

Criteria for the Evaluation of Clinical Faculty Members

College of Liberal Arts

Towson University guidelines for the employment and evaluation of Clinical Faculty are contained in policy 02-01.08 – POLICY FOR CLINICAL FACULTY EVALUATION, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND MERIT. That policy holds that “Each college with Clinical Faculty will establish general college-level criteria for Clinical Faculty.” The College of Liberal Arts, consistent with this mandate, provides the following criteria for Clinical Faculty evaluation.

- I. Workload Agreements:
 - A. As specified in TU policy, Clinical Faculty will have workload agreements recorded through the regular Annual Review form that are approved by the department Chairperson and Dean.
 - B. Clinical Faculty workload agreements will record the equivalent of eight course units as their teaching assignment, occupying 80% of their time commitment.
 - C. Clinical Faculty will record a balance between scholarly commitment and service equivalent to 20% of their time, with each category occupying at least 5% of total effort. Scholarship will include maintaining a high level of expertise and currency in the fields of the faculty member’s teaching and specialization and may, but need not, include research leading to publication in scholarly areas closely related to the faculty member’s clinical responsibilities.
 - D. Clinical Faculty may have advising responsibilities as determined by the department.

II. Criteria for Evaluation:

- A. Clinical Faculty share the general responsibilities outlined in Section V. B. of the POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS PROMOTION, TENURE, REAPPOINTMENT, MERIT (PTRM) COMMITTEE and meeting such responsibilities should be considered a necessary basis for satisfactory performance.
- B. Clinical Faculty shall be evaluated for reappointment with the following expectations from University policy in mind.
 - a. Evidence of departmental need, which may be influenced by the number of students in the program and area of specialty, and by the strategic direction of the department.
 - b. Satisfactory performance in teaching (including advising), service, and scholarship.
 - c. Evidence of on-going Clinical/Professional Excellence as reflected in the faculty member's teaching, scholarship, and/or service.
- C. All Clinical Faculty evaluations shall be carried out with close attention to the commitments and reports made through the Annual Review, Parts I and II, and with proper attention to the distribution of the Clinical Faculty member's total effort.
- D. The criteria and materials for the evaluation of teaching shall be those identified in Sections V.C. and V.D. of the CLA PTRM document (cited above), and expectations for satisfactory teaching shall be comparable to those for tenure line faculty.

- E. Clinical Faculty scholarship shall be evaluated for consistency with the objectives established in Annual Reviews; for evidence of continuing currency and current expertise in the fields most closely associated with their clinical appointment; and, when appropriate through prior agreement with the department, for professional research or publication closely related to their clinical responsibilities.

- F. The service of Clinical Faculty shall be evaluated with reference to Annual Reviews, to the needs of the department, and to any additional criteria for service established in approved department statements of Clinical Faculty evaluation criteria.

- G. Clinical Faculty shall be evaluated for merit based on the information provided through annual reviews. There are three categories for final merit rankings:
 - a. Not Meritorious: Performance fails adequately to meet standards.
 - b. Satisfactory (Base Merit): Performance is competent and contributes to fulfilling the mission of the university, college, and department.
 - c. Excellent (Base Merit plus one Performance Merit): Excellence in teaching, or scholarship, or service and satisfactory performance in other performance categories.

A rating of satisfactory for a Clinical Faculty member shall mean at minimum that (a) the faculty member has met the responsibilities defined in V.B. of the CLA PTRM document as referenced in II.A. above; (b) the faculty member has demonstrated strong teaching based on the criteria and materials referenced in II. D. above; (c) the faculty member has provided evidence of continuing currency and current expertise in the fields most closely associated with their clinical

appointment; (d) the faculty member has provided evidence of relevant and effective service as defined in II. G. above.

A rating of not meritorious shall mean that the faculty member has not met the responsibilities of V.B. of the CLA PTRM document or has failed to provide evidence of effectiveness or effort in teaching, scholarly currency, or service consistent with the expectations for a satisfactory rating.

A rating of excellent shall mean that the faculty member has clearly met the expectations for a satisfactory rating in all categories of evaluation and has demonstrated accomplishment distinctly above the satisfactory level in at least one category. Because teaching makes up 80% of the workload responsibilities on which the evaluation is based, a very strong record of teaching is essential for a rating of excellent. Specific contributions to exceptional teaching should be cited if the rating is based on teaching alone. Contributions to professional development through leadership in high quality professional seminars or workshops or through scholarly publication may also provide a basis for evaluation as excellent. Exceptional service to the department, the University, or the community, whether measured by quantity or quality, may also support an overall evaluation of excellent. Departments may establish additional or more specific criteria in departmental Clinical Faculty evaluation documents, which may include a requirement of maintaining licensure in clinical or professional areas prescribed for the position.

III. Criteria for Promotion:

- A. Clinical Faculty may apply for promotion consistent with the requirements for service, notification, and portfolio preparation established in the University policy on Clinical Faculty.

- B. To achieve promotion, a Clinical Faculty member should present evidence of excellent teaching, active scholarly engagement (as scholarship is defined for Clinical Faculty), and regular service. There should not a presumption, however, that adequate or satisfactory performance for a requisite period of years routinely establishes a case for promotion. The Clinical Faculty member seeking promotion should be able to demonstrate growth over time; the ability to build upon experience, to adapt to changing circumstances, or to contribute to department initiatives; and cumulative accomplishment as a professional that benefits students and the department.

- C. The department may establish more specific criteria associated with promotion to Associate Clinical Professor or to Clinical Professor.