

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

Revised and Accepted
by the SHTM Assembly
June 17, 2015.

School of Health Technology and Management
Health Sciences Center
Stony Brook University
June, 2015

School of Health Technology and Management
Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure
Policies and Procedures

1. Scope of SHTM APT Committee Review
 - 1.1. Charge as per SHTM By-laws
2. Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York
 - 2.1. Criteria for Promotion of Academic Employees
 - 2.2. Continuing Appointment (tenure)
3. Academic Rank Titles
 - 3.1. Less than Full-time Appointment
 - 3.2. Modified Titles
 - 3.3. Conversion from Non-Tenured Track to Tenured Track
 - 3.4. Titles at the Rank of Associate Professor and Professor
4. SHTM Criteria for Promotion and Continuing Appointment
 - 4.1. Rationale for and Application of Criteria.
 - 4.2. Overview of Promotion Paths and Tracks
 - 4.2.1. Tenured Path
 - 4.2.1.1. Research Scholar Track
 - 4.2.1.2. Educator Scholar Track
 - 4.2.2. Non-Tenured Path
 - 4.3. Definition and Application of Criteria to Rank/Appointment.
 - 4.3.1. Minimum Scholarship, Teaching, and Service Levels by Rank/Appointment.
 - 4.3.2. Explanation of Scholarship Criteria Levels
 - 4.3.3. Explanation of Teaching Criteria Levels
 - 4.3.4. Explanation of Service Criteria Levels
5. Candidacy Procedures
 - 5.1. Initiation of Candidacy
 - 5.1.1. Role of the Chair/Program Director
 - 5.1.2. Length of Service
 - 5.1.3. Mandatory Review for Continuing Appointment: Candidate Notification
 - 5.1.4. Voluntary Review for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment: Candidate Initiated
 - 5.1.5. Chair/Program Director Responsibility
 - 5.1.6. Chair/Program Director Non-Support of Candidacy
 - 5.1.7. Dean Responsibility
 - 5.2. Timeline of Steps Following Move to Candidacy
 - 5.2.1. Development of the Biographical File

- 5.2.2. Submission of Biographical File to Department Chair/Program Director
- 5.2.3. Forwarding the Biographical File from the Department to the Dean
- 5.2.4. Dean Announces Candidacy to All SHTM Faculty
- 5.2.5. List of Potential Referees Forwarded to Dean
- 5.2.6. Requests Sent for Solicited Evaluative Letters from Referees
- 5.2.7. Requests Sent for Other Solicited Letters
- 5.2.8. Assembly of the Candidates Non-Confidential General Evaluative File
- 5.2.9. Evaluation of the Candidates File by the Chair/Program Director
- 5.2.10. Review of Formal Letter of Recommendation by Chair/Program Director
- 5.2.11. Submission of the Candidacy File
- 5.2.12. Dean Formally Charges APT Chair to Review Candidate's File and Convene an APT-CRC meeting

6. The Candidacy File

- 6.1. Parts of the Candidate's Evaluative File
 - 6.1.1. The Biographical File
 - 6.1.2. Non-Confidential General Evaluative File
 - 6.1.3. Confidential Special Evaluative File
- 6.2. Contents of the Biographical File
 - 6.2.1. Curriculum Vitae
 - 6.2.2. Personal Statement
 - 6.2.3. Scholarly Activities
 - 6.2.3.1. Statement of Scholarly Activities
 - 6.2.3.2. Publications
 - 6.2.3.3. Research
 - 6.2.3.4. Presentations
 - 6.2.3.5. Copies of Scholarly Work
 - 6.2.4. Teaching Activities
 - 6.2.4.1. Statement of Teaching Activities
 - 6.2.4.2. Courses Taught
 - 6.2.4.3. Curriculum Development
 - 6.2.4.4. Teaching Effectiveness
 - 6.2.4.5. Advising/Mentoring
 - 6.2.5. Service Contributions
 - 6.2.5.1. Statement of Service Contributions
 - 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
- 6.3. Contents of the Non-Confidential General Evaluative File
 - 6.3.1. Supervisory Evaluations
 - 6.3.2. Letters
 - 6.3.3. Chair's Formal Letter of Recommendation
- 6.4. Contents of the Confidential Special Evaluative File

7. Letters
 - 7.1. Solicited Letters
 - 7.1.1. Evaluative Letters from Referees
 - 7.1.1.1. Candidate May Suggest Referees
 - 7.1.1.2. Required Number of Refereed Letters
 - 7.1.1.3. Request Sent by the Dean to Referees
 - 7.1.2. Other Solicited Letters
 - 7.1.2.1. SHTM Faculty
 - 7.1.2.2. Candidate Solicited Letters
 - 7.2. Unsolicited Letters
8. Evaluation of Candidate by SHTM APT-CRC
 - 8.1. The Appropriate Group of Faculty Defined
 - 8.1.1. Promotion Reviews
 - 8.1.2. Continuing Appointment Reviews
 - 8.2. The SHTM APT-CRC is Assembled
 - 8.2.1. In a Case of Continuing Appointment
 - 8.2.2. In a Case of Promotion
 - 8.3. Access to the File Before the Review Meeting is Convened
 - 8.4. Requirements of APT-CRC Members
 - 8.5. The SHTM APT-CRC is Convened
 - 8.6. Presence of Candidate's Chair/Program Director
 - 8.6.1. Continuing Appointment
 - 8.6.2. Promotion
 - 8.7. Additional Information Sought by the APT-CRC
 - 8.8. Vote Procedures of the APT-CRC
 - 8.9. Confidentiality of the APT-CRC
 - 8.10. Situations Not Covered by Policies and Procedures
9. Evaluation by the SHTM Dean, HS Personnel Office and the Sr. V.P., HS
 - 9.1. Dean's Review of the Candidate's File After the APT-CRC
 - 9.2. New Information Added to the File
 - 9.3. Dean's Letter of Recommendation Released to the Candidate
 - 9.4. Dean Sends File Up the Supervisory Chain
 - 9.5. Letter by the Sr. V.P, HS Released to the Candidate
 - 9.6. Candidate Notified by the HSC Personnel Office that File is Available for Review
10. Action by the University President
 - 10.1. Recommendation by the University President to the Chancellor
 - 10.2. The University President May Consult with the SHTM APT Committee or Sr. V.P., HS
 - 10.3. Letter Announcing the Decision of the University President
 - 10.4. Letter Announcing the Decision of the Chancellor
11. Resubmission
 - 11.1. Procedures for a Reconsidered Case Up to Twelve Months After Disapproval
 - 11.1.1. Parts of the File Included in a Resubmitted Case

11.1.1.1. Part I

11.1.1.2. Part II

11.1.2. Evaluation of a Resubmitted File

11.2. Procedures for a Reconsidered Case More than Twelve Months After Disapproval

12. New Appointments

13. Appendices

A. Definition of Scholarly Activities

B. Announcement of Candidacy and Solicitation for Comments from the Dean

C. Solicited Letter sent to People Identified by the Candidate from the APT Chair

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

E. Solicited Evaluative Referee Letter sent from the Dean

F. Letter by the Dean to the APT Committee Chair to Convene a Meeting of the APT-CRC

G. E-mail to determine availability for SHTM APT-CRC Promotion case

H. E-Mail to Schedule SHTM Tenure Review Committee Meeting

I. Email announcement of APT-CRC meeting & File Review

J. APT-CRC Summary Recommendation Form

K. Curriculum Vitae Template

1. Scope of the SHTM APT Committee. This document is intended to guide the SHTM in regards to appointments, promotion, and tenure (APT). Specific policies and procedures to be followed by the candidate, department Chairs/Program Directors, the Dean, and the SHTM Ad-hoc APT Candidate Review Committee (APT-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 SHTM 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 SHTM 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 APT-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 APT-CRC. Titles under the auspices of the SHTM APT Committee are briefly described in section 3.

1.1. Charge as per SHTM Bylaws. (June, 2013, 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. In addition, the APT committee may include one faculty representative from each of the Certificate Programs NOR* 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 SHTM tenured faculty member. Should the Chair position become vacant, the Vice-Chair will assume the position of Chair for the remainder of the term.

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.”

*NOR: Not Otherwise Recognized

2. Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York (2014).

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 his or her 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

SHTM 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. Previous scholarship used to attain promotion to Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor will be used as part of the candidate's scholarly record, but in addition, the candidate must show an increasing and ongoing record of scholarship from the time of the last promotion.

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. SHTM Criteria for Promotion and Continuing Appointment.

4.1. Rationale for and Application of Criteria. The SHTM 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 SHTM 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 SHTM. 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 his/her selected path of promotion. To evaluate faculty members adequately and fairly, the criteria will be utilized where and as appropriate.

4.2. Overview of Promotion Tracks and Paths. There are two tracks for promotion in the SHTM 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 scholarly activity as related to teaching. This includes, but is not limited to, manuscripts and presentations about teaching modalities. It also includes the creation, development, and/or implementation 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. All educator scholars paths require an Educator Portfolio. Full details available at WWW.XXXXXXX.edu. This candidate's Educator Portfolio must emphasize academic innovation, program development and projects with published outcome 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, education 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.

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.

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

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 his/her 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 (invited 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. The candidate must serve as a Principal Investigator of a competitively reviewed grant. There should 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 may attract students and/or junior faculty. 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.
4	In addition to level 3, the candidate should achieve a wide national and international reputation for research or other scholarly contributions and be recognized as a major influence in his/her academic discipline. Recognition can take the form of national/international awards and 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. He/she must relate well with learners and teaching colleagues. The candidate may submit comparative quantitative and qualitative evidence from student, peer, course director and/or supervisor evaluations.
2	In addition to the criteria in 1, the candidate must present evidence that he/she is an exceptional instructor with substantial teaching responsibility. The former can be shown through comparative quantitative and qualitative evidence from student, peer, course director and/or supervisor evaluations or by receipt of awards for teaching. Substantial teaching efforts may be evidenced by submitting proof - syllabi, lesson plans, lecture notes, presentations, etc. In addition the candidate should assume significant responsibility for course planning and administration.
3	In addition to the criteria in 2, the candidate should present evidence of innovative and creative teaching methods and/or curricular materials. This may be substantiated by course material publication, mentorship of peer faculty, comparative quantitative and qualitative evidence from student, peer, course director, as well as supervisor and/or external evaluations, or objective assessment related to course outcomes.
4	In addition to 2 and 3 above, the candidate should achieve a wide national or international reputation for his/her educational contributions and be recognized as a having a major influence in the educational leadership of his or her field. Such recognition can take the form of national 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	Candidate must contribute to committees and/or activities that support the program, department, SHTM, 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. Role of the Chair/Program Director. The administrative officer of the academic unit (the candidate's Chair/Program Director) ordinarily is responsible for presenting a faculty member for candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment to the Dean. In no case shall the administrative officer initiate a candidacy without first having obtained the consent of the faculty member involved.

5.1.2 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 (2014) Article XII, Title B, 3).

5.1.3. Mandatory Review for Continuing Appointment: Candidate Notification. When consideration of a continuing appointment is mandatory, the Chair/Program Director must notify the faculty member and proceed with the evaluation unless the faculty member submits a resignation, to take effect no later than the end of his or her term.

5.1.4. Voluntary Review for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment: Candidate Initiated. Any individual faculty member of academic rank may initiate his/her 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 his or her intentions to his or her Chair/Program Director with a supporting CV.

5.1.5. Chair/Program Director Responsibility. If the request for review results in support, the Chair/Program Director shall notify the Dean with a formal letter of recommendation (including CV) that he or she is initiating candidacy of a faculty member for promotion and/or continuing appointment consideration. This letter will be included in the Non-Confidential General Evaluative File that may be revised prior to transmission to the APT-CRC. If the Chair/Program Director's assessment of the faculty member results in a lack of support, the Chair must provide the faculty member with an evaluation in writing to that effect.

5.1.6. Chair/Program Director Non-Support of Candidacy. The faculty member may appeal the decision of the Chair/Program Director to the Dean after receiving written notification of the Chair/Program Director's decision. The appeal must be accompanied by supporting documents. In the case of a review that is not mandatory, the Dean's decision whether or not to move a recommendation for promotion and/or continuing appointment to the SHTM APT committee for review is final. If the Dean decides to move a case forward for review by the SHTM APT committee, the process continues as indicated in section 8.1.

5.1.7 Dean Responsibility. The Dean will review the formal letter of recommendation (including CV) provided by the Chair/Program Director. The Dean will decide whether or not to move the faculty member to candidacy. If the Dean decides to move a case forward the Chair/Program Director, Candidate and the Chair of the SHTM APT Committee will be notified.

5.2 Timeline of Steps Following Move to Candidacy

5.2.1 Development of the Biographical File. (see section 6)

5.2.2. Submission of Biographical File to Department Chair/Program Director. The complete Biographical File with the dated signature of the candidate should be submitted to the Department Chair/Program Director. If the Chair/Program Director is a candidate, the Dean of the academic unit or another appropriate authority shall be responsible for review.

5.2.3. Forwarding the Biographical File from the Department to the Dean. The candidate's Chair/Program Director, after review, shall be responsible for forwarding the completed Biographical File to the Dean. If the Chair/Program Director is a candidate, the Dean of the academic unit or another appropriate authority shall be responsible for this. The completed Biographical File shall be submitted to the Dean with one hard copy and in digital formats (e.g., Flash Drive).

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

5.2.5. List of Potential Referees Forwarded to Dean (see section 7.1.1.1)

5.2.6. Requests Sent for Solicited Evaluative Letters from Referees. (see section 7.1.1)

5.2.7. Requests Sent for Other Solicited Letters. (see section 7.1.2)

5.2.8. Assembly of the Candidates Non-Confidential General Evaluative File. The Deans office will be responsible for collecting and inserting all solicited (evaluative and other solicited letters) into the non-confidential general and/or confidential special evaluative file.

5.2.9. Evaluation of the Candidates File by the Chair/Program Director. The Deans office will notify the candidate's Chair/Program Director at the time that the file is ready for evaluation. The candidate's Chair/Program Director will be given an opportunity to review the Candidates File including solicited evaluative letters from the referees and solicited letters of comment. Following file review the Chair/Program Director will have an opportunity to modify his/her formal letter of recommendation (see section 6.3.3). A copy of the Chair's/Program Director's letter shall be released to the candidate immediately following review by the Dean.

5.2.10. Review of Formal Letter of Recommendation by Chair/Program Director. The candidate will be provided an opportunity to review the formal letter of recommendation by Chair/Program Director prior to the submission of the Candidacy File.

5.2.11. Submission of the Candidacy File. The completed formal letter of recommendation by Chair/Program Director will be submitted to the Dean's Office. The Dean's Office will insert this letter into the Candidate's File.

5.2.12. Dean Formally Charges APT Chair to Review Candidate's File and Convene an APT-CRC meeting. The Dean will notify the SHTM APT Committee chair in writing that a case of continuing appointment and/or promotion is ready for inspection for completeness. If determined that the file is incomplete the Dean will be contacted. If determined that the file is complete then the APT committee chair will begin to assemble the APT-CRC.

6. The Candidacy File. Each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment shall prepare 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 APT-CRC review meeting 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.

6.1.2. The Non-Confidential General Evaluative File. The Non-Confidential General Evaluative File contains the biographical file and information that the candidate may review before the President's decision is made. This material is available to the faculty of SHTM at the appropriate rank or higher, to the APT-CRC and to the higher academic administrators as well as to the candidate at the appropriate time. 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 APT-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 follow the standard format (Appendix J).

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.

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.

6.2.3.3. Research. Research involvement should be listed including; title/topics, brief description, role on project, funding, collaborators and institutional/departmental affiliations, years of collaboration, inclusion of students and their role, etc.

6.2.3.4. Presentations. A list of presentations that have not been published should be divided into these suggested categories: (1) invited scholarly lectures and symposia; (2) other lectures or presentations.

6.2.3.5. 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 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 must be included.

6.2.4.5. Advising/Mentoring. 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 as Mentor and time commitment.

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.

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

6.3.1. Supervisory Evaluations. These include the reports of the candidate's department Chair/Program Director, the Dean, and beyond on the supervisory chain (the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences or equivalent, the Provost).

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

6.3.3. Chair's Formal Letter of Recommendation. The candidate's Chair/Program Director shall provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's scholarly activity, teaching and service. The initial formal letter of recommendation (submitted to start the candidacy process) can be modified after review of the evaluative or other solicited letters. If information is used from confidential letters

then the Chair/Program Director should refer in their formal letter of recommendation using “such and such a point raised by Professor X,” or the statement from Referee Y.” A key identifying X and Y by name should be provided for these references and included in the confidential special evaluative file. This formal letter of recommendation shall be considered a draft until reviewed by the Dean for confidentiality of solicited opinions. The Chair/Program Director shall be responsible for any revision required to preserve confidentiality of solicited opinions.

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 (Appendix F) from the APT-CRC meeting.

7. Letters

7.1. Solicited Letters. All letters (evaluative and other solicited) should ordinarily not be more than twelve 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. Candidate May Suggest Referees. The candidate should consult with his/her Chair/Program Director to suggest a list with a minimum of six potential referees, which will be forwarded by the Chair/Program Director to the Dean for his/her 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, should be stated by the candidate and submitted with this list. 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 he or she was 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 he or she was 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 he or she was 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 he or she was a student.

7.1.1.3. Request Sent by the Dean to Referees. The letters sent by the Dean to solicit the referee's opinions should be accompanied by the candidate's CV as well as access to sections of the biographical file as selected by the candidate. All correspondence to potential external references must be included in the Non-Confidential General Evaluative File. Each letter should appear on institutional letterhead (Appendix D). If for any reason a referee is unable to provide a careful evaluation, additional referees in consultations with the Chair/Program Director 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 his/her 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. SHTM Faculty. The Dean will communicate a written announcement soliciting letters of comment from any member of the SHTM faculty who are 50% or more effort on payroll. Such 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 SHTM APT Chair. The Chair of the APT, 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 with in the period of this review.

8. Evaluation of Candidate by SHTM APT-CRC

8.1. The Appropriate Group of Faculty Defined. An appropriate group of faculty will be selected to form the APT-CRC which shall be responsible for evaluating and making a recommendation to the Dean on each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment. The appropriate group will vary according to the type of action being considered.

8.1.1. Promotion Reviews. Members of SHTM who are at a higher rank than the candidate's current academic rank can serve on the APT-CRC. In the case of promotion reviews to Clinical Professor individuals with academic rank of Associate Professor or higher with continuing appointment can serve.

8.1.2. Continuing Appointment Reviews. The Dean, in consultation with the Chair/Program Director, will select members of SHTM with a continuing appointment.

8.2. The SHTM APT-CRC is Assembled. The APT Committee Chair will assemble the APT-CRC. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the composition of the APT-CRC follows the procedures provided in this document.

8.2.1. In a Case of Continuing Appointment. In order for a case of continuing appointment to be held at least five (5) members and no more than (9) members of the SHTM faculty eligible to vote must attend. If in a case of continuing appointment the SHTM faculty eligible to vote is fewer than five (5) members or if the Dean believes expert advice from other faculty is needed to effectively evaluate the file, an enlarged group will be constituted by the Dean. A maximum of four (4) faculty members may be appointed by the Dean from outside the SHTM after consultation with the candidate's Chair/Program Director, preferably faculty members who are from other programs in the HSC.

8.2.2. In a Case of Promotion. In order for a case of promotion to higher rank to be held at least five (5) members and no more than (9) members of the SHTM faculty eligible to vote must attend. The composition of the APT-CRC must represent a cross-section of all programs within the school with no more than 2 representatives from any given program.

8.3. Access to the File Before the Review Meeting is Convened. The appropriate faculty group in all of SHTM 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 his or her examination of the file has been completed.

8.4. Requirements of APT-CRC Members. All selected members of this committee must review the file prior to the review meeting. Signatures must be provided.

8.5. The SHTM APT-CRC is Convened.

The APT Committee Chair or Vice Chair shall preside and convene a meeting of all faculty members eligible to vote on the candidate. 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 preside and convene a meeting but must not vote. Any other special circumstances (e.g., the APT Committee Chair has a dual role as the candidate's department Chair/Program Director) shall be resolved by the Dean in consultation with the APT Committee Vice Chair.

8.6. Presence of Candidate's Chair/Program Director.

8.6.1. Continuing Appointment. In the case of a continuing appointment, the candidate's Chair/Program Director must be notified of the date/time of the review meeting for his/her candidate by the APT Committee Chair; he/she may be invited to discuss their nomination regardless of their own appointment/rank. However, the candidate's Chair/Program Director must recuse him/herself after the discussion ceases and prior to voting. The candidate's Chair/Program Director must not

vote in the case of a candidate whom they have nominated regardless of his/her own appointment/rank.

8.6.2. Promotion. In the case of a promotion to higher rank (not a continuing appointment), the candidate's department Chair/Program Director must attend the review meeting to discuss their nomination and recuse him/herself after the discussion ceases and prior to the vote. The candidate's Chair/Program Director shall not vote regardless of his/her own rank.

8.7. Additional Information Sought by the APT-CRC. Prior to reaching a decision during the review meeting the APT-CRC may seek additional information that can delay a vote on the candidate, either on its own or through the Dean. Substantial new information affecting the evaluation of the candidate will be shared with the candidate's Chair/Program Director in keeping with the principle of confidentiality to respect the source(s) of that information.

8.8. Vote Procedures of the APT-CRC. Each member of the APT-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 his/her opinion of the candidate in a single vote, by secret ballot, using a standard paper ballot indicating yes, no or abstain. The vote will be kept confidential. The ballots will be counted and tallied by the APT-CRC Chair (or designated SHTM APT committee member) who will announce the results at the meeting. The original paper ballots will be placed in a sealed envelope that will be included with a summary recommendation using a standard form (see Appendix F) that reflects the numerical vote and the substance of the discussion. The APT-CRC Chair (or designated SHTM APT committee member) will submit the APT-CRC's recommendation immediately upon adjournment to the Dean. The summary recommendation form and the paper ballots will be placed in the Confidential Special Evaluative File.

8.9. Confidentiality of the APT-CRC. Apart from official communications by the APT-CRC Chair or Vice Chair, each APT-CRC member is expected to maintain strict confidentiality about the deliberations of the Committee.

8.10. 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 SHTM APT Committee, the candidate's Chair/Program Director, and the Dean shall consult to devise suitable means to deal with the case.

9. Evaluation by the SHTM Dean, HS Personnel Office and the Sr. VP, HS.

9.1. Dean's Review of the Candidate's File After the APT-CRC. The candidate's file is reviewed by the Dean after the APT-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 APT-CRC, the Dean shall meet with the Committee to allow an exchange of ideas and opinions before completing his/her formal written recommendation.

9.2. New Information Added to the File. If substantively new information affecting evaluation of the candidate is added to the file after it has been considered by the APT-CRC, this information will be communicated to the Committee and to the candidate's Chair/Program Director. If so requested, the appropriate administrative officers will discuss such information with the Committee, which shall have the right to add to the file its subsequent reaction.

9.3. Dean's Letter of Recommendation Released to the Candidate. A copy of the Dean's letter of recommendation will be released to the candidate at the time that the file is available for his/her review

9.4. Dean Sends File Up the Supervisory Chain. The Dean will then send the file to the HSC HS Personnel Office to prepare for the Sr. V.P., HS review. The Sr. V.P., HS who, after formulating a recommendation, will ordinarily forward the file to the President's Office. If the Sr. V.P., HS disagrees with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Dean or the Committee, he/she will confer with the appropriate authority (e.g., the Dean, the Committee Chair) before formulating a recommendation.

9.5. Letter by the Sr. V.P., HS Released to the Candidate. A copy of the Sr. V.P., HS letter of recommendation will be released to the candidate at the time that the file is available for his/her review.

9.6. 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 his/her 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 SHTM APT Committee or the Sr. V.P., HS. If the President disagrees with the SHTM APT Committee's recommendation, he or she may consult with the Committee before making the final decision. 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 ordinarily be sent to the APT Committee at the time it is 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. Resubmission.

11.1 Procedures for Reconsideration of a Case Up to Twelve Months After Disapproval.

Reconsideration of a case up to twelve months following disapproval of a promotion or tenure recommendation shall be considered a resubmission.

11.1.1. Parts of the File Included in a Resubmitted Case. Files for a resubmitted case should be presented in two parts.

11.1.1.1. Part I. A copy of the candidacy file presented in the preceding year. Upon request, the original file can be retrieved from the Provost's office, cleared of supervisory letters added subsequent to the SHTM APT Committee review, and transmitted to the Dean's Office for review by the SHTM APT Committee.

11.1.1.1. Part II. An account of the change in professional status of the candidate since the previous submission containing a new curriculum vitae, new documentary materials, additional solicited letters of reference from within and outside the University, an updated departmental recommendation, and an updated summary letter from the Chair/Program Director with emphasis on the recent achievement of the candidate. Part II also will be submitted for review to the SHTM APT Committee.

11.1.2. Evaluation of a Resubmitted File. Whether or not a resubmitted case merits a new review will depend on the comparative evaluation of the contents of Parts I and II of the resubmitted file. The department Chair/Program Director makes his/her recommendation to the SHTM APT Committee, which will evaluate whether or not a substantially higher level of achievement has been reached in the intervening year.

11.2. Procedures for a Reconsidered Case More than Twelve Months After Disapproval. After twelve months following disapproval of a promotion or tenure recommendation, normal procedures for submission of candidacy files should be followed.

12. New Appointments. New appointments at the senior level (Associate, Professor, Clinical Associate or Clinical Professor) are to be reviewed by the SHTM APT-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 SHTM APT-CRC.

13. Appendices.

Appendix A. Definition of Scholarship 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 Dean

MEMORANDUM

TO SHTM Faculty

FROM (NAME), Dean SHTM

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 Technology and Management 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.

SHTM 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 2011-2016 "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 SHTM faculty who are 50% or more effort on payroll.

Appendix C. Solicited Letter sent to People Identified by the Candidate from the APT Chair



School of Health Technology and Management

Office of the Dean

Stony Brook, NY 11794-8200

Month, XX, XXXX

RE: **Request for Letter of Support, (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 Technology and Management 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 Support” 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 or her) 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 frist.last@stonybrook.edu (This is the APT Chairperson).

Please send your letter (via e-mail attachment) directly to the committee administrative liaison, (Name), at frist.last@stonybrook.edu. We request that you indicate in the subject heading **(NAME): Letter of Support**. 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
SHTM, 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 at [631.xxx.xxxx](tel:631.xxx.xxxx) or frist.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

SHTM Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Committee, Chair

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

Dear XXXXXXXX,

Please find attached a request from XXXXXXXXX, Dean of Stony Brook University's School of Health Technology and Management, 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 his/her 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)**. We appreciate your time.

Thank you,

(Name), APT Administrative Liaison
Stony Brook University
SHTM, 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 Dean



School of Health Technology and Management
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 Technology and Management is a candidate for (promotion or appointment) (with continuing appointment—if applicable) at the (Full Rank) rank. Since Stony Brook University requires its review committee to consider the assessments of leaders in the candidate’s field, I am writing to request your evaluation of (Name) qualifications for this (promotion or appointment).

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: <https://www.dropbox.com/sh/zl7o115sn3nuq45/XXXXXXXXX>.

The recommended length of your evaluative letter is 2 to 4 pages, with reference to the importance/significance of the candidate’s work. In writing your letter, please make sure to include:

- Your title, rank and tenure status
- Whether you’ve had a prior relationship with candidate (If not, clearly state no prior relationship; If yes, clearly state nature of prior relationship - have you ever directly supervised the candidate?)
- Would this candidate receive (promotion or appointment) to the rank of (proposed rank) at your institution?

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 (if possible) and professional service contributions (if possible), especially with reference to (his/her) most recent work. It also would be important to know whether your opinion is based on personal observation. In addition, we would appreciate your comparing (her/his) 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 evaluative 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)
Dean, SHTM

Appendix F. Letter from the Dean to APT Committee Chair to Convene a Meeting of the APT-CRC

MEMORANDUM

TO Professor, Chair of APT Committee
FROM (NAME), Dean
SUBJECT Convene a meeting of the APT-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 to inspect the file for completeness which is now available in the Dean’s Office. If you determine that the file is incomplete, please contact me immediately (date ordinarily within one week). If you determine that the file is complete, I ask that you convene a meeting of the appropriate faculty in the School to meet as the Appointment, Promotion and Tenure-Candidacy Review Committee (APT-CRC) at this time (meeting ordinarily to be convened within 1 month of file being completed).

Appendix G: E-mail to determine availability for SHTM APT-CRC Promotion case

Good Morning 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 an APT Candidate Review Committee (APT-CRC) to advise the Dean on a candidate, (Name) for promotion to (Rank). In an effort to try to confirm a meeting time in advance, based on the availability of the large conference room, I am asking for your availability input.

I have created the attached doodle poll, with dates/times indicated on DATES. Please go to the doodle poll link provided below, type in your 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. I am including the candidate's chairperson, (Name of Chair), as (his/her) attendance is mandatory (per the P&P).

<http://doodle.com/zzzzzzzzzz>

Once the date/time are confirmed, I will notify the committee. 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!

Chairperson of APT

Appendix H: E-Mail to Schedule SHTM Tenure Review Committee Meeting

Dear Drs. X:

I am writing in my capacity as Chair of the APT Committee for the School of Health Technology and Management. In consideration of your expertise and senior academic rank Dean Lehmann requested that I invite you to serve on the tenure 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.

The files are not ready for review at this point. I expect that they will be available by *mid-April*. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to schedule a meeting on *Dates*. I am including the candidates chairperson, (Name), as (he or she) must be notified of the date/time of the APT meeting (per the P&P).

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 candidates 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/nv9cmvrmyadrzw6m>

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

Name
Chairperson of APT

Appendix I: Email announcement of APT-CRC meeting & 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: **Day, Month, X, XXXX**

Time: **2-4pm**

Location: **Place**

The APT file is available for review in the Dean's office. Please be sure to sign the signature sheet affixed to each candidates 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. Keep in mind that there is only one copy of each file available, so please do not wait until the last minute to review!

(Deans staff name) can assist you with access to the file, which cannot be removed from the Dean's Office.

A copy of the SHTM APT P&P is located inside the binder for you to use as a reference when reviewing the files. Please come to the APT-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.

As of this writing I have confirmations from: (last names of those who will attend) for the meeting on (Date and time).

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

Chairperson of APT

Appendix J. APT-CRC Summary Form

School of Health Technology and Management
APT-CRC Summary

Candidate _____

Date of Meeting _____

Current Rank _____

Department _____

Action Under Review

Rank

Appointment	[]	Associate Professor	[]
Promotion	[]	Professor	[]
Continuing Appointment	[]	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:

Chairperson

Date

Appendix K. Sample Curriculum Vitae Template

Curriculum Vitae
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Health Sciences Center

Name:

Mailing Address:

Home Telephone:

Office Telephone:

Visa Type and Number if not a Citizen:

Higher Education
(Including internship, residency and other formal professional training)

<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Degree & Date</u>	<u>Institution & Location</u>	<u>Field</u>
-------------	-----------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------

Certification & Licensure
(ECFMG, FLEX, National & Professional Boards & Licenses)

<u>Date</u>	<u>Agency</u>
-------------	---------------

Appointments
(Academic Appointments)

<u>Dates</u>				
<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Status*</u>	<u>Institution & Location</u>

Status: Voluntary (V) Salaried (S) Tenured (T)

		<u>Professional Practice & Services</u>	
<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Institutional</u>
<u>Affiliation</u>			

	<u>Professional and Scientific Societies</u>	
<u>Organization</u>	<u>Dates of Initial Membership</u>	<u>Leadership Position (s) and</u>
<u>Dates</u>		

OTHER PUBLIC SERVICE:

MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES (Title and place of responsibility):

EDITORIAL SERVICE (PEER-REVIEW PANELS, BOARDS):

	<u>Academic & Professional Honors/Awards/Distinctions</u>	
<u>Date</u>	<u>Title of Honor/Awards</u>	<u>Sponsoring Organization/Institution</u>

Bibliography / Published Work

A sample of the suggested citation format to be followed is provided below.

Instructions:

1. Do not include papers submitted or in preparation unless they have been accepted for publication, in which case list the journal in which they will appear and indicate "in press."
2. Number references consecutively in the order in which they were published beginning with the most recent.
3. Separate publications by category:
 - a. Peer-reviewed publications and reports of original investigations; clinical reports; letters to the editor, clearly indicated as such)
 - b. Books and monographs (distinguish between authoring and editing books)
 - c. Evidence of works in progress (e.g. complete articles published in conference proceedings, chapters in books; review articles; editorials, clearly indicated as such)
 - d. Development and/or publication of educational materials (e.g. teaching cases)
 - e. Development of major curricular offerings or innovative educational programs
 - f. Non-print materials (film strips, films, videotapes, computer software or other technologies relevant to appointee's academic field)
 - g. Published abstracts within the last five years (optional)
4. For each reference, provide all authors (in order listed in the reference itself), title, journal, inclusive pages, and year of publication. APA or AMA format preferred.

Peer-Reviewed Journals (examples of suggested subheadings are listed below)

1. Standard Journal Article (List all authors)
2. Corporate Author (contributing role on a Task Force/Committee/Agency should be noted)
3. Single Author
4. Editor, Compiler, Chairperson as Author
5. Chapter in Book

Professional Presentations (Invited, Peer-reviewed, Symposia)

Research Support: Grants, Contracts

MAJOR RESEARCH INTERESTS:

RESEARCH SUPPORT (as PI or Co-PI only):

Past Funding (last 10 years):

Source, PI/Co-PI, Grant Title, Year(s) Funding

Current Funding: Year(s)

Source, PI/Co-PI, Grant Title, Years Funding

Projects Pending:

INVENTIONS/PATENTS:

Teaching Activities*
Courses Directed and Taught

<u>Date</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>
-------------	--------------------	--------------	-------------------

*Distinguish among kinds of experience, e.g. course developer, course director, or course participant; lecturer, conference leader.

Also include teaching of graduate students and thesis or practicum supervision (title of projects, date of completion) in a clinical and/or research setting, other student teaching, teaching in a clinical setting, teaching in continuing education courses, advising responsibilities and leadership roles.

Service*

<u>Date</u> <u>From</u>	<u>To</u>	<u>Activity (including name of Committee and role)</u>
----------------------------	-----------	--

*List standing and ad hoc committees including service at the department, School and University levels. Professional and community service activities also may be listed here.

The information presented above is an accurate compilation of professional biographical information.

Signature of Candidate

Date