

12/5/2018



Stony Brook
School of Nursing

**Faculty Handbook on Appointment, Promotion, &
Tenure Policies
(APT)**

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	4
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER PERSONNEL PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY	5
PERSONNEL POLICIES COMMITTEE	5
FUNCTIONS OF THE APT:.....	5
MEMBERSHIP	5
CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE APT COMMITTEE AND THE SON Ad Hoc REVIEW COMMITTEE.....	5
SUMMARY OF HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE	6
SOURCES.....	6
TYPES OF FACULTY RANK	7
TRANSFERS BETWEEN ACADEMIC AND QUALIFIED ACADEMIC RANK	8
ACADEMIC REVIEW	8
INITIATION OF REVIEW FOR FACULTY APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND/OR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT	9
PROCESS OF APPOINTMENT AND DOCUMENTS REQUIRED FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND/OR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT	9
ACADEMIC REVIEW: FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, REAPPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION AND/OR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT.....	9
CRITERIA AND DOCUMENTS REQUIRED FOR NEW APPOINTMENTS	10
NEW APPOINTMENT AS LECTURER, INSTRUCTOR OR ASSISTANT PROFESSOR	10
NEW APPOINTMENT AS ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	12
NEW APPOINTMENT AS PROFESSOR	12
PROCESS OF REVIEW AND DOCUMENTS REQUIRED FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO A TERM OR TEMPORARY POSITION	14
DOCUMENTS REQUIRED FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO A TERM OR TEMPORARY POSITION	15
REAPPOINTMENT AS CLINICAL ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OR CLINICAL PROFESSOR IN A TERM OR TEMPORARY POSITION REQUIRES EVIDENCE OF:	16
POLICIES OF THE PERSONNEL POLICIES COMMITTEE FOR APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE	17
CRITERIA FOR AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FACULTY ROLE	17
CONTINUING APPOINTMENT.....	18
PROCESS AND PROCEDURE FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE.....	19
INITIATION OF CANDIDACY.....	19
LENGTH OF SERVICE.....	19
TYPES OF REVIEWS	19
PROCESS AND PROCEDURE FOR PROMOTION AND/OR TENURE.....	20
INITIATION OF CANDIDACY	20
RESPONSIBILITY TO THE CANDIDATE FOR ASSEMBLY OF CANDIDATE’S FILE.....	20
ANNOUNCEMENT OF CANDIDACY.....	20
DEAN ANNOUNCES CANDIDACY TO ALL SON FACULTY	20
DOCUMENTS FOR PROMOTION	21
EVALUATION PROCEDURES OF THE SON AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE, DEAN, VP FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES, PROVOST, AND PRESIDENT	26
EVALUATION PROCEDURES OF THE SON Ad Hoc REVIEW COMMITTEE	26
CONTINUING APPOINTMENT (TENURE)	27

CANDIDACY FOR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT (TENURE)	27
VOTING PROCEDURES OF THE SON AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE	28
EVALUATION BY THE SON AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE, DEAN, VP FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES AND THE PROVOST.....	28
CANDIDATE NOTIFIED BY THE HSC PERSONNEL OFFICE THAT THE FILE IS AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW	29
PROVOST REVIEW	29
ACTION BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT	29
LETTER ANNOUNCING THE DECISION OF THE CHANCELLOR	30
RESUBMISSION	30
EVALUATING SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES	31
SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES	31
LEVELS OF SCHOLARSHIP.....	31
THE SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING	32
SCHOLARSHIP OF DISCOVERY (RESEARCH)	33
THE SCHOLARSHIP OF APPLICATION (PRACTICE)	34
TABLE 1: SCHOLARSHIP/RANK	34
MINIMUM TOTAL SCORES	36
APPENDIX A*: DEFINING SCHOLARSHIP	35
EVALUATION OF TEACHING.....	36
EVALUATION OF SERVICE.....	37
APPENDIX B: APT/AD HOC REVIEW COMMITTEE CHAIR’S SUMMARY VOTING SHEET	39
APPENDIX C: PROMOTION AND/OR CONTINUING APPOINTMENT SUMMARY FILE CHECK-OFF LIST	40

Preamble

The faculty of the School of Nursing is diverse and differs in their activities, interests, and responsibilities. Standards set forth in this document recognize diversity and values and provide a means for assessing each faculty member's contribution thoroughly and fairly. At the core of these standards is the concept of excellence, that is, a level of performance that is not just adequate or above average but outstanding, that does not satisfy minimal requirements but exhibits insight and creativity, and that does more than maintain the status quo but advances the School's mission.

F1 Personnel Procedures for Faculty in the SON

F1.1 Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Committee

The purpose of the Appointment, Promotion & Tenure (APT) is to generate standards for faculty membership and implement the process by which all persons are recommended for appointment, reappointment, continuing appointment (tenure) and promotion.

F1.1.2 Functions of the APT:

- a. Adhere to institutional procedures for appointment, reappointment, continuing appointment (tenure), and promotion within the SON;
- b. Develop and review criteria for appointment by rank;
- c. Review written credentials and supporting documents of faculty for appointment, reappointment, continuing appointment (tenure), and promotion;
- d. Develop and review criteria/procedures to be followed in the formulation of appointment, reappointment, continuing appointment (tenure), and promotion within the SON;
- e. Formulate, evaluate, and recommend revision for policies and procedures regarding faculty activities and responsibilities.

F1.1.3 Membership

The voting membership of the committee will include faculty with continuing appointments and those holding the academic rank of Clinical Associate Professor/Associate Professor and/or Clinical Professor/Professor, as determined by institutional policy.

F1.1.4 Confidentiality of the APT Committee and the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee

Apart from official communications by the Committee Chair, each Committee member is expected to maintain strict confidentiality about the deliberations of the Committee. Materials provided to and discussion with members of APT are considered confidential and not for discussion beyond/outside of the Committee.

F.1.2 Procedures for Faculty Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

F1.2.1 Sources

SON faculty are appointed, reappointed, promoted and given continuing appointment—or denied any of these—by action taken in accordance with Article XIV of the Civil Service Code, the Policies of the State University of New York, the Agreement between the State of New York and United University Professions 2011-2016 (UUP), the Health Sciences Center policies specified in F2 of this document and the by-laws of the SON.

The faculty of the SON is diverse and differs in their activities, interests, and responsibilities. Standards set forth in this document recognize this diversity and provide a means for assessing each faculty member's contribution thoroughly and fairly. At the core of these standards is the concept of excellence, that is, a level of performance that is not just adequate or above average but outstanding, that does not satisfy minimal requirements but exhibits insight and creativity, and that does more than maintain the status quo but advances the School's mission. The basic considerations in assessing performance of a faculty member are mastery of subject matter, contributions to new knowledge, effectiveness and innovation in teaching, scholarly accomplishment, effectiveness of university service, and potential for continuing professional growth.

F1.2.2 Faculty hold continuing, term or temporary appointments, as defined in Article XI of the Policies. Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York (2006), 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 as 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** – 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. (See Appendix A outlining expected individual faculty outcomes)

F1.2.3 Types of Faculty Rank

1. Faculty appointment may be to either a tenure track or a non-tenure track. Faculty appointed to a non-tenure track will be given the qualified academic rank of clinical faculty in the appropriate rank (i.e. Clinical Lecturer, Clinical Instructor, Clinical Assistant Professor, Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor).

- a. **Academic rank.**

Faculty with academic rank hold the title instructor, assistant professor, associate professor and professor, and must be reviewed for reappointment to term or temporary appointment or for continuing appointment, following periods of service which are specified in sections XI.B and XI.D of the Policies.

- b. **Qualified academic rank.**

Faculty with qualified academic rank hold the title lecturer, or title of academic rank preceded by the designations “clinical,” “research” or “visiting.” They are not required to be reviewed for continuing appointment, but they must be reviewed for reappointment to term or temporary appointment following periods of service which are specified in section XI.D of the Policies.

In regard to continuing appointment, faculty with qualified academic rank are appointed, reappointed and promoted following the procedures used for faculty in the corresponding academic rank. Faculty with part-time or non-salaried appointments are appointed, reappointed and promoted following the procedures used for full-time faculty at their rank.

2. **Non-salaried faculty**

Non-salaried faculty will be appointed to per diem Adjunct Clinical ranks, i.e., Adjunct Clinical Lecturer, Adjunct Clinical Instructor, Adjunct Clinical Assistant Professor, Adjunct Clinical Associate Professor, Adjunct Clinical Professor, Lecturer or Visiting Professor.

Per Diem Adjunct Clinical Faculty Appointment

In selected instances, individuals employed in professional positions who contribute significantly to teach elements of the nursing program may receive clinical appointments as adjunct faculty.

Nominations can be proposed by faculty to appropriate Department Chair.

Department Chairs make recommendations to the Office of the Dean.

The Dean considers the recommendation of the Department Chair regarding the proposed appointment and suggested rank.

3. **Emeritus Academic Rank.**

No special action is required by the APT Committee to grant Emeritus status. All members of the faculty who retire in good standing and hold continuing appointment are entitled to add the word or title “Emeritus” or “Emerita” to their academic title at the time of retirement per the office of the Dean. Emeritus rank carries with it such privileges which, in the judgment of the Dean, are feasible: use of the library and study

facility, use of office and laboratory space, eligibility for research grants and representation of the University in professional groups.

In the SON, academic review of all appointments, reappointments, promotions, and actions on continuing appointment is performed by a committee of faculty members in the School (except when there are five or fewer eligible voters, in which case an ad hoc committee is formed).

F1.2.4 Transfers Between Academic and Qualified Academic Rank

1. Faculty with academic rank may transfer to qualified academic rank under certain conditions and following normal University procedures for review and approval of promotions. The candidate must consent in writing to the transfer and the candidate must meet the criteria for appointment at a particular rank. The SON's recommendation that the transfer be made must include evidence of a change in the candidate's duties, activities or career goals since the time of initial appointment, and the transfer must be made at least twelve months before mandatory review for continuing appointment.
2. Faculty with qualified academic rank may transfer to academic rank following review and approval.
3. Faculty may be considered for promotion and/or continuing appointment prior to transfer to academic rank.
4. Faculty may transfer from part-time or non-salaried appointments to full-time appointments following usual University and SON review procedures for new appointments.

F1.2.5 Academic Review

1. Most academic appointments and promotions are made following consultation between officers of the University and the candidate's peers. Peer review is carried out by academic review committees.
2. In the SON, academic review of all appointments and promotions, and actions on continuing appointment is performed by a committee of faculty members in the SON (except when there are five or fewer eligible voters, in which case an ad hoc committee is formed).
3. All recommendations for appointment, reappointment, promotion and continuing appointment are forwarded from the Dean to the Vice President (VP) for Health Sciences.
4. Failure to follow procedures or to meet standards of quality may result in return of the materials to the SON. If a deadline for notice is imminent, the candidate will receive a pro forma notice of termination in order to comply with the Policies and the Agreement.
5. Following the procedural reviews, the VP for the Health Sciences conducts a substantive review, consulting as appropriate.
6. The VP for Health Sciences forwards the recommendation to the President.

F1.3 Initiation of Review for Faculty Appointment, Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment

- F1.3.1**
1. Review of a candidate for appointment to the faculty of the SON may only be initiated by the Dean in the SON.
 2. Formal review for reappointment, promotion and/or continuing appointment in the SON may only occur under one of the following conditions:
 - a. A review is required because of the expiration of a term or a mandated review for continuing appointment.
 - b. A review maybe initiated by the Dean for reasons that are specified in writing.

F1.3.2 Process and Documents Required for Appointment, Reappointments, Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment

1. The Dean ordinarily (see F.2.3.3) initiates the process of appointment, reappointment, promotion and/or continuing appointment in writing to the candidate. The Dean's letter instructs the candidate as to the required documents to be submitted by the candidate or on their behalf by individuals providing references/serving as referees.
2. All documents are assembled by the Chair of the APT Committee, with the exception of the summary of student evaluations of faculty teaching. The assembled packet will be provided to the Department Chair who will use the packet materials and student evaluations for construction of a comprehensive letter to be written by the Department Chair. The Department Chair will submit the completed packet to the Chair of APT.
3. All letters of recommendation must be solicited by the Office of the Dean, and the candidate will be informed of the availability to read the letter pursuant to the current UUP Agreement
4. Copies of all letters received by the Dean concerning a candidate's suitability for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and/or continuing appointment must be forwarded to the Chair of the APT Committee.
5. In reappointment actions, the comprehensive evaluation letter written by the Department Chair will be reviewed and signed by the candidate.
6. Other relevant material(s) may be included among the documents assembled for review.

F1.3.3 Academic Review: Faculty Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment

1. Academic review must be conducted by a committee of faculty at the school level which:
 - a. Consists only of members of the faculty with higher academic rank(s) to the candidate and/or members with continuing appointment at equivalent rank or higher.

- 1) If the number of eligible voters is three or fewer in a school which has only an initial academic review committee, an ad hoc committee will be convened as described in section II.C.2.b.
- 2) For promotion and/or continuing appointment, opinions will be solicited from all members of the faculty of the SON.
 - b. Takes action at a meeting held after each eligible voter has been given reasonable written notice. Eligible members who cannot attend the meeting may vote in writing before the scheduled meeting.
 - c. Recommends rank, appointment, reappointment, continuing appointment or promotion and rank only when an absolute majority of the eligible voters is favorable.
 - d. Communicates a summary of its vote and the reasons for it in a confidential memorandum to the Dean. This summary must include the names of those who voted and the numerical vote.
2. In the SON: when the SON has an internal academic review committee.
 - a. The committee's recommendations and all the materials pertaining to the candidacy will be forwarded to the Dean.
 - b. When there are three or fewer eligible voters:
 - 1) The Dean will appoint an ad hoc committee, its membership subject to the approval of the VP for the Health Sciences. This committee will have no more than six members, including all eligible voters in the School. Members from outside the School may be drawn from any other school or institution. The committee's Chair will be an eligible voter within the School.
 - 2) The ad hoc committee will meet and discuss the materials pertaining to the candidacy. After the meeting, each member of the ad hoc committee will submit a written recommendation to the Chair. These recommendations will be submitted to the Dean with a summary of the action of the eligible voters.

F1.4 Criteria and Documents Required for New Appointments

Individuals being considered for new faculty appointments must include evidence to support the criteria for the academic rank to which they are being appointed.

F1.4.1 New Appointment as Lecturer, Instructor or Assistant Professor

(including full-time, part-time and voluntary; academic and qualified academic rank; transfer from part-time to full-time, non-salaried to salaried, qualified to academic).

The rank of "*Instructor*", *Lecturer* and *Assistant Professor*" will include individuals meeting the criteria below for each academic rank.

A. Lecturer

1. Content expert in nursing or related field required.
2. Professional specialization in health related field.

3. Evidence of professional practice in related field.

B. Instructor

1. Post-baccalaureate degree (Master's or Doctoral) in nursing or related field
2. Clinical specialization in nursing required.
3. Evidence of clinical competency and professional experience.

C. Assistant Professor

1. Post-Baccalaureate Degree (Masters or Doctoral) in nursing or related field required, earned doctorate preferred.
2. Professional specialization in nursing and or related field.
3. Evidence of professional practice in nursing or related field.
4. Minimum of three years in upper division college teaching and/or equivalent professional experience.

Instructor, Lecturer and Assistant Professor must also include the following documents:

1. An SON curriculum vitae, copies of diplomas, RN registration (as applicable), and certification as appropriate.
2. A list of the names and present positions of scholars holding comparable academic rank to the candidate or continuing appointment, who were selected by the Dean to write letters of reference.
3. Letters, some of which may be from outside the University solicited by the Dean.
4. Evidence that the candidate's teaching ability and professional practice, where applicable, has been personally observed and evaluated by faculty colleagues senior to the candidate. (This evidence may be provided in general reference letters or in a separate format.)
5. A recommendation from the Dean and the Department Chair stating the candidate's qualifications for appointment.
6. A memorandum from the APT to the Dean of the School which:
 - a. Outlines the review process;
 - b. Summarizes the committee's evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for appointment;
 - c. Describes the committee's vote and the reasons for it;
 - d. Includes as an attachment a completed SON appointment, promotion and tenure committee summary form.

7. A memorandum from the Dean to the VP for the Health Sciences that either recommends or denies the appointment with supporting documentation.

F1.4.2 New Appointment as Associate Professor

(Including full-time, part-time and non-salaried; academic rank and qualified academic rank; transfer from part-time to full-time, non-salaried to salaried, qualified to academic). The rank of “Associate Professor” will include individuals meeting the criteria below for this academic rank.

An “Associate Professor” is recognized as a senior professional by virtue of advanced professional status and has practice, teaching and leadership experience. The individual at the rank of “Associate Professor” would demonstrate at least the minimum levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service required for *Associate Professor* as listed below.

1. Earned doctorate in nursing or related field required.
2. Professional specialization in nursing or related field required.
3. Evidence of clinical and professional scholarship.
4. Minimum of three years in upper division college teaching.
5. Minimum of three years in leadership with evidence of involvement in education, practice, research activities and or scholarly activities and health care contributions.
6. Minimum of three years’ experience at the rank of Assistant Professor.
7. Continued growth as evidenced by contributing to current developments in the academic field of expertise.
8. Additional varied supervisory and/or teaching experience.
9. Evidence of demonstrated competence in teaching and supervision.
10. Evidence of scholarly publications, presentations and/or research and other scholarly projects.

F1.4.3 New Appointment as Professor

(including full-time, part-time and non-salaried; academic rank and qualified academic rank; transfer from part-time to full-time, non-salaried to salaried, qualified to academic).

Except in extraordinary instances, the rank of “Professor” will be reserved for senior professionals with extensive professional credentials, who meet the criteria below and who have attained widespread (national and/or international) recognition as experts, for professional leadership, and who have made significant contributions to the profession of nursing. Professors will have demonstrated strong leadership in the SON and the University. The minimum levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service required for the rank of Professor are described below.

1. Earned doctorate in nursing or related field required.

2. Professional specialization in nursing or related field required.
3. Progressive record of scholarship and leadership with clinical competency.
4. Minimum of six years in upper division college teaching.
5. Minimum of six years in a distinguished leadership position.
6. Minimum of three years' experience at the rank of Associate Professor.
7. Evidence of continued professional growth and or recognition among educators and health professionals outside the employment setting. For example, consultation invited from and provided to national, state and local agencies or groups.
8. Presentation of scholarly papers, studies or presentations to professional societies or organizations.
9. Evidence of scholarship beyond doctorate.
10. Demonstrated commitments to and effective service in professional societies or organizations (committee chairmanship, board membership, and/or elected offices held).

Associate Professor and Professor must also include the following documents:

1. SON curriculum vitae, copies of diplomas, RN registration and certification as appropriate, and malpractice insurance as appropriate.
2. For all new appointments, a professional portfolio is recommended.
3. A list of names and present positions of scholars holding comparable or higher academic rank to the candidate, and/or continuing appointment, selected by the Dean to write letters of reference.
4. No fewer than five letters, some of which should be from outside the University, solicited by the Dean.
5. A recommendation from the Dean and the Department Chair stating the candidate's qualifications for appointment.
6. Evidence that the candidate's teaching ability and professional practice, where applicable, has been personally observed and evaluated by faculty colleagues senior to the candidate. (This evidence may be provided in general reference letters or in a separate format.)
7. A memorandum to the Dean from the Chair of the initial Ad Hoc academic review committee, whose membership includes faculty with the academic rank of Professor, which:
 - a. outlines the review process;
 - b. summarizes the committee's evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for appointment;

- c. describes the committee's vote and the reasons for it;
- d. includes as an attachment a completed SON appointment, promotion and tenure summary form;
- 8. A recommendation from the Dean to the VP for the Health Sciences that:
 - a. states the candidate's qualifications for appointment;
 - b. endorses the recommendation of the academic review committee(s);
 - c. includes any required component omitted from the report(s) of the review committee(s).

F1.5 Process of Review and Documents Required for Reappointment to a Term or Temporary Position

1. The process of review for reappointment to a term or temporary position is initiated by the Dean, whose letter invites the candidate in writing to apply for reappointment. Letters are also sent by the Dean advising the candidate's Dept. Chair and the Chair of the APT Committee advising them of the invitation of the candidate to be reappointed.
2. The letter from the Dean requests that the candidate advise the Dean in writing of their decision to seek or decline consideration for reappointment.
3. If the candidate wishes to be considered, the candidate should submit the following documents to the secretary of APT:
 - a) Submit up-to-date SON curriculum vitae with letter accepting invitation.
 - b) Include examples of scholarship since last appointment
 - c) A written statement by the candidate critically appraising performance in meeting the five criteria for evaluation of academic employees as set forth by the Policies of the Board of Trustees (Article 12-Title A)
<https://www.suny.edu/about/leadership/board-of-trustees/>
 - d) A written self-evaluation of teaching effectiveness (didactic and clinical as appropriate), faculty responsibilities and professional development.
 - e) Senior teaching evaluation document.
4. The letter will be sent by the Dean with the candidate's current HSC/SON curriculum vitae, to the APT committee
 - a) The candidate is to provide the APT committee with dates of onsite classes for a teaching evaluation. The APT committee will appoint a senior faculty member to conduct an in person evaluation of the candidate's capability as a teacher.
 - b) The senior faculty member will provide a written formative evaluation of the candidate's teaching performance in relation to rank.

5. The Department Chair receives the candidate's complete packet from the secretary of APT and writes and the Department Chair's comprehensive evaluation. The comprehensive evaluation is reviewed and signed by the candidate.
6. The complete packet, including the Department Chair's comprehensive evaluation, summary of student evaluations, and recommendation for reappointment and term is returned to the Secretary of the APT who will prepare the file for review by APT or Ad Hoc Committee, as appropriate. The APT committee will make a recommendation to the Dean for reappointment and term. Should the candidate disagree with the Department Chair's recommendation for reappointment and or term of reappointment, the APT committee will review the packet. The candidate can opt to meet with the APT committee for this review.

An Ad Hoc Committee is called by the Dean for reappointment of faculty at the rank of Clinical Associate and Clinical Professor for the review of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure. Faculty from within the SON at the rank of Professor and Clinical Professor serve as members of the Ad Hoc Committee. The Committee may include faculty with the rank of Professor from within the University at large, if additional members of the Committee are needed.

7. A memorandum from the Chair APT review committee to the Dean in the SON that includes:
 - a) the outlined review process and recommendation for reappointment and term for candidate;
 - b) the committee's summarized evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for reappointment;
 - c) the Department chair's and committee's vote, as appropriate, and rationale;
 - d) a completed SON appointment, promotion and continuing appointment, and committee summary form;
8. Endorsement of the report of the initial academic review committee by the Dean that includes any required component omitted from the committee's report.
9. A memorandum from the Dean to the Senior VP for the Health Sciences that either recommends or denies the reappointment, based on a description of the candidate's qualifications, and the recommendation of the APT.

F1.5.1 Documents Required for Reappointment to a Term or Temporary Position

1. The documents for the candidate's file will be collected and collated by the Secretary of the APT, who prepares the packet for review by the candidate's department chair, APT or Ad Hoc Committee, as appropriate.
2. Up to date HSC/SON curriculum vitae, a self-evaluation, a copy of RN licensure and re-registration, certification as appropriate, health credentials or declination and malpractice insurance.

3. Evidence of scholarship as appropriate to rank.
4. Evidence of an evaluation of teaching from a senior faculty member of the SON appointed by the APT committee.
5. A summary of data obtained through student evaluations of teaching performance with comments by the candidate as appropriate including an aggregate score of all teaching evaluations per semester.
6. Recommendation from the Dean and Department Chair stating the candidate's qualifications for reappointment.

F1.5.2 Reappointment as Clinical Associate Professor or Clinical Professor in a Term or Temporary Position requires evidence of:

A. Clinical Associate Professor

Reappointment as an Associate Professor, who is recognized as a senior professional by virtue of advanced professional status in clinical practice, teaching and beginning leadership experiences, must demonstrate at least the minimum levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service required for Associate Professor that are listed below.

1. Evidence of clinical excellence and professional experience in nursing.
2. Minimum of three years in upper division college teaching.
3. Minimum of three years in a leadership position in nursing with evidence of involvement in nursing education, clinical practice, research and scholarly activities, with health care contributions.
4. Minimum of three years' experience at the rank of Assistant Professor.
5. Continued growth as evidenced by contributing to current developments in the academic field of expertise.
6. Additional varied supervisory and/or teaching experience.
7. Evidence of demonstrated competence in teaching and supervision.
8. Beginning leadership in the following areas: teaching, practice research and integration, with recognized health care contributions.
9. Evidence of scholarly publications, presentations and/or research and other scholarly projects.

B. Clinical Professor

Reappointment to the rank of Clinical Professor, who is a senior professional with extensive professional credentials, and distinguished themselves as national/international leaders, clinical experts who make significant contributions to the profession of nursing, must meet the minimum levels of scholarship, teaching, and professional service required for the rank of Professor as described below.

1. Master's degree in nursing required; earned doctorate in nursing or related field required.
2. Clinical specialization in nursing required.
3. Evidence as a clinical expert, clinical competency and professional experience.
4. Minimum of six years in upper division college teaching.
5. Minimum of six years in a distinguished leadership position in nursing with evidence of involvement in nursing education, clinical practice, research and scholarly activities with recognized health care contributions.
6. Minimum of three years' experience at the rank of Associate Professor.
7. Sustained growth as evidenced by distinguished leadership contributing to current developments in the academic field of expertise.
8. Evidence of involvement in nursing education, clinical practice, research activities and/or scholarly activities.
9. Evidence of continued professional growth and or general recognition among educators and health professionals outside the employment setting. For example, consultation invited from and provided to national, state and local agencies or groups.
10. National and international presentation of scholarly papers, studies or speeches to professional societies or organizations.
11. Demonstrated commitments to and effective service in professional societies or organizations (committee chairmanship, board membership, and/or elected offices held).
12. Evidence of research activity beyond doctorate.

F2 Policies of the Appointment, Promotion & Tenure Committee for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure

The Office of the Dean is responsible for all administrative processes involved in appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure. The APT is responsible for review of appropriate data on each candidate and for subsequent recommendations to the Dean. All policies are in agreement with the Civil Service Law, the Policies of the Board of Trustees, the Agreement between the State of New York and the United University Professions for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

F2.1 Criteria for and Characteristics of the Faculty Role

The responsibility of the faculty member

Every faculty member should be cognizant of his/her responsibilities and obligations as well as the criteria that will be used in his/her evaluation. Each faculty member should seek the

advice and counsel of senior faculty in matters pertaining to promotion and tenure and undertake to critically review their own performance with the aim of meeting advancement criteria.

The centrality of Departments within the SON in appointment, promotion and tenure

A major responsibility for establishing and maintaining a high degree of excellence rests upon SON Departmental Chairs who must recruit individuals of great promise, attempt to provide an atmosphere where creativity and excellence are fostered, ensure that recruited faculty understand their responsibilities, explain the criteria that will be applied in considering advancement, provide adequate evaluation of performance at timely intervals and take responsibility for the difficult decisions that may lead to non-renewal, non-promotion or non-tenure decision. Faculty in a department, especially the more senior faculty, are expected to share in the responsibility for recruiting new faculty, in providing collegial assistance to more junior faculty, and in evaluating performance.

The criteria of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York is used in decisions related to promotion and/or continuing appointment. Contributions of SON faculty, particularly clinical professionals, may differ in nature and emphasis from those of traditional faculty. The following framework criteria shall be applied to individual faculty to evaluate their performance based on the mission of the SON. Candidates will 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 indicated in this document may be weighed more or less heavily from one individual to the next, so that one candidate may present strengths which are determined to outweigh some relative weaknesses in another area. The criteria are to be used to achieve the goal of fair and equitable assessment for every faculty member. To evaluate faculty members adequately and fairly, the criteria will be utilized where and as appropriate.

Minimal criteria for appointment of faculty to academic rank in the SON are noted on the criteria included in the Table of Criteria for Academic Rank (See Table 1, pp.35-36).

F2.2 Continuing Appointment

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 the perception by peers and the administrative authority of the University, and his or her contributions to the University, School, and profession. One measure to be utilized in making this determination will be an ongoing and increasing record

of such achievement and contribution, throughout professional life, and especially throughout the period of service to this University.

In the New York State educational system, tenure or continuing appointment is not considered a promotion. It is considered to be a separate issue from promotion. When a faculty member is being considered for promotion and for tenure two votes are taken, one for the promotion and one for tenure. Faculty can be granted tenure at any academic rank, though usually tenure is considered when a faculty member is promoted to the rank of associate professor.

F2.3 Process and Procedure for Promotion and/or Tenure

F2.3.1 Initiation of Candidacy

The Dean ordinarily initiates a candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment. The Department Chair shall notify the Dean in writing that they wish to initiate a candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment consideration. In no case shall the Dean initiate a candidacy without first having obtained the consent of the faculty member involved.

F2.3.2 Length of Service

The Trustees' Policies (Article XI, Title B, and Section 3) provide that no initial minimum length of service in any academic rank shall be required for eligibility for promotion and/or continuing appointment. The Trustees' Policies (Article XI, Title B, Section 3) provide that, "continuing appointment as Professor, Associate Professor may be given by the Chancellor on initial appointment or thereafter." "An Assistant Professor and Instructor are not eligible for continuing appointment at any of these ranks prior to the completion of a total of seven years in a position or positions of academic rank."

F2.3.3 Types of Reviews

A. Mandatory Review for Faculty Holding Academic Appointments: Candidate Notification

When consideration of a continuing appointment is mandatory, a faculty's Department Chair must notify the candidate and proceed with the evaluation unless the candidate submits a resignation, to take effect no later than the end of his or her term.

B. Voluntary Review Initiated by Faculty

Any individual faculty member of academic rank may initiate candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment at any time prior to either receiving notice of non-reappointment or submitting a resignation. The candidate shall communicate their intentions to their Department Chair in writing, who must consider the request. If the request for review results in the Department Chair's support, the candidacy file will be assembled by the Department Chair, with the help of the candidate. If the Department Chair's assessment of the faculty member results in a lack of support, the Department Chair must provide the faculty member with an evaluation in writing. The faculty member may appeal the decision to the SON's APT for a review. The appeal must be accompanied by supporting documents.

The APT will provide a review of the faculty's Curriculum Vitae and supporting documents to evaluate as to whether or not the faculty member has met the criteria for promotion and/or continuing appointment. A written evaluation will be provided by the APT to the Dean, Department Chair and the individual faculty member. If determined by the APT that the faculty member has met all criteria for promotion and/or continuing appointment, it makes its recommendation to the Dean regarding initiating candidacy. If the review of the APT supports the decision of the faculty's Department Chair, the faculty member can appeal to the Dean of the SON, whose review is final.

F2.4 Process and Procedure for Promotion and/or Tenure

F2.4.1 Initiation of Candidacy

The Dean ordinarily initiates a candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment, upon the recommendation of an individual faculty's Department Chair. In no case shall the Dean initiate a candidacy without first having obtained the consent of the faculty member involved.

F2.4.2 Responsibility to the Candidate for Assembly of Candidate's File

The candidate's Department Chair shall assume the responsibility of assisting the candidate in assembling the materials for the candidate's file (as described below). The Chair of the APT will serve to assist the candidate in clarifying questions regarding documentation to be contained within the file.

F2.4.3 Announcement of Candidacy

F2.4.4 Dean Announces Candidacy to All SON Faculty

The Dean will communicate a written announcement of candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment to all faculty members in the SON. The announcement includes both a statement from the Dean soliciting letters of comment from any member of the faculty, and a copy of the Policies of the Board of Trustees for faculty review when writing letters of comment.

In all cases of promotion or tenure, the faculty member must confer with the Dean on selection of referees. All referees and Department Chairs will be instructed to address their comments to the Dean.

The same procedure is followed as required for reappointment. See Section F1.4.1, with the addition to the Ad Hoc Committee a member of the Stony Brook University faculty with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, when a candidate is being considered for:

1. promotion to Clinical Professor or Professor continuing appointment:
The same procedure is followed as required for reappointment.
See Section F1.5.1, with the addition of a member of the Stony Brook University faculty with rank of Professor to an Ad Hoc Committee, when a candidate is being considered for:
 - a. promotion to Clinical Professor or Professor

b. continuing appointment

F2.4.5 Documents for Promotion

A. Promotion to Lecturer, Instructor, or Assistant Professor

(including full-time, part-time and voluntary; academic rank and qualified academic rank)

The same documentation is required as for reappointment to term or temporary positions at these ranks (See section F1.5.1).

B. Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor

(including full-time, part-time and voluntary; academic rank and qualified academic rank and decisions regarding continuing appointment)

1. Current SON curriculum vitae, a copy of RN licensure and Certifications.
2. For continuing appointments, an announcement of candidacy.
3. For full-time appointments, letter of intent.
4. Copies of recent evidence of scholarship.
5. Five referees holding tenure or a rank senior to the candidate will be mutually selected by the Dean and candidate to write letters of evaluation. Referees should include individuals from within and outside the University. A biographical sketch of each referee is a required document.
6. Evidence of support will be solicited from SON faculty/staff and the Department Chair, who have personally observed and have knowledge of the candidate.
7. A summary of data obtained through student evaluations of teaching performance, with comments by the candidate as appropriate.
8. Following a review by the APT committee or ad-hoc committee (see F2.5.1) a memorandum from the Committee Chair will be sent to the Dean of the SON that:
 - a. summarizes the committee's evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for promotion
 - b. includes any required component omitted from the report of the initial academic review committee

C. Documents Required for Continuing Appointment (Tenure)

1. Current SON Curriculum Vitae, a copy of RN licensure, Certifications. The SON curriculum vitae (CV) must clearly document all scholarly activities as they pertain to each area of scholarship (teaching, discovery, application) as outlined in this handbook. Evidence of scholarly work contained in the CV should be included in the candidate's file.
2. The letter written by the Dean to the University President will be included in the documents.
3. Evidence of on-going cumulative scholarship reflective of rank.

4. Evidence of effectiveness of University and community service.
5. A letter of recommendation must be provided for the candidate by each of the five (5) referees, and reflect personal knowledge of the candidate's professional and academic activities.

External referees must be individuals who can 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 and the indication of the relationship, if any with the candidate, should be stated by the candidate and submitted in the candidate's letter to the Dean.

6. A memorandum from the Chair of the initial academic review committee to the Dean that:
 - a. summarizes the committee's evaluation of the candidate's qualifications for appointment
 - b. describes the committee's vote with rationale

D. The Candidacy File

The Candidate's File includes a biographical file, general evaluative file and a special evaluative file. See Appendix C for a checklist for the documents and order of the file.

1. The Biographical File

The biographical file is prepared by the candidate. The file is available to all who have a right to contribute to the evaluative files.

The Department Chair will forward the completed biographical file to the Dean. If a Department Chair is a candidate, the Dean or another appropriate authority shall be responsible for the preparation of these materials.

Each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment shall prepare a biographical file that will become part of his or her evaluative file. This file shall include information concerning professional accomplishments that relevant to their candidacy. A personal statement of accomplishments and future plans in the areas of teaching, research, and/or professional service may be included.

Other documents that should be included in the biographic file includes, but is not limited to:

a. Current CV, RN licensure, and certifications

b. Publications

Peer reviewed publications or those accepted for publication should be used

c. Presentations

Presentations should be listed and divided into the following categories: (1) invited and peer reviewed scholarly lectures and symposia; (2) other lectures or presentations.

d. Research

Research that has been awarded, not-funded and pending review should be listed. Research conducted in collaboration with others should also be listed with the faculty's role (e.g. principle investigator), number of years of collaboration, title of the study), institutional/departmental affiliations and funds requested.

e. Copies of Scholarly Work

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

f. Teaching Contributions

Teaching contributions should be well documented. Such documentation might include, but not limited to, as many of the following categories as appropriate: contributions toward curricular development; design, redesign or teaching of new or existing courses; support of students' learning outside of the classroom; use of effective and innovative pedagogical approaches; advising, mentoring and supervising of students; evidence that course goals have been met; experiences outside of University settings that can be adapted to teaching at the University; and contributions to the scholarship of learning and teaching. In some of the categories, the candidate may choose to emphasize special contributions towards undergraduate or graduate education.

g. Student Advisees

Doctoral projects supervised, including student's name, title of project with dates of completion, as appropriate. Service on a doctoral dissertation committee (including role, e.g. Chair, committee member, outside reader). Undergraduate student advisement, as appropriate, may be included.

h. Service Contributions

Service contributions should be arranged in the following categories: (a) Departmental service; (b) University service (School level and above); (c) Professional service, outside the University; (d) Community service associated with field of specialization or within the University. The account should plainly indicate dates of service and roles taken (e.g., member, chair of committee) specifically, leadership provided. It should also include special contributions (e.g., prepared report on a specified topic). When individuals have a lengthy record of service, the list may be limited to a representative selection of activities.

i. Memberships

A list of the memberships in scholarly and professional societies, and role (e.g. member, chair), particularly noting leadership roles. National/international initiatives served, in which substantive contributions have been made should be included.

2. The General Evaluative File

This file contains the biographical file with the addition of confidential information that the candidate may review before the President's decision is made. This material is available to the appropriate faculty group, to the Ad Hoc Committee and to the higher academic administrators as well as to the candidate at the appropriate time.

a. Supervisory Evaluations

The General Evaluative File will contain all supervisory evaluations. These include the reports of the candidate's Department Chair, the Dean, and beyond on the supervisory chain (the Senior VP FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES or equivalent, the Provost). The General Evaluative File will also contain the recommendation of the SON Ad Hoc Committee as indicated in a letter by the Committee's Chair summarizing the recommendations of that faculty group. These letters should provide a clear and specific summary of the case while still preserving the confidentiality of those solicited opinions that must not be seen by the candidate. When writers of solicited letters have given permission for the candidate to see their letters, copies of their letters (either as written or with identity of course and authorship removed, as specified by the writer) will be included in the General Evaluative File. The originals will stand in the section of the Special Evaluative File that contains solicited evaluations from outside referees, colleagues and students.

b. Department Chair's Evaluation of Candidate's Teaching.

The candidate's Chair shall provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness (perhaps included as a specific section of his/her letter of recommendation). This evaluation should be based on, but not necessarily limited to, a summary of student evaluations of teaching solicited in courses in which the candidate has taught. The summary of student evaluations of teaching should indicate the course number and title and the semester in which the course was offered.

3. The Special Evaluative File.

This file contains confidential material that is not accessible to the candidate, but only to the appropriate faculty, the SON Ad Hoc Committee and higher academic administrators.

Division of File

The division of the file should contain all solicited recommendations (referees and faculty) other than those who are supervisory to the candidate. It should contain substantive written evaluations from at least five authorities from outside the University in all cases of promotion to higher rank or continuing appointment or both. 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 the candidate was a student. Each outside letter should appear on letterhead (or have attached to it a statement identifying the writer, explaining why she or he has been chosen to evaluate the case, and indicating the relationship, if any, with the candidate if that is not stated in the letter of reference). These letters of evaluation should ordinarily not be more than twelve months old. All letters in a language other than English must be accompanied by a translation.

Letters Included in the File

All letters soliciting opinions from outside authorities all responses received from them (including those who decline or are unable to write), and all solicited letters (those contributed under these procedures) from within the University must be included in this file. All letters in the supervisory chain (Departmental Chair, Dean, etc.) are open to the candidate as set forth by the Board of Trustees policies.

a. Letters from the University, Outside the Candidate's Department

When the candidate has engaged in teaching, research or service in the University, but outside of the SON, letters from those in a position to evaluate these contributions should be included in the candidacy file.

b. Candidate May Suggest External References

The candidate may suggest a list of no more than five and no less than three external references from which the SON may choose all or at least three. The references should be individuals who can provide substantive written evaluations from outside the University in all cases of promotion to higher rank or continuing appointment or both. The candidate should consult with their Department Chair to suggest the list of potential referees, which will be forwarded by the Department Chair to the Dean for his/her consideration.

c. Expertise of External References

The candidate, in consultation with their Department Chair should take care to suggest a referee who can 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. The name, title and address of the referee should be provide to the secretary of APT.

d. Correspondence to the External References

The candidate is not to correspond with potential reviewers. All correspondence to potential external references must be included in the Special Evaluative File. The Department Chair will submit the list of potential reviewers along with the candidate's Biographical File to the Dean. The Dean will send letters of solicitation to potential reviewers. If for any reason an outside reviewer is unable to provide a careful evaluation, additional reviewers must be solicited to make up the required minimum.

e. Letters Sent by the Dean to External References

The letters sent by the Dean to solicit the referee's opinions should be accompanied by the candidate's CV as well as by reprints and/or preprints selected by the candidate. The soliciting letter should contain all the substantive categories, which request that the referee specifically address:

1. include specific evaluation of the candidate's achievements (teaching, scholarship, 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);

2. compare the candidate's scholarly or professional contributions with those in the candidate's field who are at a comparable career stage;
3. supply information when possible about the candidate's teaching effectiveness;
4. 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.

F2.5 Evaluation Procedures of the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee, Dean, VP for the Health Sciences, Provost, and President

F2.5.1 Evaluation Procedures of the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee

a. The Appropriate Group of Faculty Defined

An Ad Hoc Committee of senior faculty of the SON (including and faculty who hold continuing appointments at the rank of Professor and Clinical Professor) shall be responsible for and making a recommendation to the Dean on each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment. The SON Ad Hoc Review Committee also will review new appointments at the senior level (Associate or Professor) and new part-time continuing appointments at the senior level. Files for these appointments should adhere to the specifications provided above.

The appropriate group will vary according to the type of action being considered.

Promotion: All members of the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee who are of higher rank than the candidate.

Continuing Appointment: All members of the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee with a continuing appointment.

b. File is Ready for Evaluation by the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee

The Dean will notify the candidate's Department Chair at the time that the file is ready for evaluation. The candidate's Department Chair will be given an opportunity to review the solicited referee letters and modify his/her supervisory letter. The letter by the candidate's Department Chair shall be considered a draft until reviewed by the Dean for confidentiality of solicited opinions. This may be done by referring in the letters without identifiers. Key identifying individual authors of letters by name should be provided for these references and included in the special evaluative file, but not seen by the candidate. The Department Chair shall be responsible for any revision required to preserve confidentiality of solicited opinions. A copy of the Chair's letter shall be released to the candidate immediately following review by the Dean and, if necessary, revision.

c. The SON Ad Hoc Review Committee is Convened

The SON Ad Hoc Review Committee Chair shall preside and convene meetings to review a case. The Dean shall notify the Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee in writing that a case of continuing appointment and/or promotion has been initiated. In the notification letter to the of Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee Chair he/she is charged by the Dean to inspect the candidates of Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee Chair shall convene a meeting of all faculty members eligible to vote on the candidate (within approximately one month of file completion). The Chair of the Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee is responsible for ensuring that the composition of the of Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee follows the procedures provided in this document. If the of Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee Chair does not hold the rank or appointment required to evaluate a candidate, responsibility for presiding and convening a meeting shall be executed by the Associate Dean. Any other special circumstances (e.g., the Nursing Ad Hoc Review Committee Chair has a dual role as the candidate's Department Chair) shall be resolved by the Dean.

Prior to reaching a decision the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee may seek additional information, either on its own or through the Dean. Substantively new information affecting the evaluation of the candidate will be shared with the department Chair in keeping with the principle of confidentiality to respect the source(s) of that information.

d. Eligibility to Vote

In order for a case of continuing appointment to be held at least five (5) members and no more than (9) members of the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee faculty eligible to vote must attend.

e. In a Case of Continuing Appointment: An Enlarged Group

If in a case of continuing appointment the SON 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 SON, preferably faculty members who are from other programs in the HSC. Faculty on the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee eligible to vote but who do not attend the formal meeting shall not be counted as part of the size requirement.

f. Access to the File by the SON Committee Before the Meeting is Convened

The appropriate faculty group, in advance of making its recommendation, shall have ready access to the completed file and to a copy of these procedures. The file shall carry on its face 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. The file can only be reviewed in the office of the Dean.

F2.6 Continuing Appointment (Tenure)

F2.6.1 Candidacy for Continuing Appointment (Tenure)

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 IX, Titles B and D). Candidacy for continuing appointment will be considered using the criteria set forth in section 3 and following the procedures outlined in section 5. 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 the perception by peers and the administrative authority of the University, and his or her contributions to the University, School, and profession. One measure to be utilized in making this determination will be an ongoing and increasing record of such achievement and contribution, throughout professional life, and especially throughout the period of service to this University.

Appointments bearing the titles "Instructor," "Lecturer" or modified by terms such as "Research," or "Clinical," or for faculty duties of less than a full-time nature, will be considered to be non-tenure generating. Such appointments will be for a stated term. Time spent in such appointments will not count toward the time period utilized for continuing appointment (mandatory tenure review) considerations. However, voluntary review for continuing appointment (tenure) among individuals holding a modified title may be considered and will use the criteria set forth in Table 1 (See pp. 35-36) and following the procedures outlined in this document.

F2.6.2 Voting Procedures of the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee

Each member of the appropriate faculty group, after having examined the candidate's file and engaging in a discussion of the case by attending the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee meeting, 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 Committee Chair who places them in a sealed envelope filed in a secure location separate from the candidate's file. The Chair will include a written summary recommendation that reflects the numerical vote and the substance of the discussion. The Committee will submit the Committee's recommendation using a standard form (see Appendix B) immediately upon adjournment to the Dean.

F2.6.3 Evaluation by the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee, Dean, VP for the Health Sciences and the Provost

a. Dean's Review of the Candidate's File after the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee's Review

The candidate's file is reviewed by the Dean after the APT/SON Ad Hoc Review Committee makes a recommendation, ordinarily within two weeks of receipt. If the Dean does not agree with, or has questions about the recommendation of the Committee, the Dean shall meet with the Committee to allow an exchange of ideas and opinions before completing his/her formal written recommendation.

b. 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/Ad Hoc Review Committee, this information will be communicated to the APT/Ad Hoc Review Committee and to the candidate's Department Chair. If so requested, the appropriate administrative officers will discuss such information with the APT/Ad Hoc Review Committee, which shall have the right to add to the file its subsequent reaction.

c. **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 their review

d. **File Sent by Dean of the SON up the Supervisory Chain**

The Dean will then send the file to the VP for the Health Sciences (or the equivalent) who, after formulating a recommendation, will ordinarily forward the file to the HSC Personnel Office. If the VP for the Health Sciences 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 Review Committee Chair) before formulating a recommendation.

e. **Letter by the VP for the Health Sciences Released to the Candidate**

A copy of the VP for the Health Sciences' letter of recommendation will be released to the candidate at the time that the file is available for his/her review.

F2.6.4 Candidate Notified by the HSC Personnel Office that the File is Available for Review

The candidate will ordinarily be notified that the file is available for his/her review by the HSC Personnel Office within 5 days of notification, thereafter it will be forwarded to the next level of review (e.g., Provost or President's office).

F2.6.5 Provost Review

The Provost, after formulating a recommendation, will ordinarily forward the file to the President. If the Provost disagrees with, or has questions about the recommendation of the prior authorities (the VP for the Health Sciences or equivalent, the Dean of the SON, or the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee), the Provost will ordinarily confer with the appropriate authorities before formulating a recommendation.

F2.6.6 Action by the University President

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.

The University President May Consult with the APT/ Ad Hoc Review Committee

If the President disagrees with the SON APT/Ad Hoc Review 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.

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/Ad Hoc Review 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.

Consultation by the President of the University with the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee

If the President disagrees with the SON's APT/AD HOC Review 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.

F2.6.7 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.

F2.6.8 Resubmission

a. Procedures for Reconsideration of a Case up to Twelve Months Following Disapproval

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

b. Resubmitted File

Files for a resubmitted case should be presented in two parts.

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 SON Ad Hoc Review Committee review, and transmitted to the Dean's Office for review by the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee.

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 Department Chair with emphasis on the recent achievement of the candidate. Part II also will be submitted for review to the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee.

c. Evaluation of the 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 makes their recommendation to the SON Ad Hoc Review Committee, which will evaluate whether or not a substantially higher level of achievement has been reached in the intervening year.

d. Procedures for a Reconsidered Case More than Twelve Months Following Disapproval

After twelve months following disapproval of a promotion or tenure recommendation, normal procedures for submission of candidacy files should be followed.

F3 Evaluating Scholarly Activities

F.3.1 Scholarly Activities

Scholarly Activities are expected to be cumulative. Higher levels of scholarship are associated with higher academic ranks, and will expand upon the level(s) that precede it (See Table 1). Descriptions of the aspects of scholarship as described by the American Association of Colleges of Nursing are provided in Appendix A.

The faculty of the SON embrace the description of scholarship as set forth in;

- a. the position statement of the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN), *Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing* (1999);
- b. the National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties (NONPF), *Scholarship and Career Development: Strategies for Success* (2005);
- c. the above two documents are based on aspects of scholarship, teaching, and professional service described by Boyer (1990).¹

F3.2 Levels of Scholarship

The descriptions of scholarship described by AACN, NONPF and Boyer, describe aspects of scholarship that include teaching, application (practice), discovery (research) and integration (interdisciplinary concepts/collaboration). Levels of scholarship have been identified. Scholarly activities within each level progress from a more basic to higher level of activity within each aspect of scholarship. The level of scholarly activity of faculty may vary among the aspects of scholarship. However, patterns and strengths of individual faculty that lead to achievement of the highest levels of scholarship demonstrate their growth as scholars and contributions to their profession and the community at large.

The Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York consider the mastery of subject matter, effectiveness in teaching, scholarly ability, effectiveness of University service and continuing growth as key characteristics of faculty, and are congruent with both the criteria for academic rank (see Table 1) and the descriptions and guidelines of AACN, NONPF and the Boyer model of scholarship (See Appendix A). The levels of scholarship as identified in Teaching, Discovery (research), Service, Application (practice) as identified below, provide for levels of scholarly growth, from which the characteristics of faculty included in the Policies of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York apply. The scholarship of the integration pertains to interdisciplinary collaboration and/or integration of concepts from other disciplines within all aspects of scholarship (teaching, application, discovery and integration)

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

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. Faculty members are expected to demonstrate minimum levels of service to the University and SON, as well as to the professional community at large (e.g. professional and community organizations).

F3.2.1 The Scholarship of Teaching

All faculty members are expected to demonstrate at least 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:

Scholarship Level 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 and course director evaluations.

Scholarship Level 2

The candidate must present evidence that he/she is an exceptional instructor with substantial teaching responsibility. The former can be shown by receipt of university awards for teaching or through comparative quantitative and qualitative evidence from student, peer and course director evaluations; the latter, by submitting proof – syllabi, lesson plans, lecture notes, case presentations, etc.—of substantial teaching efforts. In addition the candidate should assume significant responsibility for course planning and administration.

Scholarship Level 3

In addition to the criteria in level 2, the candidate should present evidence of innovative and creative teaching methods and/or curricular materials. Moreover these materials must be publically available and critically acclaimed either in professional publications or by external evaluators, or evidenced by extensive use at other institutions.

Scholarship Level 4

In addition to level 2 and 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 awards and honors.

F3.2.2 Scholarship of Discovery (Research)

The scholarship of discovery is inquiry that produces the disciplinary and professional knowledge that is at the very heart of academic pursuits (Boyer, 1990). Within nursing, the scholarship of discovery reflects the unique perspective of nursing that “takes an expanded view of health by emphasizing health promotion, restoration, and rehabilitation, as well as a commitment to caring and comfort (AACN, 1998, p.1).” The scholarship of discovery takes

the form of primary empirical research, historical research, theory development and testing, methodological studies, and philosophical inquiry and analysis. It increasingly is interdisciplinary and collaborative in nature, across professional groups and within nursing itself.

Scholarship Level 1

The candidate must participate in a research program or demonstrate a pattern of scholarship leading to publications in peer reviewed journals. The publications may involve scientific, clinical and/or educational research or other forms of recognized scholarship. The specific role in collaborative work and publications must be made clear. Case reports or course materials generally will count for little here unless appearing in critically reviewed journals with a clearly defined and significant contribution from the candidate.

Scholarship Level 2

The candidate must conduct a research program or demonstrate a pattern of scholarship with a steady or improving rate of publication in critically refereed journals. This could include significant review articles, book chapters, monographs published curricula, computer software, and other modes of scholarship amenable to peer review. There should also be evidence of invited lectures at major symposia and professional or scientific meetings.

Scholarship Level 3

The candidate supervises an independent, productive research program or demonstrates a pattern of scholarship that addresses major and significant problems or topics. There should be a solid record of original and important publications in top peer-reviewed journals in the candidate's field, or first or senior author publications in books, or other recognized intellectual products that can be objectively evaluated on a retrospective basis. The candidate should also attract students and fellows. There must be evidence of a strong national reputation and respect among peers documented through such vehicles as letters of recommendations, invited lectures, extensive citation or use of published work, as well as serving as a Principal Investigator of a competitively reviewed grant or lead investigator in a significant study.

Scholarship Level 4

In addition to the above, 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 awards and honors.

F3.2.3 The Scholarship of Application (Practice) / Professional Service

The discipline of nursing recognizes the scholarship of clinical practice as an essential to nursing faculty in order to maintain clinical competency within a university setting and the advancement of clinical knowledge in the discipline (AACN 1999). The Scholarship of Practice includes evidence of direct impact on health care and defining health care problems. Knowledge in the discipline of nursing is advanced is achieved through competence in clinical practice. Faculty practice roles provided role models for students to emulate. Role of faculty in practice may be as direct care provider, clinical educator, consultant and/or in nursing administration. All faculty are expected to maintain clinical competence in their area of clinical practice, and serve as resources to apply and translate clinical knowledge for students within the classroom.

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 College and University public service, committee work, administrative work, and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships. Additional contributions include correcting discrimination and encouraging diversity, improving efficiency of operations, etc. Contributions to the profession or field also constitute service as demonstrated by such things as serving as a referee, discussant, and chairing conference sessions. Levels of professional service are defined as:

Service Level 1

The candidate must accept and perform well as reasonable share of clinical or administrative and governance duties and interact in a positive way with faculty and students.

Service Level 2

This candidate should perform substantial amounts of service and make an outstanding contribution to administration, governance, and/or clinical services. He/she should also participate in significant professional service outside SUSB (i.e. membership in editorial boards of major journals, membership in standing NIH study sections, or a significant role in professional or scientific societies).

Service Level 3

In addition to the criteria in 2, the candidate must show substantial evidence of leadership within SUSB and /or outside. This would include chairing important SUSB committees, serving as an officer in a national professional organization, managing a major clinical service, etc.

F.3.4 Application of Scholarship Levels to Rank/Appointment

Table I: below outlines the expected scholarship levels for promotion and tenure by faculty rank and track (Research Scholar, Educator Scholar or Clinical Scholar). An overall minimum total score for each faculty rank/track is assigned. A minimum research/scholarship total score is also assigned for each faculty rank/track

Minimum Scholarship by Rank/Appointment & Promotion Guideline

Criteria/Position	Clinical Instructor	Clinical Assistant Professor	Clinical Associate Professor	Clinical Professor	Assistant Professor	Associate Professor	Professor
Minimum Discovery Level	0	1	1	1	1	2	3
Minimum Teaching Level	1	2	3	4	2	3	3
Minimum Application Level	1	1	2	3	1	2	3
Minimum Total Score	2	4	6	8	4	7	9

APPENDIX A*: DEFINING SCHOLARSHIP

The American Association of Colleges of Nursing's (AACN) and the National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties (NONPF) have both published guidelines for scholarship. The AACN position paper, *Defining Scholarship for the Discipline of Nursing* (1999), provides standards that clarify and describe a full range of scholarship within the discipline of nursing. In particular, this statement focuses on four aspects of scholarship that are salient to academic nursing-- discovery, teaching, applications in clinical practice, and integration of ideas from nursing and other disciplines. These areas support the values of a profession committed to both social relevance and scientific advancement. It is a descriptive tool, and may be used to guide promotion, tenure, and merit reviews in a way that is appropriate to the profession; expand the scope of recognized scholarly activities; guide individual career planning; and demonstrate the growth of the profession over time. The unique culture and context of each academic institution, and the priorities of each nursing unit, will determine the relevance and value of the proposed standards within its own setting. (<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm>, retrieved, 5/21/07)

AACN recognizes that as a practice profession, nursing, “may have priorities for teaching, scholarship, and service that are linked directly to the goals of the profession”. Scholarship in nursing has been defined by AACN as, “those activities that systematically advance the teaching, research, and practice of nursing through rigorous inquiry that 1) is significant to the profession, 2) is creative, 3) can be documented, 4) can be replicated or elaborated, and 5) can be peer-reviewed through various methods”, (<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm>, retrieved, 5/21/07).

The four aspects of scholarship, teaching, application, discovery and integration have been described as salient to academic nursing, with each area supporting the “values of a profession committed to both social relevance and scientific advancement.”, (<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm>, retrieved, 5/21/07). The NONPF publication, *Scholarship and Career Development: Strategies for Success. A Scholarship Manual for APN Faculty* (2005) builds upon and elaborates on the AACN position statement on defining scholarship, with emphasis on the meaning of scholarship for advance practice nursing.

Individual Faculty Outcomes

Each individual faculty will engage in committee activities within the SON and or university-wide each academic year **(Service)**.

Each individual faculty will engage in community service outside the SON each academic year **(Service)**.

Each individual faculty teaching in an APRN clinical specialty course will engage in clinical practice **(Practice)**.

Each individual faculty will achieve a 3.00 or greater mean score on teaching evaluations each academic year **(Teaching)**.

Each individual faculty will engage in two professional development activities each academic year **(Professional Development)**.

Each individual faculty will hold membership on a local, state, or national organization/professional committee **(Professional Development)**.

Each individual faculty will demonstrate scholarship through one of the following activities each academic year: a local, regional, national or international presentation (podium or poster); a publication; grantsmanship; and / or conduct of research **(Scholarship)**.

Evaluation of Teaching

The Scholarship of Teaching contributes to the development of critically reflective knowledge about teaching and learning. It “emphasizes the development, testing, and dissemination of advances in pedagogy.”² 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.

The evaluation of teaching activities is not always readily quantifiable. Excellence and innovation in teaching, is just as real a phenomenon as excellence and innovation in research. Excellence and innovation in teaching can be evaluated by a variety of measures, e.g. teaching awards, systematic and objective student evaluations, the development of new courses, the introduction of innovative course materials, teaching aids, or teaching methods, participation in the writing of text books or book chapters, and invitations and peer reviewed presentations nationally, at other institutions or organizations regarding teaching programs. Teaching clinical skills can be assessed by measures such as the performance of students on standardized evaluative tests, the insight and thoroughness of written student case reports, the establishment of new clinical services that involve student practitioners, the instructing of students in clinical research projects, the participation of students in published case reports, and the establishment of interdisciplinary clinical services that expand student understanding of patient care. It is also understood that faculty who enhance their own clinical skills, e.g. hold and maintain national specialty national certification and practice clinically, maintain high levels of competency that enhances clinical teaching. Faculty engaged in clinical practice will be able to provide enhanced clinical skills to students. It is recognized that faculty must maintain clinical skills through faculty practice and that the maintenance of clinical skills is necessary to be an effective clinical instructor. However,

*Adapted from, American Association of the Colleges of Nursing (1999). *Defining scholarship for the discipline of nursing*. (<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm>, retrieved, 5/14/08) and Chase, S. Dumas, MA and MirrJansen, M. (2005) *Scholarship and career development: Strategies for success*. Washington D.C.: National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties.

² Smith K.D. and Their, S.L. (2005). “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.

participation in faculty practice per se is not deemed scholarly in itself or a service-related activity that can be used to advance a promotion or tenure decision. Scholarly faculty practice includes peer reviewed publications, presentations, development of clinical practice protocols which are peer reviewed, published and implemented in the practice arena. Leadership participation in national professional organizations dedicated to improving the teaching of a subject area will also be viewed as an attempt to enhance the general level of teaching.

Evaluation of Application (Practice)

The scholarship of practice 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. Clinical practice requires obtaining and maintaining national certification, which are evidence of excellence and an indicator of quality. Excellence in application can be assessed by exemplars that have been produced beyond the responsibilities of the practice role. Examples include, but are not limited to, peer review or solicited request for national presentations on clinical topics, in which the faculty is expert; clinical publications in peer reviewed journals; development of clinical practice protocols which are peer reviewed, published and adapted.

Evaluation of Discovery (Research)

Research generates new knowledge, and a better understanding of questions and issues relevant to the discipline of nursing. Excellence in research can be evaluated by a variety of measures, e.g. the securing of research grant support from external agencies, publications in peer reviewed scholarly journals, organizing research meetings and colloquia, invitations and/or peer reviewed presentations at meetings or symposia, contributions to books and monographs. Excellence in research is also reflected by community service activities such as serving as a member of the editorial staff of a scholarly journal, the executive of a professional research organization or a reviewer in a scientific review committee beyond the SON and one's faculty role. In a clinical institution such as the SON, the ability of an investigator to involve clinical colleagues as well as nursing students in his/her research endeavors is recommended and viewed as scholarly mentoring.

Evaluation of Integration

Integration of interdisciplinary concepts and collaboration within the scholarship of teaching, application and research is integral to scholarship. Evidence of interdisciplinary scholarly collaboration include, but are not limited to, interdisciplinary teaching, curriculum development, research collaboration, 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. Innovative means for bridging gaps across disciplines, overcoming potential barriers, and sharing what is learned falls into this form of scholarly activity.

Evaluation of Service

All faculty are expected to participate in a meaningful way in service to the institution. This can be administrative service such as serving on committees or patient related service such as participating in clinical service beyond one's clinical practice responsibilities. Service that is highly innovative, that advances the institutional mission to a new level, that has far reaching consequences, will be considered in the evaluation of a candidate for promotion and tenure.

References

- American Association of the Colleges of Nursing (1999). *Defining scholarship for the discipline of nursing*. (<http://www.aacn.nche.edu/Publications/positions/scholar.htm>), retrieved, 5/14/08).
- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities for the professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Chase, S. Dumas, MA and MirrJansen, M. (2005) *Scholarship and career development: Strategies for success*. Washington D.C.: National Organization of Nurse Practitioner Faculties.
- Smith K.D. and Their, S.L. (2005). "Considering 'Faculty Priorities Reconsidered'", In, O'Meara K, Rice RE (Ed.). *Faculty priorities reconsidered: Rewarding multiple forms of scholarship*. San Francisco: CA. John Wiley and Sons.

APPENDIX B: APT AD Hoc Review Committee Chair's Summary Voting Sheet

School of Nursing APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE SUMMARY

Date of Meeting: _____

Candidate: _____

Department _____

Academic: _____ Salaried _____ Non-Salaried _____

Qualified Academic: _____

Action Under Review

Rank

Qualifier

_____ Appointment

_____ Lecturer

_____ Research

_____ Reappointment

_____ Instructor

_____ Clinical

_____ Promotion

_____ Assistant Professor

_____ Visiting

_____ Tenure

_____ Associate Professor

_____ Other: Adjunct

_____ Full Professor

Faculty Eligible to Vote (include rank and tenure if appropriate):

Result of Vote

Recommendation

No. In Favor: _____

No. Not In Favor: _____

No. Abstaining: _____

Chair

APPENDIX C: Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment Summary File Check-Off List

The file should be organized as indicated below. The material in the Biographic, General Evaluative, and Special Evaluative must be presented so that it will remain intact during the review process (e.g. a loose leaf binder with subdivisions). **Check** each box as items are included in the file.

1	Biographic File (Copies of publications of the candidate. If extensive, a representative sample is sufficient).
2	General Evaluative File (open to review by candidate at the appropriate time)
2a	Notice of announcement of candidacy.
2b	Chair's supervisory letter.
2c	Copy of standard form letter sent soliciting the references.
2d	Teaching evaluations in the form of summaries of questionnaire responses, etc., provided the names of respondents, whether faculty or students, are not included.
2e	Published reviews and appraisals of the candidate's publications, contributions and scholarship.
2f	Copies of letters of evaluation whose authors have indicated in writing that the candidate may see their letter. If such permission has been given only on condition that all identification as to its source is removed, a purged copy shall be provided here. All the original letters of evaluation shall be placed in the appropriate section of the special evaluative file.
3	Special Evaluative File (not open to review by the candidate at any time):
3a	Vote of appropriate faculty group (ballots)
3b	Copies of letters of evaluation whose authors have indicated in writing that the candidate may see their letter. If such permission has been given only on condition that all identification as to its source is removed, a purged copy shall be provided here.
3c	All statements regarding the outside reviewer's qualifications and acquaintance with candidate.
3d	Outside letters of evaluation by authors who did not indicate that the candidate may see their letter.
3e	Solicited letters of evaluation and recommendation from SUSB personnel other than supervisory who did not indicate that the candidate may see their letter.
3f	Teaching evaluations solicited from faculty or students.
4	List of those who may review the file and comment on its contents should be attached to the complete file (with space below for signatures after review).
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	