology, grants; serving as liaison/support to the student organization; etc.)*
 - *Leadership role played in the development, redesign and/or management of specific Warner School programs.*
 - *Testimonials of colleagues, staff and students to the effect of these contributions.*
- o Sustained record of participation in activities that are needed to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of one’s profession, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Membership and participation in relevant professional organizations.*
 - *Serving as reviewer for articles, proposals, grants, etc.*
 - *Serving on local/regional committees and task-forces related to one’s profession*

Criteria for “outstanding performance” in this area:

In addition to meeting all the excellence criteria listed above, a clinical faculty member also demonstrates some of the following:

- o Evidence of some participation in the life of the university beyond the Warner School, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Occasional participation in university-wide committees/task forces, faculty Senate, etc.*
 - *Occasional participation in university-wide initiatives such as lectures/colloquia, campus conferences, professional development opportunities, open forums, etc.*
 - *Evidence of initiating and/or facilitating collaborations with colleagues in other units of the university.*
- o Sustained record of having made major contributions to the Warner School and/or University of Rochester “as an institution” (i.e., beyond contributions to specific components of the Warner School mission made through one’s teaching, scholarship and/or practice), *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Key role played in several important program, school-wide and/or university-wide initiatives – such as key committees/task forces, efforts towards accreditation (ex: preparing major reports, developing assessment tools and systems, participating as Warner School representative in Middle State accreditation group; serving on university budget committee), etc.*
 - *Sustained record of providing specific services of great need and value to the Warner School and/or the University of Rochester (ex: participation in student recruiting beyond what is expected of all faculty members; organizing and overseeing “writing support services” or similar initiatives – at Warner and/or involving other units in the university; providing professional development for WS and/or university-wide faculty and/or staff on some specific issues – ex: instructional technology, entrepreneurship, etc.; serving as liaison/support to the student organization; etc.)*
 - *Sustained leadership role played in the development, redesign and management of specific Warner School programs.*
 - *Testimonials of colleagues, staff and/or students to the effect of the nature, effect and significance of these contributions.*
- o Record of some leadership role in activities that are necessary to ensure the well-being and good-functioning of one’s profession at and beyond the local level, *as demonstrated by a combination of indicators that may include:*
 - *Taking on some leadership positions and/or responsibilities in relevant professional organizations.*
 - *Serving on state/national committees and task-forces related to one’s profession*