

School of Health Professions
Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT)
Policies and Procedures

Accepted
By the SHP Assembly
September 8, 2021
Updated July 12, 2022

School of Health Professions
Health Sciences Center
Stony Brook University

Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Policies and Procedures

1. Scope of the SHP APT Committee.	7
1.1 Charge as per SHP Bylaws.	7
(November 13, 2019, section 8.5)	7
2. Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York (2021).	8
2.1. Criteria for Promotion of Academic Employees.	8
2.2. Continuing Appointment (tenure).	8
3. Academic Rank Titles.	9
3.1. Less than Full-time Appointment.	9
3.2. Modified Titles.	9
3.3. Conversion from Non-Tenured Track to Tenured Track.	9
3.4. Titles at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor.	9
4. SHP Criteria for Promotion and Continuing Appointment.	10
4.1. Rationale for and Application of Criteria.	10
4.2. Overview of Promotion Tracks and Paths.	10
4.2.1. Tenured Track.	10
4.2.1.1. Research Scholars Path.	10
4.2.1.2. Educator Scholars Path.	10
4.2.2. Non-Tenured Track.	11
4.3. Definition and Application of Criteria to Rank/Appointment.	11
4.3.1. Minimum Scholarship, Teaching, and Service Levels by Rank/Appointment.	12
4.3.2. Explanation of Scholarship Criteria Levels.	12
4.3.3. Explanation of Teaching Criteria Levels.	13
4.3.4. Explanation of Service Criteria Levels.	15
5. Candidacy Procedures.	15
5.1. Initiation of Candidacy.	15
5.1.1. Length of Service.	15
5.1.2. Mandatory Review for Continuing Appointment.	15
5.1.3. Voluntary Review for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.	15
5.2. Roles and Responsibilities.	15

5.2.1. Role of the Faculty Candidate.	15
5.2.2. Role of the Department Chair.	16
5.2.3. Role of the Departmental Candidate Review Committee.	16
5.2.4. Role of the APT Committee Chair.	16
5.2.5. Role of the Associate Dean.	16
5.2.6. Role of the School Candidate Review Committee.	17
5.2.7. Role of the Dean.	17
5.3. SHP APT Process. (See Appendix O and current academic year timeline)	17
5.3.1. Faculty Candidate Initiation of Process.	17
5.3.2. Department Chair Provides List of Candidates to Dean.	17
5.3.3. Department Chair assembles the Departmental Candidate Review Committee.	17
5.3.4. Candidate Prepares and Submits their Biographical File to their Department Chair.	17
5.3.5. Department Chair and Departmental Candidate Review Committee Review of Biographical File.	17
5.3.6. APT Committee Chair informs the Department Chair and the Associate Dean whether the Departmental Candidate Review Committee recommends advancement.	17
5.3.7. Forwarding the Biographical File to the Associate Dean.	17
5.3.8. Request for Candidate Letters.	17
5.3.8.1. Associate Dean Requests Letters of Comment from SHP Faculty.	17
5.3.8.2. List of Potential Referees Forwarded to Associate Dean.	17
5.3.8.3. Requests Sent for Solicited Evaluative Letters from Referees.	17
5.3.8.4. Requests Sent for Other Solicited Letters.	17
5.3.9. Assembly of the Candidate's Non-Confidential General and Confidential Special Evaluative Files.	18
5.3.10. Associate Dean informs the APT Chair to Schedule a School Candidate Review Committee meeting.	18
5.3.11. School Candidate Review Committee Provides Recommendation to SHP Dean. (Appendix L)	18
5.3.12. SHP Dean Reviews Candidate's Full Evaluative File and Provides Written Recommendation.	18
5.3.13. Appeal Process.	18
5.3.13.1. Candidate Decides Whether to Appeal.	18
6. The Candidate's Evaluative File.	18
6.1. Parts of the Candidate's Evaluative File.	18
6.1.1. The Biographical File.	18
6.1.2. The Non-Confidential General Evaluative File.	19
6.1.3. The Confidential Special Evaluative File.	19
6.2. Contents of the Biographical File.	19
6.2.1. Curriculum Vitae.	19

6.2.2. Personal Statement.	19
6.2.3. Scholarly Activities.	19
6.2.3.1. Statement of Scholarly Activities.	19
6.2.3.3. Research	19
6.2.3.4. Presentations.	19
6.2.3.5. Copies of Scholarly Work.	20
6.2.4. Teaching Activities.	20
6.2.4.1. Statement of Teaching Activities.	20
6.2.4.2. Courses Taught.	20
6.2.4.3. Curriculum Development.	20
6.2.4.4. Teaching Effectiveness.	20
6.2.4.5. Advising/Mentoring.	20
6.2.5. Service Contributions.	20
6.2.5.1. Statement of Service Contributions.	20
6.2.5.2. Departmental Service.	21
6.2.5.3. University Service (School level and above).	21
6.2.5.4. Professional Service outside the University.	21
6.2.5.5. Community Service Associated with Field of Specialization or with the University.	21
6.3. Contents of the Non-Confidential General Evaluative File.	21
6.3.1. Supervisory Evaluations.	21
6.3.2. Letters.	21
6.3.3. Chair's Letter of Evaluation.	21
6.4. Contents of the Confidential Special Evaluative File.	21
7. Letters.	21
7.1. Solicited Letters.	21
7.1.1. Evaluative Letters from Referees.	21
7.1.1.1. Candidates May Suggest Referees.	21
7.1.1.2. Required Number of Refereed Letters.	21
7.1.1.3. Request Sent by the Associate Dean to Referees.	22
7.1.2. Other Solicited Letters.	23
7.1.2.1. SHP Faculty.	23
7.1.2.2. Candidate Solicited Letters.	23
7.2. Unsolicited Letters.	23
8. Evaluation of the Candidate by SHP School Candidate Review Committee (S-CRC).	23
8.1. The Standing School-Candidate Review Committee Group of Faculty is Defined.	23
8.1.1 Selection of Standing School-Candidate Review Committee	23
8.1.2 Standing School-Candidate Review Committee Term of Service	23

8.2. The SHP School Candidate Review Committee is Assembled.	23
8.2.1. In a Case of Continuing Appointment.	23
8.3. Access to the File Before the Review Meeting is Convened.	24
8.4. Requirements of School Candidate Review Committee Members.	24
8.5. The SHP School Candidate Review Committee is Convened.	24
8.6. Additional Information Provided by the Candidate.	24
8.7. Voting Procedures of the School Candidate Review Committee.	25
8.8. Confidentiality of the School Candidate Review Committee.	25
8.9. Situations Not Covered by Policies and Procedures.	25
9. Evaluation by the SHP Dean, HS Personnel Office and the Executive Vice President for HS.	25
9.1. Dean's Review of the Candidate's File after the School Candidate Review Committee.	25
9.2. Dean's Letter of Recommendation Released to the Candidate.	25
9.3. Dean Sends File Up the Supervisory Chain.	25
9.4 Letter by the Executive Vice President for HS, Released to the Candidate.	25
9.5. Candidate Notified by the HS Personnel Office that File is Available for Review.	26
10. Action by the University President.	26
10.1. Recommendation by the University President to the Chancellor.	26
10.2. The University President May Consult with the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences or SHP School Candidate Review Committee.	26
10.3. Letter Announcing the Decision of the University President.	26
10.4. Letter Announcing the Decision of the Chancellor.	26
11. New Appointments.	26
Appendices.	27

Appendices

- A. Definition of Scholarly Activities
- B. Announcement of Candidacy and Solicitation for Comments from the Associate Dean
- C. Letter from the APT Committee Chair sent to People Identified by the Candidate for Letters of Comment
- D. Email that Accompanies Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Associate Dean
- E. Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Associate Dean
- F. Sample Evaluative letter
- G. Letter by the Associate Dean to the APT Committee Chair to Convene a Meeting of the School Candidate Review Committee
- H. E-mail to determine availability for SHP School Candidate Review Committee Promotion case
- I. E-Mail to Schedule SHP Tenure Review Committee Meeting
- J. Email announcement of School Candidate Review Committee meeting & File Review
- K. Departmental Candidate Review Committee Summary Recommendation Form
- L. School Candidate Review Committee Summary Recommendation Form
- M. Template for List of Evaluative Letter Writers
- N. Curriculum Vitae Directions
- O. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Process Overview

1. Scope of the SHP APT Committee.

This document is intended to guide the SHP in regards to appointments, promotion, and tenure (APT). Specific policies and procedures to be followed by the candidate, Department Chairs (DC) or Program Directors (PD), the Dean, the Departmental Candidate Review Committee (D-CRC) and the School Candidate Review Committee (S-CRC) are provided in this document for cases of:

- a. Promotion to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor and granting of Continuing Appointment (Tenure).
 - In SHP and in this document this academic rank is referred to as a “*not modified*” rank.
- b. Promotion or Appointment to the rank of Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor for qualified academic ranks.
 - Qualified academic rank: Rank held by those members of the academic staff having titles of lecturer, or titles of academic rank preceded by the designations “clinical” or “visiting” or other similar designations (as per Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York (2014) Article II, 1(k)). In SHP and in this document it is commonly referred to as a “*modified*” rank.

New full time and part-time appointments to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor (modified or not) are to be reviewed by the DC, D-CRC and S-CRC. Files for these appointments should adhere to the specifications given in section 12. Appointments for adjunct or visiting faculty and faculty at ranks below Associate are not reviewed by the S-CRC. Titles under the auspices of the SHP APT Committee are briefly described in section 3.

1.1 Charge as per SHP Bylaws.

(November 13, 2019, section 8.5)

“The appointment, promotion and tenure (APT) committee shall be the primary review body for appointment or promotion to the qualified or unqualified rank of Associate Professor or Professor or for a continuing appointment (tenure) to the faculty of the school.

The APT committee shall consist of one faculty representative from each of the academic units within the school. The nomination and election of the faculty representative shall conform to the following principles:

- a. Nominees shall be a faculty member or emeritus faculty of the academic unit
- b. Nominations and elections shall be open to all faculty members of the academic unit
- c. Elections shall be decided by majority vote
- d. Nominations and elections shall be complete by June 1st. All other procedures for nomination and election of said representative shall be determined by the faculty member’s academic unit.

An alternate faculty representative may also be chosen. The nomination and election of the alternate faculty representative shall conform to the same principles as the nomination and election of the faculty representative (above).

There shall be a minimum term of 3 years for committee members, with no maximum limit. The Chair shall be elected by the committee members and serve a minimum of one 2-year term, subject to committee renewal. The Vice-Chair shall be elected by the members of the committee. The Chair or Vice-chair must be an SHP tenured faculty member. Should the Chair position become vacant, the Vice-Chair will assume the position of Chair for the remainder of the term and a new vice-chair will be elected by the committee.

Responsibilities of the APT committee shall be to:

- a. Consider all matters referred to it by the Dean or by the Assembly that relate to the APT policies and procedures of the school;
- b. Maintain policies and procedures that govern its operations, subject to final approval by the Assembly;
- c. Assure compliance with APT policies and procedures throughout a candidate's review process;
- d. Promote awareness about APT policies and procedures to faculty;
- e. Form subcommittees of faculty eligible to vote, in accordance with APT policies and procedures, on candidates who are being considered for promotion and/or tenure. Subcommittee responsibilities shall be to:
 - i. Consider all candidates for appointment, or promotion to senior rank;
 - ii. Consider all candidates for continuing appointment to the faculty of the school as forwarded by the Dean;
 - iii. Recommend approval or disapproval of these candidates to the Dean.

Minutes of this committee are considered privileged.

2. Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York (2021).

2.1. Criteria for Promotion of Academic Employees.

Article XII, Title B, paragraph 2, indicates "recommendations of academic employees, or their appropriate committees, or other appropriate sources may consider, but shall not be limited to consideration of, the following:

- (a) Mastery of subject matter – as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards and reputation in the subject matter field.
- (b) Effectiveness in teaching – as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials or new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation.
- (c) Scholarly ability – as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, publications and reputation among colleagues.
- (d) Effectiveness of University service – as demonstrated by such things as college and University public service, committee work, administrative work and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships.
- (e) Continuing growth – as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic employee's fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility."

2.2. Continuing Appointment (tenure).

As per Article XI, Title B, "A continuing appointment shall be an appointment to a position of academic rank which shall not be affected by changes in such rank and shall continue until resignation, retirement, or termination." Full time appointment to unmodified academic titles (e.g., Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor) constitutes "on the tenure track." Persons holding such an appointment must be considered for continuing appointment (mandatory tenure review) in a timely manner consistent with the Trustees' Policies (Article XI, Title B). Continuing appointment will ordinarily be conferred by the Chancellor only upon members of this faculty who have attained the rank of Associate Professor or higher. In addition to achieving the qualifications presented here for rank, conferral of tenure by the Chancellor will be based largely

upon evaluation by peers and the administrative authority of the University, and their contributions to the University, School, and profession.

3. Academic Rank Titles.

3.1. Less than Full-time Appointment.

Appointments for faculty duties of less than a full-time nature, will be considered to be non-tenure generating.

3.2. Modified Titles.

Full-time appointments bearing titles modified by terms such as “Clinical” or “Research” will be considered to be non-tenure generating (qualified) ranks eligible for promotion. Further, an individual holding a modified title is eligible to seek voluntary review for continuing appointment (tenure) and will be considered using criteria set forth in section 4.

3.3. Conversion from Non-Tenured Track to Tenured Track.

SHP is unique in that faculty who are currently in Non-Tenured Track positions have the opportunity to be evaluated for promotion to a tenured position. Since there is no mandatory review period for individuals in non-tenured positions faculty may seek a voluntary review when they can meet all criteria as outlined for Associate Professor. Scholarship used to attain promotion to Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor may be used as part of the candidate’s scholarly record, however the candidate must show an increasing and ongoing record of scholarship from the time of the last promotion. Please note that new evaluative letters will be required.

3.4. Titles at the rank of Associate Professor and Professor.

These titles (with or without modification) will ordinarily be assigned according to the following criteria:

- a. An individual with the rank of Associate Professor would be recognized as a senior professional by virtue of advanced professional status and extensive practice experience (or other experience as appropriate). She or he would have some years of successful teaching experience, an established area or areas of inquiry, demonstrated leadership in the professional field, graduate level academic qualifications (preferably beyond the master’s, and/or to the doctoral level). An individual at the rank of “Associate Professor” would demonstrate at least the minimum levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service required for such a position (see section 4).
- b. An individual with the rank of Professor will be reserved for senior professionals with extensive professional credentials and, except in extraordinary instances, for those who hold a relevant doctoral degree, have attained widespread (national and/or international) recognition for professional leadership, have made significant contributions to the literature (usually reflected by an extensive list of publications in refereed journals), and have shown strong leadership in this School and University. An individual at the rank of “Professor” would demonstrate at least the minimum levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service required for such a position (see section 4).

4. SHP Criteria for Promotion and Continuing Appointment.

4.1. Rationale for and Application of Criteria.

The SHP faculty members share the University's goal and contribute to the fulfillment of the campus mission in the areas of teaching, research, and service. However, the criteria for promotion and/or continuing appointment outlined below are designed to recognize that the contributions of SHP faculty, particularly clinical professionals, may differ in nature and emphasis from those of traditional faculty. The following criteria shall be applied to individual faculty to evaluate their performance based on the mission of the SHP. Candidates shall be evaluated based on their contributions to the School's mission of excellence in multidisciplinary education that fosters research, scholarly activity, critical thinking, evidence-based practice, human diversity, professionalism, ethical behavior, service and teamwork in health care. Faculty members contribute to the School's mission in a number of ways. They do so as teachers of the knowledge, attitudes and skills needed to ensure excellence in practice; as scholars who encourage innovative and responsible methods of managing and delivering high quality, cost-effective, accessible health care, as well as, respond to current and emerging public health challenges both locally and globally; and as citizens who cultivate partnerships among faculty, staff, students and community working together toward the greater good.

It is anticipated that the different criteria are to be used to achieve the goal of fair and equitable assessment for every faculty member within their selected path of promotion. To evaluate faculty members adequately and fairly, the criteria (see section 4.3) will be utilized where and as appropriate.

4.2. Overview of Promotion Tracks and Paths.

There are two tracks for promotion in the SHP at Stony Brook University; continuing appointment (further referenced in this section as tenure) and non-tenured.

Tenured Track (not modified ranks)

- Research Scholars Path
 - Associate Professor
 - Professor
- Educator Scholars Path
 - Associate Professor
 - Professor

Non-Tenured Track (modified ranks)

- Clinical Associate Professor
- Clinical Professor

4.2.1. Tenured Track.

The tenured track includes two options for promotion, a research scholars' path and an educator scholars path. There are two academic ranks within each path that are recognized by the unqualified faculty titles of Associate Professor and Professor.

4.2.1.1. Research Scholars Path.

This path is for those who seek tenure, are on a tenure track, or tenured faculty whose primary function is research. A research agenda developed by the individual, an ongoing and increasing record of funding and primary or senior authored papers is often critical to promotion. An increasing and ongoing record in scholarship is needed for promotion to Professor. Prior scholarship (to the level of Associate Professor) does not count towards promotion to Professor. For promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, individuals will also need to demonstrate accomplishments in teaching and service.

4.2.1.2. Educator Scholars Path.

This path is for those who seek tenure, are on a tenure track, or tenured faculty whose primary function is scholarship of teaching and learning. This includes, but is not limited to, manuscripts and presentations about teaching modalities. It also includes the creation, development, implementation and assessment of novel intellectual products such as: new texts, multimedia, websites, teaching aids, and educational programs, new methods of evaluating the success of educational programs or the progress of trainees, scholarly reviews of existing teaching products or methods and projects that advance the educational mission of the institution. This candidate's file should emphasize academic innovation, program development, and educational products with peer reviewed publications, published outcomes, studies and outside institutional acceptance. Evaluation of scholarship can be supported by the intellectual products themselves, or by demonstration of successful product use or publication. An increasing and ongoing record in scholarship is needed for promotion to Professor. Prior scholarship (to the level of Associate Professor) does not count towards promotion to Professor. For promotion to Associate Professor or Professor, individuals will also need to demonstrate accomplishments in teaching and service.

4.2.2. Non-Tenured Track.

The non-tenured track does not include paths. There are two academic ranks recognized by the qualified faculty titles of Clinical Associate Professor and Clinical Professor. These ranks identify individuals who have demonstrated sustained ongoing and substantial efforts in scholarship, teaching and service. Prior scholarship (to the level of Clinical Associate Professor) does not count towards promotion to Clinical Professor.

4.3. Definition and Application of Criteria to Rank/Appointment.

Decisions of promotion and tenure are partly based on a criteria formula system whereby each candidate must achieve a certain minimum score for success. Criteria are based on levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service derived from Boyer (1990).¹ Definitions of scholarly activities are provided in Appendix A. Criteria are intended to be cumulative in that a higher level within a category will include and expand upon the level(s) that precede it. Before ascending to the next higher level in any category, the candidate must fulfill all requirements of all levels below. An overall minimum total score for each faculty rank/appointment is assigned.

¹ Based on: Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Table 4.3.1 provides a description of the minimum scholarship, teaching, and service requirements by promotion path and track. The definitions of each criteria are noted in sections 4.3.2, 4.3.3, and 4.3.4.

4.3.1. Minimum Scholarship, Teaching, and Service Levels by Rank/Appointment.

Title	Track	Path	Minimum Total Points	Minimum Scholarship	Minimum Teaching	Minimum Service
Associate Professor	Tenure	Research Scholars	5	3	1	1
Professor	Tenure	Research Scholars	7	3	1	1
Associate Professor	Tenure	Educator Scholars	5	2	2	1
Professor	Tenure	Educator Scholars	7	2	2	1
Clinical Associate Professor*	Non-Tenure	-----	4	1	1	1
Clinical Professor^	Non-Tenure	-----	5	1	1	1

*Must demonstrate a significant period (typically 5-7 years) of sustained and substantial effort; at least 2 of the 4 points must be derived from either teaching or scholarship

^Must demonstrate an additional significant period (typically 5-7 years) of sustained, ongoing and substantial effort since prior promotion; at least 2 of the 5 points must be derived from either teaching or scholarship.

4.3.2. Explanation of Scholarship Criteria Levels.

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate a minimum level of scholarship. Scholarship includes, but is not limited to, direct contributions to knowledge, reviews of existing practice, innovative and supportive applications of existing discoveries, and contributions to the development of creative teaching and learning in the professions. Levels of scholarship are defined as:

Points/Level	Scholarship Criteria
1	The candidate must demonstrate an ongoing pattern of scholarly activity. This activity should be incorporated into their duties and activities as a member of the faculty at the institution. Scholarship includes, but is not limited to, direct contributions to knowledge, reviews of existing practice, innovative and supportive applications of existing discoveries, and contributions to the development of creative teaching and learning in the professions. Dissemination of scholarship must occur and may be in the form of print, presentation or alternative media. There is no requirement of refereed articles.
2	In addition to level 1, the candidate must demonstrate a steady or increasing record of peer reviewed publications. Evidence of peer reviewed scholarly activity at this level includes journal articles, book chapters or other modes of scholarship. Additional scholarship at this level should include presentations (keynote or invited by conference organizers specifically for your expertise/research and/or peer-reviewed) at symposia or at society/professional meetings.
3	In addition to level 2, the candidate must supervise an independent, productive research program or demonstrate a pattern of scholarship that addresses significant problems or topics. There must be evidence of a national reputation and respect among peers documented through such vehicles as letters of recommendation, invited lectures, extensive citation or use of published work. There must be a solid record of first or senior author publications in leading peer reviewed journals in the candidate's field, as well as books, and/or other recognized intellectual products that can be objectively evaluated on a retrospective basis. The candidate should serve as a Principal Investigator of at least one awarded competitively reviewed grant. The candidate may also attract research students and/or faculty to their research group.
4	In addition to level 3, the candidate must achieve a wide national or international reputation for research or other scholarly contributions and be recognized as a major influence in their academic discipline. Recognition may take the form of national/international awards and/or honors.

4.3.3. Explanation of Teaching Criteria Levels.

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate a minimum level of teaching effectiveness. Teaching may include instruction in the classroom, clinical or lab environments, and/or mentoring. Teaching effectiveness may be evidenced by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials on new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation. Levels of teaching effectiveness are defined as:

Points/Level	Teaching Criteria
1	The candidate must contribute to the University's teaching mission and should carry out teaching duties in a competent, effective and responsible fashion. They must relate well with learners and teaching colleagues. The candidate must submit comparative quantitative and qualitative evidence from student, peer, and Program Director and/or Chair.
2	In addition to the criteria in 1, the file must include evidence that the candidate is an exceptional instructor with substantial responsibility for teaching, course development, revision or administration. This level must have evidence from peer and Program Director and/or Chair evaluations. This may also be evidenced by receipt of awards for teaching. Inclusion of lesson plans, lecture notes, presentations, etc., are not necessary unless they are demonstrating innovative or exemplary items.
3	In addition to the criteria in 2, the candidate must present evidence of innovative and creative teaching methods and/or curricular materials. This may be substantiated by course material publication and/or adoption of such material by other programs. Evidence should also include mentorship of peer faculty, external evaluations, or objective assessment related to course or program outcomes.
4	In addition to the criteria in 3, the candidate must achieve a wide national or international reputation for their educational contributions and be recognized as having a major influence in the educational leadership of their field. Such recognition may take the form of national/international awards and/or honors.

4.3.4. Explanation of Service Criteria Levels.

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate a minimum level of professional service. Professional service includes contributions to enrich the life of the University as demonstrated by such things as School and University public service, committee work, administrative work, and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships. Contributions to the profession or field also constitute service and may be evidenced by such things as serving as a referee, discussant, holding leadership roles and chairing conference sessions. Levels of professional service are defined as:

Points/Level	Service Criteria
1	The candidate must contribute to committees and/or activities that support the program, department, SHP, University, and/or SUNY.
2	In addition to level 1, the candidate must demonstrate a substantial contribution to service within and/or outside of the University. Service outside the University may include professional and/or community activities.
3	In addition to level 2, the candidate must show evidence of leadership within University, SUNY or professional activities.

5. Candidacy Procedures.

5.1. Initiation of Candidacy.

5.1.1. Length of Service.

For promotion in rank, completion of a minimum period of service with the University may be a consideration but shall not be a qualification (The Trustees' Policies (2021) Article XII, Title B, 3).

5.1.2. Mandatory Review for Continuing Appointment.

When consideration of a continuing appointment is mandatory, the faculty member initiates their candidacy for continuing appointment unless the faculty member submits a resignation, to take effect no later than the end of their term.

5.1.3. Voluntary Review for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.

Any individual faculty member of academic rank initiates their candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment at any time prior to either receiving notice of non-reappointment or submitting a resignation. The faculty member shall communicate their intentions to their Chair.

5.2. Roles and Responsibilities.

5.2.1. Role of the Faculty Candidate.

The faculty member must notify their DC of their intention to apply for promotion and/or continuing appointment. The candidate is responsible for preparing their biographical file (section 6) and preparing a list of individuals for solicited and evaluative letters (section 7). The complete Biographical File with the dated signature of the candidate should be submitted to the DC in one binder hard copy format and a digital copy prior to the deadline noted on the APT timeline.

5.2.2. Role of the Department Chair.

The DC shall provide to the Dean a list, without recommendation, of potential candidates who may be considered for promotion and/or continuing appointment in the current APT cycle. The DC shall submit the binder containing the hard and digital copy of the Biographical File to the APT Chair. The DC shall assemble the D-CRC consisting of at least three faculty members at or above the rank of the proposed candidate. The DC cannot serve on the D-CRC. When needed, D-CRC members can be invited by the DC, in consultation with the candidate, from outside of the department but within SHP. The Biographical File is made available by the DC to the D-CRC. The DC shall independently review the candidate's Biographical File and submit a written recommendation in support or non-support of the candidate's promotion and/or continuing appointment to the APT Chair.

5.2.3. Role of the Departmental Candidate Review Committee.

The D-CRC shall select a Chair for the committee. The D-CRC Chair shall convene a meeting to evaluate the candidate's Biographical File. The committee shall independently meet and vote on whether the candidate meets the requirement for advancement of the file. The D-CRC Chair shall submit their written recommendation in support or non-support of the candidate's promotion and/or continuing appointment to the APT Chair (Appendix K). Faculty members who are on the D-CRC cannot serve on a S-CRC for the same candidate. D-CRC members are not permitted to write letters of support or evaluative letters for any candidate whom they are evaluating.

5.2.4. Role of the APT Committee Chair.

The APT Committee Chair ensures that all policy and procedures are followed. The APT Committee Chair also solicits and collects letters of support for candidates as well as assists the Associate Dean (AD) with the collection of evaluative letters. The APT Chair collects the recommendation from the DC and the D-CRC Chair. The APT Chair informs the candidate's DC and SHP AD whether the D-CRC and DC recommends the candidate for advancement. If either the DC or D-CRC recommendation is not in support of advancement, the APT Chair writes a summative report which is shared with the candidate. If the DC and D-CRC both recommend advancement, the APT Chair convenes the S-CRC. The APT Chair forwards the Biographical File (hard copy and electronic file) and DC and D-CRC recommendations and any solicited or unsolicited letters of support received to the AD.

5.2.5. Role of the Associate Dean.

The AD acts as a liaison between the SHP APT Committee, the APT Committee Chair, DC, Dean's office and candidate. The AD also coordinates the collection of evaluative letters from referees and maintains candidate files, both past and current. In the case of a DC or D-CRC non-support, and if the candidate provides a written appeal, the AD shall review the candidate's biographical file, DC's recommendation, and D-CRC recommendation. The AD will decide whether or not to move the faculty member's evaluative file to the S-CRC. Whether the AD supports or does not support the candidate for advancement, they write a recommendation and provide it to the candidate, DC and APT Committee Chair. When a candidate is a DC, the AD acts in the role of a candidate's DC and organizes and convenes an ad hoc CRC of peers and writes the recommendation for the candidate.

5.2.6. Role of the School Candidate Review Committee.

See section 8.

5.2.7. Role of the Dean.

The Dean reviews the full evaluative file for the candidate seeking promotion and/or continuing appointment and writes a recommendation in support or not in support of advancement. If the decision is in support of the candidate's advancement, the recommendation is forwarded to the Executive Vice President for the Health Sciences.. If the decision is not in support of the candidate's advancement, a justification letter is prepared and sent to the candidate and the APT Committee Chair is notified of the decision.

5.3. SHP APT Process. (See Appendix O and current academic year timeline)

5.3.1. Faculty Candidate Initiation of Process.

The faculty member must notify their DC of their intention to apply for promotion and/or continuing appointment.

5.3.2. Department Chair Provides List of Candidates to Dean.

This list must include the name, department, current rank and proposed promotion rank and/or tenure that they are seeking for each candidate.

5.3.3. Department Chair assembles the Departmental Candidate Review Committee.

See section 5.2.2.

5.3.4. Candidate Prepares and Submits their Biographical File to their Department Chair.

5.3.5. Department Chair and Departmental Candidate Review Committee Review of Biographical File.

Independently and concurrently, the D-CRC and DC review the candidate's file and submit their independent recommendations and biographical file to the APT Committee Chair.

5.3.6. APT Committee Chair informs the Department Chair and the Associate Dean whether the Departmental Candidate Review Committee recommends advancement.

5.3.7. Forwarding the Biographical File to the Associate Dean.

If the D-CRC and DC recommends advancement of the file, the APT Committee Chair shall be responsible for forwarding the completed Biographical File, including the DC and D-CRC recommendations to the AD. The completed Biographical File shall be submitted to the AD with a hard copy in one three ring binder and in digital format.

5.3.8. Request for Candidate Letters.

5.3.8.1. Associate Dean Requests Letters of Comment from SHP Faculty.

Following receipt of a completed Biographical File the AD will communicate a written announcement of candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment to all faculty members in the SHP who are 50% or more effort on payroll. This announcement shall include a statement from the AD soliciting letters of comment. A sample letter of announcement is supplied in Appendix B.

5.3.8.2. List of Potential Referees Forwarded to Associate Dean.

(Section 7.1.1.1)

5.3.8.3. Requests Sent for Solicited Evaluative Letters from Referees.

(Section 7.1)

5.3.8.4. Requests Sent for Other Solicited Letters.

(Section 7.1.2)

5.3.9. Assembly of the Candidate's Non-Confidential General and Confidential Special Evaluative Files.

The AD shall be responsible for overseeing the collection of all evaluative letters from referees and inserting into the non-confidential general and/or confidential special evaluative file. In collaboration, both the APT Chair and the AD shall be responsible for collecting other solicited letters and inserting into the non-confidential general and/or confidential special evaluative file.

5.3.10. Associate Dean informs the APT Chair to Schedule a School Candidate Review Committee meeting.

(Appendix G).

5.3.11. School Candidate Review Committee Provides Recommendation to SHP Dean. (Appendix L)

5.3.12. SHP Dean Reviews Candidate's Full Evaluative File and Provides Written Recommendation.

5.3.13. Appeal Process.

5.3.13.1. Candidate Decides Whether to Appeal.

The only time that the candidate can appeal a decision during the APT process is when the D-CRC and/or DC's recommendation is not in support of advancement. If the D-CRC or DC does not recommend the candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment, the candidate is provided by the APT Chair, a summary of the D-CRC and DC recommendations. If the candidate decides to appeal the recommendation(s), they must provide a written appeal to the AD for review within one week of notification. The AD will request the Biographical File from the APT Chair for review. The candidate may not revise the biographical file during the appeal process. The appeal is based on the originally submitted biographical file, unless an addendum with new information is submitted. The AD reviews the candidate's biographical file, the recommendation from the DC and from the D-CRC and provides a recommendation. Whether the AD is in support or not in support of advancing the file, a recommendation letter is written and submitted to the candidate, their DC and the APT Committee Chair. The AD's decision whether or not to move a recommendation for promotion and/or continuing appointment to the S-CRC for review is final. If the AD decides to move a case forward for review by the S-CRC, the process continues as indicated in section 5.3.7.

6. The Candidate's Evaluative File.

Each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment shall have an Evaluative File. Any review of the candidate's file is considered confidential and is not to be shared with the candidate or anyone else. Discussions regarding the file that take place during the D-CRC and S-CRC review meetings are confidential.

6.1. Parts of the Candidate's Evaluative File.

6.1.1. The Biographical File.

The Biographical File is created by the candidate. This file in its entirety is available to reviewers that will contribute Evaluative letters. The candidate's CV, which is part of this file, is available to all who wish to contribute a letter of comment. A description of the

biographical file is provided below in section 6.2. Candidates are welcome to reach out to the SHP APT Committee members for guidance and mentorship in preparing their file.

6.1.2. The Non-Confidential General Evaluative File.

The Non-Confidential General Evaluative File contains the biographical file and material that is available to the faculty of SHP at the appropriate rank or higher and to the higher academic administrators. This file is described below in section 6.3.

6.1.3. The Confidential Special Evaluative File.

The Confidential Special Evaluative File contains confidential material that is not accessible to the candidate. This file is accessible to the S-CRC and higher academic administrators. A description of this file is provided below in section 6.4.

6.2. Contents of the Biographical File.

6.2.1. Curriculum Vitae.

The Curriculum Vitae should be complete and must follow the guidelines noted in Appendix N.

6.2.2. Personal Statement.

A personal statement of accomplishments, responsibilities and future plans in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and professional service must be included. This should be limited to three pages.

6.2.3. Scholarly Activities.

6.2.3.1. Statement of Scholarly Activities.

A statement describing scholarly activities that have been completed, ongoing activities and the impact of their scholarly activity should be included. Each scholarly activity should be listed in only one section noted below.

6.2.3.2. Publications.

References to all scholarly works should be included in the list of publications. Only work already published or accepted for publication should be on this list. The list of publications should be divided into these suggested categories: (1) papers (divided into refereed journal papers, refereed conference papers and non-refereed papers); (2) books and monographs; (3) peer-reviewed abstracts (divided into poster and presentation); (4) patents and (5) miscellaneous published material. Metrics based on publication data must include measures such as number of publications, number of citations, the journal impact factor score, and the h-index as appropriate. For assistance with publication metrics, see <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4987709/>.

6.2.3.3. Research and Grants.

Research involvement should include all applicable areas such as; title/topics, brief description, your role on project, collaborators and institutional/departamental affiliations, years of collaboration, inclusion of students and their role, funder, funding status and funding amount (if funded).

6.2.3.4. Presentations.

A list of unpublished presentations should be divided into these suggested categories: (1) invited scholarly lectures and symposia; (2) other lectures or presentations.

6.2.3.5. Inventions/Patents

A description of inventions or patents including information relating to patent or invention type, status, title, year, copyright/patent/ID number, and patent nationality.

6.2.3.6 Scholarship Honors or Awards

A description of any honors or awards received for scholarship initiatives.

6.2.3.7. Copies of Scholarly Work.

Representative copies of the candidate's scholarly work should be included.

6.2.4. Teaching Activities.

6.2.4.1. Statement of Teaching Activities.

A statement of teaching goals, initiatives, effective and innovative pedagogical approaches, educational philosophy, and future plans related to the University's teaching mission should be included.

6.2.4.2. Courses Taught.

This must indicate the title and number of the course, your role in the course, the date the course was given, the class enrollment, whether it is required or elective, the group of students for which it is intended (e.g., undergraduate, graduate) and a brief description of the course and its place in the program. A sample of the most recent and/or relevant course syllabi should be included.

6.2.4.3. Curriculum Development.

Contributions toward curricular development, design or redesign of new or existing courses and laboratories and outcomes related to curriculum should be provided with evidence when appropriate.

6.2.4.4. Teaching Effectiveness.

This includes comparative quantitative and qualitative evidence from students regarding quality of in-class teaching and support of student's learning outside of the classroom, peer, course director and/or supervisor evaluations. A summary of student course evaluations, related analysis and changes made in response to the evaluation, must be included.

6.2.4.5. Advising/Mentoring.

Advisement/mentoring includes mentorship of peers and/or students. The candidate's graduate student advisees (undergraduate students, as appropriate may be included) and their thesis/practicum titles shall be listed together with their dates of completion, as appropriate. The candidate should also describe their role(s) as mentor and time commitment(s).

6.2.4.6 Teaching Honors or Awards.

A description of any honors or awards received for teaching initiatives.

6.2.5. Service Contributions.

For all of the service categories listed below, indicate dates of service and roles taken (e.g., member, chair of committee). The candidate should mention any special contribution (e.g., prepared report on a specified topic) and evidence should be provided when possible.

6.2.5.1. Statement of Service Contributions.

A statement of service philosophy and future plans should be included.

6.2.5.2. Departmental Service.

6.2.5.3. University Service (School level and above).

6.2.5.4. Professional Service outside the University.

6.2.5.5. Community Service Associated with Field of Specialization or with the University.

6.2.5.6 Service Honors or Awards.

A description of any honors or awards received for service initiatives.

6.3. Contents of the Non-Confidential General Evaluative File.

6.3.1. Supervisory Evaluations.

These include the reports of the candidate's DC, the Dean, and beyond on the supervisory chain (e.g. the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences).

6.3.2. Letters.

Evaluative letters from referees that the candidate has been given permission to see and all other solicited and unsolicited letters that the candidate has been given permission to see will be included.

6.3.3. Chair's Letter of Evaluation.

The candidate's Chair shall provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity, teaching and service.

6.4. Contents of the Confidential Special Evaluative File.

This file should contain all solicited recommendations in which it has been indicated that the letter is to be held confidential. The Confidential Special Evaluative File will also contain the summary recommendation form from the D-CRC (Appendix K) and S-CRC (Appendix L) meetings.

7. Letters.

7.1. Solicited Letters.

All letters (evaluative and other solicited) should ordinarily not be more than 12 months old. Unsolicited letters should ordinarily fall within the period of the candidate's review file. All letters in a language other than English must be accompanied by a translation.

7.1.1. Evaluative Letters from Referees.

7.1.1.1. Candidates May Suggest Referees.

The candidate should consult with their DC to suggest a ranked list with a minimum of ten potential referees, which will be forwarded by the DC to the Dean for their consideration. The referees should be individuals of rank and tenure status at least equivalent to that proposed for the candidate who can provide substantive written evaluations in all cases of promotion to higher rank or continuing appointment or both. In the case of promotion to Clinical Professor, referees with academic rank of Associate Professor or higher with continuing appointment may be used. The referees should have the expertise to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's professional accomplishments. When the candidate's work spans more than one discipline, care should be taken to engage specialists from the appropriate disciplines. A brief sketch of the referee's expertise (name, rank/tenure, institutional affiliation, address, email and phone) and an indication of the relationship, if any with the candidate, must be stated by the candidate and submitted with this list (see Appendix M). The candidate is not to correspond with potential referees.

7.1.1.2. Required Number of Refereed Letters.

A. Associate Professor (with continuing appointment). A minimum of six evaluative letters, with at least two from authorities outside the University are required. At least three letters must be from scholars who are not current or former collaborators, departmental colleagues, or members of the candidate's graduate department during the time they were a student.

B. Professor (with continuing appointment). A minimum of six evaluative letters, with at least three from authorities outside the University are required. At least three letters must be from scholars who are not current or former collaborators, departmental colleagues, or members of the candidate's graduate department during the time they were a student.

C. Clinical Associate Professor. A minimum of four evaluative letters, with at least one from an authority outside the University are required. At least two letters must be from scholars who are not current or former collaborators, departmental colleagues, or members of the candidate's graduate department during the time they were a student.

D. Clinical Professor. A minimum of six evaluative letters, with at least two from authorities outside the University are required. At least three letters must be from scholars who are not current or former collaborators, departmental colleagues, or members of the candidate's graduate department during the time they were a student.

7.1.1.3. Request Sent by the Associate Dean to Referees.

The email and letter sent by the AD to solicit the referee's recommendations (Appendices D and E) should be accompanied by the candidate's CV as well as access to sections of the biographical file as selected by the candidate. Each letter should appear on institutional letterhead (sample found in Appendix F). If for any reason a referee is unable to provide a careful evaluation, additional referees in consultation with the DC must be solicited to make up the required minimum. The evaluative letter completed by the referee should contain all the substantive points as listed below.

- A. a statement identifying the writer and indicating the relationship, if any, with the candidate
- B. include specific evaluation of the candidate's achievements (scholarship, teaching, and professional service), especially with reference to the candidate's most recent work (rather than merely to comment on the general character or promise of the candidate),
- C. compare the candidate's scholarly or professional contributions with those in the candidate's field who are at a comparable career stage,
- D. supply information when possible about the candidate's teaching effectiveness,
- E. indicate whether their letter of evaluation is to be held confidential or whether the candidate may read it either as it stands or with all identification of source and writer expunged. Prospective writers must be told that confidentiality will be maintained unless they explicitly specify otherwise. If the letter is to be held confidential it will be placed in the Confidential Special Evaluative File.

7.1.2. Other Solicited Letters.

7.1.2.1. SHP Faculty.

The AD will communicate a written announcement soliciting letters of comment from any member of the SHP faculty who are 50% or more effort on payroll. Such an announcement must give each respondent the opportunity to specify that the candidate may have access to her/his letter either as it stands or with all reference to the identity of the source removed. If such permission is not given, a response will be considered confidential and will be placed in the Confidential Special Evaluative File. A sample letter of announcement is supplied in Appendix B.

7.1.2.2. Candidate Solicited Letters.

The candidate will provide a list of potential letter writers (collaborators, students, alumni, community, etc) to the SHP APT Chair who will then solicit an opportunity for comment from these individuals. The list must include name, title (if appropriate) and email address. A sample letter of announcement is supplied in Appendix C.

7.2. Unsolicited Letters.

The candidate may provide additional letters of comment to support promotion and or continuing appointment. For example, these letters may include unsolicited letters the candidate received from students or collaborators within the period of this review.

8. Evaluation of the Candidate by SHP School Candidate Review Committee (S-CRC).

8.1. The Standing School-Candidate Review Committee Group of Faculty is Defined.

The S-CRC is responsible for evaluating and making a recommendation to the Dean on each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment. An appropriate group of ten SHP faculty who are at least 0.5 FTE will be selected to form the Standing S-CRC. The Chair of the APT Committee will ensure the Standing S-CRC will have representation from each of the SHP departments and no one department will have more than two representatives.

8.1.1 Selection of Standing School-Candidate Review Committee

The DC must put forth 1-2 faculty member names to the Chair of the APT Committee. DCs from departments with at least nine faculty should submit two names for the committee. When possible, the two faculty members should be of differing academic rank/tenure status.

8.1.2 Standing School-Candidate Review Committee Term of Service

Five members of the Standing S-CRC will have a two year term (after the first two year term is completed, five new members will serve a three year term) and five members will have a three year term. The DC recommending the faculty will indicate if the faculty are appointed to a two or three year term. Any individual on the Standing S-CRC may serve any number of consecutive terms. The APT Chair will maintain an advisory role to ensure that the committee maintains the required composition.

8.2. The SHP School Candidate Review Committee is Assembled.

The APT Committee Chair will assemble the S-CRC (Appendix G). The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the composition of the S-CRC follows the procedures provided in this document. Faculty members who are on the D-CRC cannot serve on a S-CRC for the same candidate.

8.2.1. In a Case of Continuing Appointment.

Five SHP faculty from within the Standing S-CRC, with only one representative from any given program and who are at a higher rank than the candidate's current academic rank,

are invited to serve on the S-CRC by the APT Committee Chair (Appendix H). At least one S-CRC member must be tenured and at the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. If the number of SHP faculty eligible to participate is fewer than five members or if the Dean believes expert advice from other faculty is needed to effectively evaluate the file, an enlarged group of Stony Brook University faculty will be selected by the APT Committee Chair in consultation with the candidate's DC and the Dean (Appendix I). The five S-CRC members are not allowed to write letters of support or evaluative letters for the candidate applying for continuing appointment whom they are evaluating. The remaining five members of the Standing S-CRC who are not members of the S-CRC can write letters of support or evaluative letters for a candidate.

8.2.2. In a Case of Promotion.

Five SHP faculty from within the Standing S-CRC, with only one representative from any given program and who are at a higher rank than the candidate's current academic rank, are invited to serve on the S-CRC by the APT Committee Chair (Appendix H). In the case of promotion reviews to Clinical Professor individuals with academic rank of Associate Professor or higher with continuing appointment can serve. When candidates are applying for promotion to Professor, at least one SHP faculty committee S-CRC member must also be at the rank of Professor. If the number of SHP faculty eligible to participate is fewer than five members or if the Dean believes expert advice from other faculty is needed to effectively evaluate the file, an enlarged group of Stony Brook University faculty will be selected by the APT Committee Chair in consultation with the candidate's DC and the Dean (Appendix I). The five S-CRC members are not allowed to write letters of support or evaluative letters for the candidate applying for promotion whom they are evaluating. The remaining five members of the Standing S-CRC who are not on the S-CRC can write letters of support or evaluative letters for a candidate.

8.3. Access to the File Before the Review Meeting is Convened.

The appropriate faculty group within the S-CRC shall have ready access to the completed file and to a copy of these procedures. The file shall carry on its cover the names of all those faculty members eligible to consult it, with space provided for their signatures. Each eligible faculty member consulting the file shall sign the cover sheet to indicate that their examination of the file has been completed.

8.4. Requirements of School Candidate Review Committee Members.

All selected members of this committee must review the file prior to the review meeting. Signatures must be provided to verify the files were reviewed.

8.5. The SHP School Candidate Review Committee is Convened.

The APT Committee Chair or Vice Chair shall schedule, preside and convene a meeting of the S-CRC (Appendix J). If neither the APT Committee Chair nor Vice Chair holds the rank or appointment required to vote on a candidate, the Chair or Vice Chair may schedule, and convene a meeting but must not vote. In this instance a faculty of appropriate rank and tenure status will be appointed to chair the S-CRC. Any other special circumstances (e.g., the APT Committee Chair has a dual role as the candidate's DC) shall be resolved by the AD in consultation with the APT Committee Chair or Vice Chair.

8.6. Additional Information Provided by the Candidate.

Prior to the S-CRC meeting, the candidate (in consultation with their DC) is allowed to provide an addendum with evidence related to new activities that have occurred since submission of the biographical file.

8.7. Voting Procedures of the School Candidate Review Committee.

Each member of the S-CRC after having examined the candidate's file and engaging in a discussion of the case by attending the Review meeting convened to do so, will express their opinion of the candidate in a single vote, by secret ballot, indicating yes, no or abstain. The vote will be kept confidential. The ballots will be counted and tallied by the S-CRC Chair (or designated SHP APT committee member) who will announce the results at the meeting. If paper ballots are used, they will be placed in a sealed envelope that will be included with a summary recommendation using a standard form (see Appendix L) that reflects the numerical vote and the substance of the discussion. The S-CRC Chair (or designated SHP APT committee member) will submit the S-CRC's recommendation immediately upon adjournment to the Dean. The summary recommendation form and the ballots will be placed in the Confidential Special Evaluative File.

8.8. Confidentiality of the School Candidate Review Committee.

Apart from official communications by the S-CRC Chair, each S-CRC member is expected to maintain strict confidentiality about the deliberations of the Committee.

8.9. Situations Not Covered by Policies and Procedures.

When situations not covered by the procedures specified in this section arise, the Chair (or Vice Chair) of the SHP APT Committee, the candidate's DC, and the Dean shall consult to devise suitable means to deal with the case.

9. Evaluation by the SHP Dean, HS Personnel Office and the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences.**9.1. Dean's Review of the Candidate's File after the School Candidate Review Committee.**

The candidate's full evaluative file (including the biographical file, D-CRC and S-CRC recommendations, DC recommendation and all solicited and non-solicited letters) is reviewed by the Dean after the S-CRC makes a recommendation, ordinarily within two weeks of receipt. If the Dean does not agree with, or has questions about the recommendation of the S-CRC, the Dean shall meet with the S-CRC to allow an exchange of ideas and opinions before completing their formal written recommendation.

9.2. Dean's Letter of Recommendation Released to the Candidate.

A copy of the Dean's letter of recommendation will be released to the candidate and at that time the file will be available for the candidate to review.

9.3. Dean Sends File Up the Supervisory Chain.

If the Dean supports the recommendation the file is sent to the HS Personnel Office to prepare for the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences to review. The Executive Vice President for Health Sciences who, after formulating a recommendation, will ordinarily forward the file to the President's Office. If the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences disagrees with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Dean or the Committee, they will confer with the appropriate authority (e.g., the Dean, the Committee Chair) before formulating a recommendation. If the Dean does not support advancement of the candidate, the Dean provides a letter to the candidate with the Dean's final recommendation.

9.4 Letter by the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences Released to the Candidate.

A copy of the letter written by the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences will be released to the candidate at the time that the file is available for their review.

9.5. Candidate Notified by the HS Personnel Office that File is Available for Review.

The candidate will ordinarily be notified that the file is available for their review by the HS Personnel Office within 5 days of notification, thereafter it will be forwarded to the next level of review (President's office).

10. Action by the University President.**10.1. Recommendation by the University President to the Chancellor.**

In cases involving the granting of a continuing appointment, the President makes a recommendation to the Chancellor and the Board of Trustees. In all other cases the President makes the final decision, based on the array of previous faculty and administrative recommendations together with the supporting materials in the file. The effective date for promotion and/or continuing appointment will be indicated in the President's letter.

10.2. The University President May Consult with the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences, Dean or SHP School Candidate Review Committee.

If the President disagrees with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences, Dean or S-CRC, they will confer with the appropriate authority (e.g., the Executive Vice President for Health Sciences, Dean, or S-CRC Chair) before formulating a recommendation. Such consultation should be carried out as early as possible, preferably before the end of the term in which the file is submitted, to ensure a hearing by the full membership of the Committee.

10.3. Letter Announcing the Decision of the University President.

A copy of the letter announcing the President's decision will be sent to the candidate. The effective date for promotion and/or continuing appointment will ordinarily be indicated in the President's letter.

10.4. Letter Announcing the Decision of the Chancellor.

In the case of a continuing appointment, the final decision is made by the Chancellor. The candidate is sent a letter announcing the Chancellor's final decision.

11. New Appointments.

New appointments at the senior level (Associate, Professor, Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor) are to be reviewed by the SHP S-CRC. Files for these appointments should adhere to the specifications given in this document. Appointments for adjunct or visiting faculty are not reviewed by the SHP S-CRC.

Appendices.

- A. Definition of Scholarly Activities
- B. Announcement of Candidacy and Solicitation for Comments from the Associate Dean
- C. Letter from the APT Committee Chair sent to People Identified by the Candidate for Letters of Comment
- D. Email that Accompanies Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Associate Dean
- E. Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Associate Dean
- F. Sample Evaluative Letter
- G. Letter by the Associate Dean to the APT Committee Chair to Convene a Meeting of the School Candidate Review Committee
- H. E-mail to Determine Availability for SHP School Candidate Review Committee Promotion Case
- I. E-mail to Schedule SHP Tenure Review Committee Meeting
- J. E-mail Announcement of School Candidate Review Committee Meeting and File Review
- K. Departmental Candidate Review Committee Summary Recommendation Form
- L. School Candidate Review Committee Summary Recommendation Form
- M. Template for List of Evaluative Letter Writers
- N. Curriculum Vitae Directions
- O. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Process Overview

Appendix A. Definition of Scholarly Activities²

Scholarship of Discovery: contributes to the development or creation of new knowledge. This represents the traditional view of research, and is disseminated through publications such as peer-reviewed articles, books, and presentations at scientific meetings.

Scholarship of Integration: contributions to the critical analysis and review of knowledge within disciplines or the creative synthesis of insights contained in different disciplines or fields of study. This includes activities such as literature reviews that contribute something new or are useful to summarize an area of knowledge, meta-analysis, and the synthesis of the literature from other disciplines and discussion of its significance for health sciences questions. Innovative means for bridging gaps across disciplines, overcoming potential barriers, and sharing what is learned falls into this form of scholarly activity.

Scholarship of Application/Practice (engagement): applies findings generated from other scholarly activity (discovery or integration) to solve real problems in the professions, industry, government, and the community. This involves taking findings and applying them to clinical practice or teaching and learning. This category takes service in the community to the scholarship level. The scholarship of engagement is not synonymous with outstanding service in the community. It involves engagement in the community (either through patients seen or other types of service within the local community) that is translated into findings from the experience that represent a contribution to knowledge worthy of dissemination.

Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: contributes to the development of critically reflective knowledge about teaching and learning. It “emphasizes the development, testing, and dissemination of advances in pedagogy.”³ It is important to differentiate between the scholarship of teaching and “good” teaching. Each faculty member has an obligation to teach well. The scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. The attributes associated with scholarship of teaching include classroom assessment and evidence gathering, current ideas about teaching in the field, peer collaboration and review, and inquiry and investigation centered on student learning. It requires faculty members to frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning, teaching methods, and educational theory. Scholarship of teaching and learning should be widely disseminated for the benefit of the field and society.

²Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

³ Smith and Their, “Considering ‘Faculty Priorities Reconsidered’” – a Commentary of O’Meara K, Rice RE (Ed.). Faculty Priorities Reconsidered: Rewarding Multiple Forms of scholarship. San Francisco, CA. John Wiley and Sons, 2005.

Appendix B.

Announcement of Candidacy and Solicitation for Comments from the Associate Dean

MEMORANDUM

TO SHP Faculty

FROM (NAME), Associate Dean SHP

SUBJECT Announcement of Candidacy: Name of Candidate

DATE

(Name) is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) to the rank of (full rank) (with continuing appointment—if applicable) in the (name of department). (Name)'s curriculum vitae is available for review upon request. If you currently hold the rank of (candidates proposed rank) or higher you may access other parts of the candidacy file.

Any member of the faculty of the School of Health Professions may write to me about this candidacy. Please send your written comments electronically, on department letterhead, to the attention of (name of Dean's office liaison) (email of Dean's office liaison) by (DEADLINE DATE) for inclusion in the candidate's file.

If you choose to write a letter of support for this candidate, your name will be removed from the list of potential members of their candidate review committee (S-CRC) to avoid any potential conflict of interest. If you don't write a letter and are eligible to sit on the S- CRC, but are unable to participate for this candidate when the meeting is scheduled, you will have the opportunity to submit a letter of support in advance of the CRC meeting date.

SHP provides candidates with access to your letter only if you give explicit written permission. If such permission is not given, your comments will remain confidential under the provisions of Article 31.2b of the July 2016-2022 "Agreement between the United University Professions and State of New York." Please include one of the following statements at the conclusion of your letter.

- The candidate **may** read my letter as it is currently written
- The candidate may **not** read my letter.
- The candidate **may** read my letter, **if all information indicating my identity is deleted.**

Distributed: (List)

Note: Distributed to all SHP faculty who are 50% or more effort on payroll.

Appendix C. Letter from the APT Committee Chair sent to People Identified by the Candidate for Letters of Comment



School of Health Professions
Office of the Dean
Stony Brook, NY 11794-8200

Month, XX, XXXX

RE: **Request for Letter of Comment, (Name)**

Dear Colleague,

Greetings! I am writing to you in my role as Chair of the Appointments, Promotion and Tenure Committee for the School of Health Professions at Stony Brook University. **(Name)**, (current academic rank) in the (Department or Program), is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) (with continuing appointment—if applicable) at the (Full Rank) rank. I invite you to write a “Letter of Comment” on behalf of (Name) to be included in the candidate’s promotion file which will be reviewed by members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, as well as senior administrators involved in the review of files.

Your name appears on a list that (Name) has provided me of past and current students, collaborators, colleagues, and/or others who are familiar with (his/her/their) activities related to:

- teaching (including, but not limited to, teaching and curriculum contributions as well as mentoring and advising),
- scholarship (including, but not limited to, research and related scholarly activities), and/or
- service (including service to the University, professional service, and/or community service)

Your letter should reflect how long you have known (Name) and in what capacity. It should share any information that you think would be useful to those involved in assessing (name)’s candidacy for (promotion or appointment) (with continuing appointment—if applicable) at the (Full Rank) rank at Stony Brook University. In addition, please include one of the following statements at the conclusion of your letter.

- The candidate **may** read my letter as it is currently written
- The candidate may **not** read my letter.
- The candidate **may** read my letter, **if all information indicating my identity is deleted.**

Should you be interested in reviewing (Name)’s CV to assist you with your letter, please contact me at [631.xxx.xxxx](tel:631.xxx.xxxx) or first.last@stonybrook.edu (This is the APT Chairperson).

Please send your letter (via e-mail attachment) directly to the committee administrative liaison, (Name), at first.last@stonybrook.edu. We request that you indicate in the subject heading **(NAME): Letter of Comment**. Letters will be accepted until **DATE**. Should you choose not to remit your letter electronically, you may submit a letter to this mailing address:

(Name), APT Administrative Liaison
Stony Brook University
SHP, Health Sciences Center, Level 2
Stony Brook, NY 11794-8200 (note: the full zip code is essential)

Please note that you will receive a confirmation of receipt. If you have any questions or concerns, I can be reached at [631.xxx.xxxx](tel:631.xxx.xxxx) or first.last@stonybrook.edu (This is the APT Chairperson). Thank you for your time and effort in support of our candidate.

Sincerely,

Signature

Name

Academic Title, Department

SHP Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, Chair

Appendix D. Email that Accompanies Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Associate Dean

Dear XXXXXXXX,

Please find attached a request from XXXXXXXXX, Associate Dean of Stony Brook University's School of Health Professions, to provide a letter evaluating (Candidate Name) a candidate for promotion (with continuing appointment—if applicable) to (Full Rank). You have been identified as a scholar who would be well-qualified to evaluate their candidacy.

Please reply via email by **(1-week from today)** if you will be able to evaluate this candidate.

If you are able to provide an evaluation for (Candidate Name) please email or mail a copy of your evaluative letter, by **(MONTH ##, YEAR)**. A template for your evaluative letter is attached. We appreciate your time. Thank you,

(Name), APT Administrative Liaison
Stony Brook University
SHP, Health Sciences Center, Level 2
Stony Brook, NY 11794-8200 (note: the full zip code is essential)

Appendix E. Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Associate Dean



School of Health Professions

Office of the Dean

Stony Brook, NY 11794-8200

Month, XX, XXXX

Dear _____:

(Name), (Current rank) in the (Current Department), in the School of Health Professions is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) (with continuing appointment—if applicable) at the (Full Rank) rank. (Name) and (his/her/their) Department Chair recommended you as an individual qualified to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's promotion (or continuing appointment) file. Stony Brook University requires its review committee to consider the assessments of leaders in the candidate's field. **Please note that our School's Appointments, Promotion and Tenure (APT) Policies and Procedures prohibit the candidate from contacting you during the entire promotion (or continuing appointment) process.**

A Dropbox folder containing a copy of our School's Appointment, Promotion and Tenure policies and procedures, as well as (Name)'s curriculum vitae and supporting materials, has been created for your review. It is accessible by clicking this link: XXX.

It would be important to have your assessment of (Name)'s achievements in the areas of scholarship (including research and publications) as well as teaching effectiveness and professional service contributions, especially with reference to the candidate's most recent work. It also would be important to know whether your opinion is based on personal observation. The recommended length of your evaluative letter is 2 to 4 pages, with reference to the importance/significance of the candidate's work. A template for your evaluative letter has been provided as a separate attachment. In writing your letter, please make sure to include:

- Your title, rank and tenure status
- Whether you have had a prior relationship with the candidate (If not, clearly state no prior relationship; If yes, clearly state nature of prior relationship – have you ever directly supervised the candidate?)
- Your numeric evaluation of the candidate using the Definition and Application of Criteria to Rank/Appointment (section 4.3 of the APT Policies and Procedures)

The following may also be included in your evaluative letter:

- A comparison of this candidate's work with others in the field at a comparable career stage

Your letter will be read by members of our School's peer review committee, as well as by senior academic officers. All employees in our statewide system are unionized under a contract that allows a faculty member to read such letters if a referee gives permission in writing. Please include one of the following statements at the conclusion of your letter.

- The candidate **may** read my letter of evaluation as it is currently written
- The candidate may **not** read my letter of evaluation.
- The candidate **may** read my letter of evaluation, **if all information indicating my identity is deleted.**

Please email your evaluative letter to first.last@stonybrook.edu (name of APT Administrative Liaison) by **DATE**.

Please note that you will receive a confirmation of receipt.

I appreciate your willingness to assist us in evaluating (Name).

Sincerely,

(Name)

Associate Dean, SHP

Appendix F: Sample Evaluative Letter

Please write this letter on your institution's letterhead.

DATE (please have this completed by XXXX)

Stacy Jaffee Gropack, PT., Ph.D., FASAHP
Dean and Professor
School of Health Professions
Health Sciences Tower, Level 2, Room 400
Stony Brook University
101 Nicolls Road
Stony Brook, NY
11794-8231

Dear Dr. Gropack and Members of the Committee,

I am pleased to write this evaluative letter for STONY BROOK CANDIDATE NAME, an applicant for RANK in the DEPARTMENT in the School of Health Professions (SHP), Stony Brook University. I have KNOWN.../ NEVER MET CANDIDATE NAME (state any personal or professional relationship with the candidate). I am writing this letter based on the information provided to me as part of the TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION package and with a background as STATE YOUR ACADEMIC OR PROFESSIONAL TITLE AND ANYTHING ELSE MIGHT BE RELEVANT TO YOUR ABILITY TO REVIEW THE PACKAGE. The School of Health Professions sets forth three areas for consideration in the Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Policies and Procedures (APT P&P): Scholarship, Teaching, and Service. I address each of these in the sections below.

Scholarship (Please be sure to include the numeric level you believe the candidate has achieved using the guideline provided on page 13 of the APT P&P)

Areas that can be included in this section:

- A brief review of accomplishments during the candidate's education/doctoral studies
- Peer reviewed material that demonstrates the candidate's scholarly path
- Presentations at the local, national and international level
- Grants submitted and/or awarded
- Collaborations within and across disciplines
- Evidence of a scholarly agenda noted in the package

Teaching (Please be sure to include the numeric level you believe the candidate has achieved using the guideline provided on page 14 of the APT P&P)

Areas that can be included in this section:

- Teaching experience as a graduate student or prior to the current Stony Brook appointment
- Current classroom teaching record including evidence of innovation in the classroom
- Curriculum development

- Evidence of teaching excellence in the form of noted awards, peer and student reviews
- Chapters, books or other materials that the candidate has created for use in the field for teaching
- Student mentorship (e.g., undergraduate or graduate thesis, research project)

Service (Please be sure to include the numeric level you believe the candidate has achieved using the guideline provided on page 15 of the APT P&P)

Areas that can be included in this section:

- Service within the candidate's department, SHP, University or SUNY system
- Service to the candidate's profession through participation and/or leadership roles in professional organizations or activities
- Service to the community and/or related awards

I believe CANDIDATE NAME HAS/HAS NOT achieved a level of scholarship, teaching and service that meets / exceeds the standards set forth by the School of Health Professions APT P&P and RECOMMEND/DO NOT RECOMMEND CANDIDATE for PROMOTION/TENURE to the rank of RANK.

PLEASE STATE HERE WHETHER THE CANDIDATE MAY OR MAY NOT HAVE ACCESS TO YOUR LETTER.

Salutation,

Name, Professional Degree(s)

Title

Academic Rank

Department

University

[email address](#)

Appendix G. Letter from the Associate Dean to APT Committee Chair to Convene a Meeting of the School Candidate Review Committee

M E M O R A N D U M

TO Professor XXXXX, Chair of APT Committee
FROM (NAME), Associate Dean
SUBJECT Convene a meeting of the S-CRC
DATE

(Name) is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) to the rank of (full rank) (with continuing appointment—if applicable) in the (name of department). As Chair of the APT Committee, I ask that you convene a meeting of the appropriate faculty in the School to meet as the School Candidate Review Committee (S-CRC) at this time (meeting ordinarily to be convened within 1 month of file being completed).

Appendix H: E-mail to Determine Availability for School Candidate Review Committee Promotion case

Dear Colleagues,

If you are receiving this email, it means that you are at the (Proposed Rank for candidate) rank or higher, and therefore eligible to serve on the School's Candidate Review Committee (S-CRC) to advise the Dean on a candidate, (Name) for promotion to (Rank). Your service would require review of the candidate's file and in-person attendance at a one-time meeting held in the Health Sciences Center to discuss and vote on the candidate's file. Once there is a confirmed date and time, the candidate's file will be made available to those faculty members serving on the CRC. Ample time will be provided for file review prior to the scheduled meeting.

In an effort to confirm a meeting time in advance, I am asking for your availability using doodle poll. Please go to the link provided below, type in your full name on the left-hand column, and indicate your availability for each of the time slots listed. Press "save" and your response will be sent to the meeting administrator. I will review the responses and select a date/time based on the majority. If the doodle does not result in the required minimum of confirmed participants available (between 5 and 9), I will send new dates and times.

Please respond at your earliest convenience and block the times until confirmed, ideally by (DATE).

<http://doodle.com/zzzz>

If you are selected to participate on the CRC, you will be notified of the meeting date/time. A copy of the APT P&P is attached for your convenience.

Thank you in advance for your assistance with scheduling this very important meeting.

Have a great day!

Chair, SHP APT Committee

Appendix I: E-Mail to Schedule SHP Tenure or Promotion Review Committee Meeting

Dear Dr. X,

I am writing in my capacity as Chair of the APT Committee for the School of Health Professions. In consideration of your expertise and senior academic rank Dean Gropack requested that I invite you to serve on the tenure (promotion) review committee for (Name) who is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) to the rank of (full rank) with continuing appointment in the (name of department).

Your service would require review of the candidate's file and attendance at a one-time meeting held in the HSC to discuss and vote on the candidate's file.

To facilitate scheduling, I have employed the use of a "doodle poll." Please go to the link below, and click all possible dates/times from the options provided, to indicate your availability. Kindly do this at your earliest convenience (preferably no later than *Date*), at which time I will close the poll. Once we have a confirmed date/time, I will let you know. Soon after, the candidate's files will be made available, allowing ample time for review prior to the scheduled meeting. A copy of the APT P&P is attached for your convenience.

The link to your poll is: <http://doodle.com/xxxxx>

Thank you for your consideration of this request. I look forward to hearing from you soon!

Have a great day!

Name

Chair, SHP APT Committee

Appendix J: Email Announcement of School Candidate Review Committee Meeting and File Review

Dear Colleagues,

Please mark your calendar for the following date/time to discuss the candidacy of (Name) who is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) to the rank of (full rank) with continuing appointment in the (name of department).

Date: month, day, year

Time: time of day

Location: place

The binder copy of the candidate's full evaluative file is available for review in the Associate Dean's office. The documents contained in this file will also be securely shared with you on Google Drive. Please be sure to sign the signature sheet affixed to each candidate's file to indicate that you reviewed the file prior to the meeting date, as it is required that all who vote at the meeting will have reviewed the file prior to doing so. If the S-CRC meets via a Zoom session, you will be asked to attest to reading the file. (Dean's staff name) can assist you with access to the binder file, which cannot be removed from the Dean's Office.

A copy of the SHP APT P&P is located inside the binder and with the digital file for you to use as a reference when reviewing the files. Please come to the S-CRC meeting prepared for discussion and vote based on the APT P&P criteria. The criteria are to be used to achieve the goal of fair and equitable assessment for every faculty member.

Please be sure to follow the procedures identified in this e-mail and in the APT P&P so that the process runs smoothly. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you!

Name

Chair, SHP APT Committee

Appendix K. Departmental Candidate Review Committee Summary Recommendation Form

School of Health Professions
D-CRC Summary

Candidate _____

Date of Meeting _____

Current Rank _____

Department _____

Action Under Review

Appointment []

Promotion []

Continuing Appointment []

Rank

Associate Professor []

Professor []

Clinical Associate Professor []

Clinical Professor []

Committee Members (Include name, rank, tenure (if appropriate) and department)

Total # of faculty present _____

Result of Vote:

in favor _____

not in favor _____

abstaining _____

Recommendation, remarks or special notes regarding the candidate's scholarship, teaching and service (including specific and detailed evidence to support committee findings):

Chairperson

Date

Appendix L. School Candidate Review Committee Recommendation Form

School of Health Professions
S-CRC Summary

Candidate _____

Date of Meeting _____

Current Rank _____

Department _____

Action Under Review

Appointment []

Promotion []

Continuing Appointment []

Rank

Associate Professor []

Professor []

Clinical Associate Professor []

Clinical Professor []

Faculty Eligible to Vote (Include name, rank, tenure (if appropriate) and department)

Total # of faculty present _____

Result of Vote:

in favor _____

not in favor _____

abstaining _____

Recommendation, remarks or special notes: regarding the candidate's scholarship, teaching and service (including specific and detailed evidence to support committee's findings):

Chairperson

Date

Appendix M
Template for List of Evaluative Letter Writers

Candidate Name:

Chair/PD initial for approval:

Anticipated Rank Sought:

Date:

Please use the format below to list 10 external referees. Please write your list in rank order.

1. Last Name, First Name:

Credentials:

Academic Title:

Tenured (Y/N):

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review the candidate's binder and comment on their promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

2. Last Name, First Name:

Credentials:

Academic Title:

Tenured (Y/N):

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on their promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

Appendix M con't.

Candidate Name:

3. Last Name, First Name:

Academic Title:

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Credentials:

Tenured (Y/N):

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on their promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

4. Last Name, First Name:

Academic Title:

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Credentials:

Tenured (Y/N):

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on their promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

Appendix M con't.

Candidate Name:

5. Last Name, First Name:

Academic Title:

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Credentials:

Tenured (Y/N):

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on their promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

6. Last Name, First Name:

Academic Title:

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Credentials:

Tenured (Y/N):

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on your promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

Appendix M con't.

Candidate Name:

7. Last Name, First Name:

Academic Title:

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Credentials:

Tenured (Y/N):

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on their promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

8. Last Name, First Name:

Academic Title:

University/College Name:

Mailing Address:

Telephone Number:

E-Mail Address:

Credentials:

Tenured (Y/N):

Brief description of why this individual is qualified to review your binder and comment on your promotion and/or tenure:

Prior relationship with candidate? Describe in detail or write None:

You may copy and continue this list when necessary.

Appendix N. Curriculum Vitae Directions

Faculty candidates for promotion and continuing appointment must upload all curriculum vitae information to the Faculty 180 platform and then download a PDF of the *Stony Brook* CV for your biographical file. Faculty 180 login information as well as tutorials can be found [here](#).

Appendix O. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure Process Overview

