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I. General Principles  

A. Philosophy and Mission  

The School of Social Work is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education at the graduate and undergraduate levels. The profession, the state, and the University help to shape the School's mission. Because social work is a profession and is practice-oriented, there is an interdependent relationship between teaching, research and service activities at the School and we are highly mission- and goal-centered.  

The mission of the School is at the center of what we do: The School of Social Work, through its programs of professional education, research and public service is dedicated to the enhancement of human well-being and to the alleviation of poverty and oppression through developing and improving systems of social services, especially public social services.  

The School's primary means of achieving its mission is by preparing skilled social work practitioners who are committed to practice that includes services to the poor and oppressed, by improving and developing social service programs, and by promoting professionalism in social work in Oklahoma. To this end the School offers two degree programs: the undergraduate major in social work leading to Bachelor of Arts and a graduate program leading to Master of Social work. The mission and goals of the School are consistent with the goals of professional social work education and with those of the University of Oklahoma.  

To achieve its mission, the School of Social Work has established the following goals:  
1. to educate skilled social workers that can effectively serve individuals, families, groups, organizations and communities;  
2. to increase the availability of skilled social work professionals, particularly from minority groups; and  
3. to develop and strengthen social services through:  
a. scholarly activities that elaborate and explicate issues relevant to the enhancement of human well-being and the alleviation of poverty and oppression;  
b. research and evaluation activities aimed at facilitating effective practice and the generation of knowledge;
c. consultation and leadership to emerging and existing social service programs; and
d. continuing education and training.

The mission statement of the School is the nexus for the School's activities and is the standard against which the School's success is evaluated. The Faculty Evaluation and Development: Policy and Procedures document emanates from the mission statement.

Faculty development and faculty evaluation are part of a continuum. Leadership and responsibility for both of these activities rests with the Director and Committee A. Consistent with our focus on goals and goal attainment, all faculty, especially non-tenured faculty, are encouraged to formulate three-year plans. Committee A meets with faculty members around their three-year plans and the plans help to guide the preparation of materials for annual review. Three-year plans constitute a formalized tool designed to help faculty plan for successful academic careers and to help the School meet its goals. Minimally, plans are updated annually. The plans are not rigid and inviolate, but rather convey a thoughtful, planned series of activities that is understood, endorsed and supported by the School.

Senior faculty are also encouraged to mentor untenured faculty in research activities. Mentoring may range from inclusion on projects and scholarly work to consultation and advice.

Goals, feedback and support are necessary ingredients to effectiveness. The School’s Faculty Evaluation and Development: Policy and Procedures seeks to encompass these features and build a collaborative, supportive work environment.

B. General Criteria/Standards and Procedures

The School’s evaluation and development process will adhere to the procedures, policies, and intent of the Faculty Handbook. Faculty are to be familiar with this Handbook, in with the content of Section 3 “Faculty Policies and Information.” Evaluation of faculty performance is carried out by Committee A which consists of the Director and two elected tenured faculty members. Program coordinators may be asked to give feedback regarding the faculty member’s work in their respective areas of responsibility.

The importance of direct (face-to-face, if possible) communication in faculty evaluation and development is recognized. As such, individual faculty are encouraged to request to meet with Committee A around evaluation or faculty development issues. In the same vein, Committee A is encouraged to
request to meet directly with faculty members about any concerns or questions. These meetings are encouraged both during the formal evaluation period and at other times in the year.

C. Weights

As teaching and research are its primary areas of emphasis, the School seeks to devote approximately equal resources to each. Thus, about 40% of the School’s resources and effort will be devoted to teaching and 40% to research. About 20% of resources and effort will be directed to service. These percentages are intended to be guidelines rather than rigidly set standards. They may shift some according to factors such as: 1) the particular talents and interests of faculty members, and 2) the particular demands (needs) in the three areas of teaching, research, and service.

For both tenure track and non-tenured faculty, the standard weights for evaluation are: 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. Again, these weights are not rigid standards. Some degree of flexibility is needed to take advantage of differing talents and interests of faculty and the changing needs of the School and community. The range of acceptable weights is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teaching:</th>
<th>Research:</th>
<th>Service:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured faculty</td>
<td>25 to 60</td>
<td>25 to 60</td>
<td>10 to 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured, tenure track</td>
<td>25 to 50</td>
<td>40 to 55</td>
<td>10 to 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All weights (percentages) must sum to 100. Committee A will support requests for weights other than the standard weights only where such weights do not adversely affect the School’s ability to carry out its mission. The assignment of non-standard weights in a given year does not guarantee that these will be extended into the next. Changes in School needs or, perhaps, a request for non-standard weights by another faculty are factors that might need to be considered. Faculty requesting a change in weights must make a written request to Committee A prior to January 1 of the year to which the request applies. The Director and or Committee A will negotiate with faculty members regarding responsibilities and assignments.

Weights affect the annual evaluation numeric summary because performances in each area (teaching, research, and service) are multiplied by these weights. Weights should also be considered in making evaluative judgments. For instance, suppose that two faculty produce identical research products in a given year but that weights in research differ. In this situation, the faculty member with the lower weight in research should garner the higher rating in this area because the same work was accomplished even though a lower proportion of total effort (as indicated by the lower weight) was directed towards
research. This same principle applies to teaching and service ratings. Weights should reflect actual work responsibilities. For instance, a faculty with a higher than standard weight in teaching should have more responsibilities in this area than a faculty with a lower weighting. Weights should be considered in tenure and promotion decisions. Where a request for non-standard weights is made, the Director and/or Committee A will negotiate with the individual faculty member regarding responsibilities and assignments.

D. Evaluation of Teaching

The evaluation of teaching focuses on work in: 1) classroom teaching, 2) field liaison (if appropriate), and 3) advising. Advising is viewed as highly important. Teaching is defined as any course in the social work program (full time, part time, and intercessions) and doctoral and master’s committee work.

The School seeks faculty who are committed to teaching and to fostering a spirit of intellectual interchange and inquiry. Characteristics of effectiveness in teaching may include: thorough coverage of course content, expertise and currency in substantive content, enthusiasm, rigor, clarity of presentation, organization, creating a climate conducive to learning, stimulation of critical and creative thinking, willingness to address controversial subject matter, respect shown to students, and attentiveness to individual student concerns and issues. The following summarizes sources that will be considered by Committee A in evaluating classroom teaching:

- **Quantitative student evaluation.** These will ordinarily be taken from the College of Arts and Sciences (which will be administered at all program sites) or Advanced Programs student evaluation forms. In assessing the student’s quantitative responses, Committee A will consider potential biases. Such biases include: where initial student interest and/or motivation is low, this can lower student ratings; where instructor rigor is high and/or grading standards are demanding, this can lower student ratings; and that issues of personality (entertainment) can, in some instances, exert inordinate influence on ratings.

- **Qualitative student evaluations.** These will ordinarily be taken from student evaluation forms. In interpreting student responses, Committee A will focus on comments pertaining to factors such as those enumerated above in describing characteristics of effective teaching.

- **Teaching materials.** In particular, where new and innovative materials have been developed, this will reflect positively in the evaluation. Committee A will assess the overall quality of materials such as, for instance, the syllabus and bibliography.

- **Teaching load and assignments.** Factors such as the number of new preparations, the number of preparations, class size, and the number of courses taught will be
considered. Independent study assignments and any masters or doctoral committee work will be considered.

- **Peer evaluation.** Peer evaluation is defined as the active involvement of a tenured faculty peer in the development and evaluation of the teaching of a colleague. Faculty are encouraged to use peer evaluation and mentoring to increase teaching effectiveness. Peer development and evaluation may include activities such as classroom observation, consultation on assignments and class exercises, and in general, developing strategies for more effective teaching. Direct classroom observation is encouraged at least once per year for untenured, tenure-track faculty. Faculty who will be observed select observers from among the School’s tenured faculty.

Faculty are responsible for providing Committee A with materials by which to evaluate their classroom teaching. These materials should include the course syllabus and bibliography. Faculty are encouraged to furnish other materials such as: handouts, tests, assignments, etc. Student evaluations, in particular quantitative evaluations, will often be the most important factor in evaluating classroom teaching. Yet, these should not become so important that other factors play only a marginal role.

The evaluation of the liaison function will include such factors as: 1) frequency of contact, 2) helpfulness to instructor and student, 3) knowledge of social work practice as applied in liaison role, 4) ability to further students’ development and skills, and 5) communication with the field supervisor. Committee A may solicit input from the Practicum Coordinator.

The assessment of advising will focus on factors such as: 1) knowledge of School and College (or Graduate College) requirements, 2) helpfulness and attentiveness to student concerns, 3) time spent in advising. It is recognized that undergraduate academic advising is ordinarily more time demanding than is graduate academic advising. Professional advising is critical at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

The standard teaching load of tenured and tenured track faculty shall be defined as four classroom courses and one field liaison assignment (6 to 8 students) per academic year. Faculty requesting an option of teaching five classroom courses will be accommodated when possible. Consistent with accreditation and School requirements, appropriate reductions in teaching load will be extended the Director, program coordinators, and others with intensive administrative assignments. When a non-tenure track faculty’s responsibilities do not include research, the teaching load may well exceed five courses. In consultation with the Director, faculty may use grant monies to “buy out of” selected courses. These statements on teaching load presume adequate funding and resources.
E. Evaluation of Research

Research is integral to the School’s mission. Research is conceptualized broadly, and is better described by the term “scholarship.” It is recognized that scholarly work may advance theory development, empirical knowledge, social policy, and/or social work practice. Contributions in all of these areas are viewed as vitally and equally important. The term research can be further expanded to encompass “creative activity.” For instance, the development of a highly innovative computer software program or of a pioneering practice intervention model may be considered in the research area. The School encourages collaboration among faculty on research projects and seeks to develop a climate supportive of research and creative activity. Both quantitative and qualitative approaches are encouraged.

Though research is conceptualized broadly, scholarly publication remains the key mechanism for evaluation in this area. The most highly rated scholarly activities are: articles in peer-reviewed journals, books that advance knowledge (scholarly books), textbooks, book chapters, and edited books. Among these activities, (non-edited) books are clearly ranked above articles, chapters, and edited books. In evaluating these activities, Committee A will consider factors such as: quality and prestige of journal/publisher, sole versus lead versus co-authorship, the candidate’s role in the work product, the pertinence of the work to social work, scientific and/or scholarly sophistication and rigor, innovation and creativity, and the importance of the work. It is recognized that scholarly work in some areas may be more difficult to publish in “traditional,” high prestige journals than work in other areas.

Publications other than those mentioned above are also encouraged but, ordinarily, will be rated lower. These publications would include: 1) the production of final evaluation reports and 2) publications in conference proceedings. Presentations at international, national, and regional meetings are evaluated in the research area. While, presentations are encouraged they are not evaluated at the same level as are the research products mentioned in the prior paragraph. Though credit is given for evidence of ongoing progress in scholarship -- for instance, the submission of a paper for review in a peer-reviewed journal, substantial progress on a book, etc. – predominant credit accrues in the year of publication.

Faculty are encouraged to seek financial support for their research. Grants from external sources, in general, will be evaluated more favorably than those from internal (University sources). Among external grants, grants from national organizations (public or private) will ordinarily be evaluated more positively than those from state agencies. Research-related grants will ordinarily be evaluated more positively than those pertaining to training or program development. Ordinarily, greater credit will be given to larger grants (in terms of dollars) than to smaller ones. While to some degree an end in themselves, research grants is viewed largely as a route to a product, that product being the published paper or manuscript. It is recognized that availability of funding varies in different areas. This may be considered in evaluative decisions.
More credit will ordinarily be extended to a funded grant than to an unfunded grant application. Yet, because grant solicitation is encouraged, some credit will be given to application, even if unsuccessful. Where a grant extends across more than one calendar year, greatest credit will ordinarily be given in the year of receipt of the grant. Particularly, where considerable work is extended on the grant in a subsequent year(s), significant credit may be extended for this work.

F. Evaluation of Professional and School/University Service

Service may occur at many different levels, for instance, within the School, the College, the University, the community, the state, nationally, or internationally. There are at least two “branches” of service: 1) service to the field of social work, that is, professional service, and 2) service to the School/University. Both are encouraged and neither is viewed as more important than the other. Still a third type of service is administrative service. Ordinarily such service is carried out by the Director or by program coordinators. The following are examples of professional service that will be considered in evaluation:

- Participation in state, national or international scholarly and professional organizations such as service as an officer, editorial board member, or major committee member;
- Refereeing or reviewing of research papers, chapters, books, or grant proposals;
- Service as consultant to national, state or local agencies or to other public bodies where the consultant contributes to the goals and purposes of the School and University;
- Service on local, state, national or international commissions, advisory boards or agencies, councils (public or private) related to the profession;
- Social work-related talks or presentations to external groups such as schools, colleges, other universities, churches, civic organizations;
- Paper presentations at local or state meetings;
- Direct social work practice with client systems; and
- Social change efforts that seek to enhance social justice.

In most instances, chairing or leading a task force or other group would earn more credit than would simply serving on such a group. Where service is at a national or international level, this ordinarily counts for greater credit than does service at a regional, state or local level. The amount of time involved is considered in the evaluation decision.

The following are examples of School/University service:

- participation in University- or College-wide councils, boards, and committees;
- participation on Committee "A" and/or other School committees and through involvement in student activities; and
- providing leadership in or devoting effort to School or University functions that take place outside of formal committee structure (for instance, recruiting).

It is recognized that untenured, tenure track faculty can easily become overly involved in service activities to the detriment, in particular, of research productivity. Therefore, expectations for service are lower for these faculty than for tenured faculty. Given equal weights, the same service activity by an untenured faculty and by a tenured faculty should result in a higher rating for the untenured faculty.

In addition to professional service and School/University service, those with significant administrative responsibility (usually the Director and program coordinators) will be evaluated in the area of administrative service. Evaluation of administrative service will consider factors such as effectiveness of leadership, communication with faculty and students on key issues, organization, advances or innovations made, and accessibility and availability. The Director’s evaluation will also focus on relationships with external constituencies such as alumni groups, agency personnel, those in the social work education community, and potential funders.

For those with administrative responsibility, “administrative” tasks often overlap with School “service” tasks. For instance, program coordinators typically chair School committees. Given this overlap, administrators are, almost by definition, more involved in “school/administrative” service than are other faculty. As such, expectations for such service are higher for those with administrative responsibility than for others. Given equal weights, the same service activity on the part of a coordinator and a non-administrative faculty member would ordinarily result in a higher service evaluation for the non-administrative faculty. Release time from teaching and/or research will be extended to those with administrative service responsibilities. Evaluation weights should reflect the actual balance of work.

II. Criteria/Standards for Initial Appointment

Applicants for initial appointment in a tenure line position should possess 1) a masters degree in social work and 2) a doctorate in social work or a related field. Preference is given to applicants with two years of post-masters practice experience. Applicants should demonstrate capacity for excellence in teaching, research, and professional service and should hold values that are consonant with those of the social work profession. Where an applicant has not completed a doctorate, the School, with the approval of the College Dean, may hire with the contingency that the doctorate be completed by a specified time. Similarly, with the approval of the Dean, a faculty member with a strong record may be hired at a senior level, sometimes with tenure. For non-tenure track appointments, the masters in social work will ordinarily be required. Preference will be given to those with a doctorate.
III. Annual Evaluation Procedures

The annual evaluation period is the calendar year. Annual Evaluation of faculty performance is carried out by the School’s Committee A. It is the responsibility of faculty members to submit evaluation materials at the appropriate time to Committee A.

Committee A assigns scores in each area (teaching, research, and service). These numbers are then multiplied by weights to derive an overall number that is a quantitative summary of performance in the evaluation period. This number is used in determining raises and salary increments. In determining raises in a given year, a three-year average is used (the mean quantitative summary number for the evaluated year and for the two prior years). Appropriate accommodation is made so that those who have not accumulated three years are not penalized. In making annual evaluations, Committee A uses the evaluation form provided by the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). It is recognized that this form may change from year to year. The current form has five rating categories, each of which applies, to all three areas. These categories, ordered from highest to lowest are: outstanding; very good; good, meets expectations, marginal, and unacceptable. In addition to quantitative evaluation, Committee A produces a brief narrative summarizing performance.

Faculty who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion should recognize that annual evaluations, decisions to reappoint (or not to do so) for another year, and tenure and/or promotion decisions are distinct procedures. In particular, satisfactory annual evaluation does not guarantee a favorable recommendation on tenure and/or promotion.

A. Teaching

The evaluation of teaching applies the principles developed in Section I. D. As Section I. D. states, effectiveness in teaching (classroom and/or liaison) is the primary evaluative factor and effectiveness of advising is a secondary factor.

The following is an example of performance that would be evaluated at the middle category of the current five-point CAS scale (or of a similar scale): student quantitative evaluations on questions addressing instructor and course expectations typically in the range from “good” to “very good” (or, should the evaluation form change, other equivalent responses); syllabus and course materials accurate, clear, and up to date; predominantly positive qualitative student evaluations, though some weak points might be noted; and solid (though not exceptional) performance in field liaison work and advising. Performance above this level would garner a higher evaluation. Lower performance would garner a lower evaluation.
B. Research

The evaluation of research applies the principles developed in Section I. E. The following performance would earn a rating at the middle category of the current CAS (or similar) instrument: lead or sole author of an article published in a refereed journal (or of a book chapter in a well recognized press) and significant progress on some research project besides the article (for instance, the submission of an article).

C. Service

The evaluation of service follows the principles developed in Section I. F. This section outlines different service expectations for tenure-track versus tenured faculty. The following performance would earn a rating towards the higher end of the middle category for tenure-track faculty and in the middle of this category for tenured faculty: appropriate service on assigned School committees, participation on University or non-University committees or task forces, review of manuscripts or grant applications, and some presentation to local or state groups. Where a faculty has substantial administrative responsibility (for instance, Director or program coordinators) their work in the administrative role will be evaluated as part of service.

IV. Annual Reappointment and Third-Year Review of Tenure Track Faculty

Each year during the probationary appointment, Committee A makes a recommendation to the Dean regarding whether the candidate for tenure should be reappointed for another year. The primary consideration in this recommendation is whether adequate progress towards tenure is being made. (The formal tenure decision is made during the candidate’s sixth year.) During the spring semester of the third probationary year, a “Third-Year Review” of progress towards tenure is conducted by Committee A. For the third-year review, the candidate develops a brief statement summarizing their accomplishments and goals in the three areas of teaching, research, and service. As part of the third-year review, Committee A solicits input from tenured faculty. Also, annual reviews, reappointment letters, the candidate’s statement, quantitative teaching evaluations, and scholarly work will be available for review by tenured faculty.

Both in the annual reappointment and in the third-year review, Committee A summarizes the adequacy of progress towards tenure and, where appropriate, points out activities that need to be carried out to enhance the candidate’s opportunity for an affirmative tenure decision. Both the annual reappointment process and the third-year review process result in a recommendation from Committee A
to the Dean to 1): reappoint, or 2) not reappoint. Though the third-year review process has greater depth than annual reviews, Committee A may recommend not to reappoint in any year where the candidate is judged not to be making adequate progress.

V. Tenure and Promotion Decisions

Accomplishment in teaching and research are the primary considerations in the tenure decision and in the decisions to promote to Associate Professor or Professor. Service is considered in the decisions but as a secondary factor. The general principles for teaching, research and service outlined in Section I (General Principles) apply. Weights should be taken into account but not to the extent that they override basic tenure or promotion expectations. Presuming standard weights (40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service), teaching and research ordinarily count equally in the tenure and promotion decisions. Faculty who are candidates for tenure and/or promotion should recognize that annual evaluations, decisions to reappoint (or not to do so) for another year, and tenure and/or promotion decisions are distinct procedures. In particular, satisfactory annual evaluation does not guarantee a favorable recommendation on tenure and/or promotion. For faculty hired at the assistant professor rank, the decision to award tenure and the decision to promote to associate are based on the same standards and requirements. Thus (for those at the assistant professor rank), all comments in this document that pertain to the tenure also pertain to promotion to associate professor.

For both the tenure decision and the decision to promote to Professor, the candidate’s research/scholarship is sent to a minimum of six to eight scholars outside of the University. Though the candidate may suggest names, primary responsibility for the selection of external reviewers rests with Committee A. The reviewers should be experts in the candidate’s field and should not be closely associated with the candidate on a personal basis. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate the candidate’s research record and to recommend whether that record would earn tenure and/or promotion at their own institution. The letters of external reviewers are viewed as a key source of information for both decisions. These letters are confidential and, thus, are not shared with the candidate. In addition to the scholarly record, reviewers receive a copy of the School’s tenure and evaluation standards; i.e., they receive a copy of this document.

Both decisions require the development of a dossier of pertinent materials. The candidate, with assistance from the Director, has primary responsibility for developing the dossier. The candidate and Director should work jointly to assure that it is developed in timely fashion and in accord with College and University guidelines. All tenured faculty vote in the tenure decision. Only professors vote in the decision to promote to Professor. For both decisions, Committee A members vote and develop a report to the Dean. For both decisions, the Director votes and develops a report to the Dean. Tenure and promotion decisions adhere to policies and procedures in the Faculty Handbook.
A. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor

The tenure decision ordinarily takes place during the candidate’s sixth year although a shortened tenure consideration period may be negotiated between the faculty member, the School, and the College. The decision-making criteria follow:

1. Assessment of Teaching

Candidates will be evaluated according to the principles outlined in Section I. D. The successful candidate should be a highly capable and skilled educator who contributes to the intellectual development of students and to the fostering of a climate of learning in the School.

Information from the sources of information delineated in Section I – quantitative student evaluations, qualitative student evaluations, teaching materials, and teaching load and assignment – bear in the teaching assessment as does work in field liaison and advising. Student quantitative evaluations will be important in the decision-making process. At a minimum, quantitative responses to questions probing teaching and course effectiveness should be at least reasonably close to (not greatly below) median levels in the College and/or School. Potential biases in student quantitative evaluations (see Section I. D.) should be taken into account. Trends across the probationary period should be considered. In particular, improved teaching across the course of this period is viewed positively.

The candidate’s weight in teaching should be taken into account. Where this weight has been higher than the standard weight of 40%, expectations for performance should be adjusted modestly upwards. Where this weight is lower, expectations should be adjusted modestly downward.

2. Assessment of Research

Research will be evaluated according to the principles outlined in Section I. E. The successful candidate should produce work of high quality and of sufficient quantity. The successful candidate should be a skilled researcher/scholar committed to the development of new knowledge and/or theory that benefits the field of social work.

Apart from books, articles in refereed journals and book chapters are the highest ranked forms of publication. As a broad guideline, the successful candidate for tenure should publish (or have accepted for publication) a minimum of six refereed articles and/or book chapters. Alternatively, a book with a recognized publisher and a lesser number of articles/chapters would also represent publication that is in accord with tenure expectations. Factors such as those listed in Section I. E. should be considered in assessing quality. These factors include: quality and prestige of journal/publisher, sole versus lead versus co-authorship, the candidate’s role in the
work product, the pertinence of the work to social work, scientific and/or scholarly sophistication and rigor, innovation and creativity, and the importance of the work. Consistency of publication across the probationary period and the potential for future publication will be considered. Where the candidate’s scholarship establishes them as a recognized (national level) expert in a given area, this is positively evaluated. Where the candidate’s publications are in concentrated areas (lines of research) rather than scattered haphazardly, this is viewed positively. The candidate should demonstrate leadership in research.

The suggested minimum of six articles/chapters applies to a candidate whose research weighting is the standard 40%. This figure should be adjusted modestly where the candidate’s research weight is not 40%.

Grant activity, particularly research grants funded by external sources, is encouraged and will count favorably in the tenure/promotion decision. The absence of such activity may weaken the record, particularly where one’s research area offers ample opportunity for funding.

3. Assessment of Service

Service will be evaluated according to the principles in Section I. F. The successful candidate should have made solid service contributions and should be committed to continued future contributions. Service is ordinarily a secondary factor in the tenure/promotion decision. Very high levels of service count positively. Poor service, particularly an unwillingness to contribute to the School, will weigh negatively in the tenure/promotion decision.

B. Promotion to Professor

Just as in the tenure decision, teaching and research are the key factors considered in deciding whether to promote to Professor. The primary requirement for promotion is sustained, high quality work in teaching and research. Exceptional performance in one of these areas may compensate to some degree for lesser performance in the other. Service is a secondary factor. Principles developed in Section I, General Principles apply.

Generally speaking, the standards for teaching are much the same as for the tenure decision. The successful candidate should have a sustained record of strong teaching and should contribute to the intellectual life of the School. The faculty member should demonstrate leadership in the curricular area(s) of their expertise.

The evaluation of research covers the full span of the academic career. Most often, the successful candidate will have attained national recognition and visibility in an area of expertise. The successful candidate should have a sustained record of strong research and publication. In most instances, this record will include substantial publication since the award of tenure (or, if hired with tenure, since the
date of hiring). (Where a faculty member is hired at the level of Associate Professor without tenure, the
decisions to tenure and to promote to full professor may, in some cases, apply together; in such a
situation the prior sentence would not apply.)

As a general guideline, the successful candidate will have published a minimum of 15 refereed
articles and/or book chapters. They may well have authored a book with a recognized publisher. If this
is the case, a lesser number of articles and/or book chapters could suffice. In most instances, the
candidate will have experienced significant success in grantsmanship. The absence of such (except,
perhaps, where funding does not pertain to the research/scholarly area) could weaken the candidate’s
record.

The requirements for service are much the same as those for tenure or promotion to associate
professor. Mentorship and support of newer faculty and effective collaboration with faculty are distinct
assets. A record of strong, sustained service will be viewed positively but will not outweigh the basic
requirements in the teaching and research areas.

VI. Clinical, Adjunct, and Visiting Faculty

The master’s in social work is ordinarily the requirement for clinical, adjunct, and visiting
faculty. These are non-tenure track appointments and, unless otherwise negotiated, are on a year-
to-year basis. The expectations in teaching and service are much the same as those outlined in this document for
tenure-track faculty. Non-tenure track faculty usually does not have research responsibilities. Where
this is the case, other expectations may be increased. For instance, the faculty member may be assigned
more than five courses during a year. Final work responsibilities will be negotiated with the Director
and/or Committee A. Weights will be assigned in accord with these responsibilities.
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