



Stony Brook University

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE

November 18, 2024

Revised: November 10, 2025

PREAMBLE

The Promotion and Tenure Committees (Promotion and Tenure Committee - Junior and Promotion and Tenure Committee - Senior) are standing committees of the Arts and Sciences Senate. The PTCs serve three of the four affiliate units of the Arts & Sciences Senate: the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), the Division of the University Libraries, and the School of Communications & Journalism. The fourth unit, the School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences (SoMAS) is served by their internal PTC. These Guidelines are to be used by all four units for the preparation of promotion and tenure files. The procedures described herein will be used by the PTCs to evaluate all files.

The PTCs are advisory committees to the Deans of each unit. The PTCs make recommendations, based on their review of the files, by voting as to whether they concur or do not concur with the recommendations made by the voting faculty of the unit.

These Procedures are intended to guide Departments in cases of:

1. Promotion (from within) OR Appointment (from without) to the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor
2. Continuing Appointment (Tenure whether internally or for new appointments).

[Intentionally Left Blank]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. POLICIES ON PROMOTION AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENT.....	4
2. DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	7
2.1 Initiation of Candidacy.....	7
2.2 Re-submission.....	8
2.3 Announcement of Candidacy.....	10
2.4.3 The Biographic File.....	11
2.4.4 The General Evaluative File.....	13
2.4.5 The Special Evaluative File.....	15
2.5 Evaluation.....	18
2.6 Submission to the Promotion and Tenure Committee.....	20
3. NEW FACULTY & ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS.....	22
4. EVALUATION BY THE ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE.....	27
5. EVALUATION BY THE DEAN.....	29
6. EVALUATION BY THE PROVOST.....	30
7. ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT.....	31
8. REVISION AND REVIEW OF THE GUIDELINES.....	32
9. APPENDICES.....	33
9.1 Sample announcement of initiation of a candidacy for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.....	34
9.2 Sample letter of solicitation for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.....	35
9.3 Suggested Order of Material in Files.....	38
9.4 Biographic File Template Customization.....	39
9.5 Definitions.....	40
9.6 Acronyms.....	42
10. Revision History.....	43

1. POLICIES ON PROMOTION AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

1.1 Criteria

The Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University of New York, Art. XII, Title A, paragraph 4 and Title B, paragraph 2, indicate the elements which should be weighed in evaluating candidates for promotion and/or continuing appointment (tenure):

"recommendations of academic employees, or their appropriate committees, or other appropriate sources may consider, but shall not be limited to consideration of, the following:

"(a) Mastery of subject matter -- as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards, and reputation in the subject matter field.

"(b) Effectiveness in teaching -- as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials on new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation.

"(c) Scholarly ability -- as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, publications, and reputation among colleagues.

"(d) Effectiveness of University service -- as demonstrated by such things as College and University public service, committee work, administrative work, and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships.

"(e) Continuing growth -- as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic

employee's fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility."

To further the commitment to affirmative action at SUNY Stony Brook, the following additional criterion will be applied when evaluating candidates for promotion and/or continuing appointment (tenure):

"(f) Contributions to enriching the life of the University by correcting discrimination and encouraging diversity – as demonstrated by teaching, University service, or scholarship concerning women and minorities. Besides reports from professionals within a field, colleagues, and students, a candidate's effectiveness may be assessed by accepting a diverse range of publications and modes of service that address the contributions, interests and special needs of minorities or women and promote efforts to achieve equal opportunity."

1.2 Mandatory Review for Continuing Appointment

1.2.1 The Trustees' Policies (Article XI, Title B: Continuing Appointment, Section 3: Eligibility) defines the regulations on continuing appointment:

Professors or Librarians on an initial three-year term appointment, and who may be having past service applied, must be granted continuing appointment at the end of that term.

Associate Professors or Associate Librarians on an initial three-year term appointment, and who may be having past service applied, must be granted continuing appointment at the end of that term.

1.2.1.1 Assistant professors and instructors reappointed in academic rank positions (professor, associate, assistant and instructor, or parallel librarian titles) in the SUNY

must be reappointed with continuing appointment if they have completed seven years of service in a position or positions of academic rank in the University. Satisfactory full-time service in academic rank in any other accredited institution of higher education shall be credited as service up to a maximum of three years, but waiver of all or part of this service credit shall be granted upon written request of the employee to the chief administrative officer not later than six months after the date of the initial appointment. Such requests should be submitted to the department head for forwarding to the administration.

1.2.2 Continuing appointment cases must be considered at least one year prior to the time when continuing appointment would become mandatory or when the final term appointment would expire (Policies, Art. XI, Title D, section 5).

1.2.3 Associate or full professors holding a term appointment must be reviewed for continuing appointment not later than the second year of service in that rank.

1.2.4 Assistant professors or instructors who have neither previously been reviewed for tenure at the Stony Brook nor submitted a letter of resignation, must be reviewed for continuing appointment not later than the sixth year of service in academic rank.

1.2.5 In computing consecutive years of service for the purposes of appointment or reappointment, periods of leave of absence at full salary shall be included; periods of leave of absence at partial salary or period beyond continuing appointment without salary and periods of part-time service shall not be included, but shall not be deemed an interruption of otherwise consecutive service.

1.3 New Appointments

1.3.1 New appointments at the senior level (Associate or Full Professor) and new part-time continuing appointments at the senior level are also to be reviewed by the Promotion and Tenure Committee - Senior. Files for these appointments should adhere

to the specifications given in section 3. Appointments for adjunct or visiting faculty are not reviewed by the Committee.

1.3.2 Files for new appointments should show evidence that affirmative action guidelines have been observed and that the best qualified candidate has been proposed. Approval or disapproval by the Office of Equity and Access must be obtained before the file is sent to the Committee.

2. DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

2.1 Initiation of Candidacy

2.1.1 The department chairperson (or program director) ordinarily initiates a candidacy for promotion to higher rank, or for a continuing appointment, or both, having obtained the consent of the faculty member involved. The department chairperson is responsible for the preparation of the candidacy file, although the responsibility of assembling materials for the file may be delegated to an ad hoc committee. If this is the case, the chairperson must consult with the candidate on the choice of the faculty member named to head that committee. The ad hoc committee and the candidate shall be furnished with a copy of these Procedures, which will guide their work.

2.1.2 When consideration of continuing appointment is mandatory, the chairperson must notify the candidate and proceed with the evaluation unless the candidate submits a resignation, to take effect no later than the end of their term.

2.1.3 Except as noted in section 2.1.4, any individual faculty member of academic rank may with the approval of their department initiate their candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment at any time prior to either receiving notice of non-reappointment or submitting a resignation. This request must be communicated in writing to the chairperson by the candidate. The chairperson must then convene the

department to consider the request. If the request for review is approved by the department, the candidacy file will be assembled by the chairperson in accordance with 2.1.1 above.

2.1.4 Reconsideration of a case in the year immediately following disapproval of a promotion or tenure recommendation is subject to review as provided in section 2.2.

2.1.5 If the department does not approve a faculty member's request for a review, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the Promotion and Tenure Committee after receiving written notification of the department's decision. The appeal must be accompanied by supporting documents.

2.2 Re-submission

2.2.1 If a case is presented again to the Promotion and Tenure Committee in the academic year directly following a negative or inconclusive outcome of a promotion or tenure recommendation, it shall be considered a re-submission.

2.2.2 When a letter of non-renewal of employment has already been received, when a letter of resignation has been submitted and accepted, or when a non-mandatory case is being brought forward as a re-submission, the decision whether or not to submit or resubmit the case to the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be made by the department. Reconsideration of a resubmitted case should only be requested on the basis of strong evidence that a substantially higher level of achievement has been reached in the intervening year, which will be determined by majority vote of the appropriate faculty group based on documentation of the candidate's recent achievements. If the department determines that there is strong evidence of substantially higher achievement, a new file should be prepared as described in section 2.2.3 for reconsideration by the department as specified in section 2.2.4. If the department decides that the evidence for substantially higher achievement is

insufficient to warrant resubmission, the candidate may appeal this decision to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. If upon appeal the Committee rules that sufficient evidence does exist, the department will proceed as described in sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.

2.2.3 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 Committee review, and transmitted to the Dean's office.

Part II An account of the change in professional status of the candidate since the previous submission containing a) a new curriculum vitae, b) new documentary materials, and c) additional solicited letters of reference internal and external to the University. This account will be divided into a biographic file and general and special evaluative files and will be prepared according to the present norms for preparing such files.

2.2.4 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.

Departmental evaluation of the resubmitted file shall follow the procedures specified in section 2.5 for regular candidacy files, including an updated departmental recommendation, an updated summary letter from the chairperson with emphasis on the recent achievement of the candidate, faculty signature sheets and vote tally sheet. If the department or program recommends promotion and/or continuing appointment by a two thirds majority vote of the appropriate faculty group, Parts I and II of the file will be submitted to the Dean for transmission to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. Evaluation of the resubmitted file shall then follow procedures specified in sections 4, 5, and 6. If the department fails to recommend re-submission, an appeal may be made to the chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2.2.5 After two years, normal procedures for submission of candidacy files should be followed.

2.3 Announcement of Candidacy

The initiation of each candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment shall be communicated in writing by the chairperson or director to all the faculty members of the department or program. This written announcement shall include a statement from the chairperson or director soliciting letters of comment from any member of the University community. Such announcements must give respondents the opportunity to specify that the candidate may have access to their letters either as they stand or with all reference to the identity of the source removed. If such permission is not given or if the respondent does not specify, a response will be considered confidential and will be placed in the special evaluative file (See section 2.4.5). A sample letter of announcement is supplied below in section 7.1. (p. 19).

2.4 The Candidacy File (Note: The following section pertains to internal cases; for outside appointments, see Section 3.)

2.4.1 The candidacy file contains three parts (see Appendix 8.3 for a detailed list of the content and organization of each):

A. The biographic file drawn up by the candidate.

This file is available to all who have a right to contribute to the evaluative files.

B. The general evaluative file containing 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 Promotion and Tenure Committee and to the higher academic administrators as well as to the candidate at the appropriate time.

C. The special evaluative file containing confidential material that is not accessible to

the candidate, but only to the appropriate faculty, the Promotion and Tenure Committee and the higher academic administrators.

2.4.2 The department chairperson or program director shall be responsible for the preparation and collection of appropriate materials on each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment (see sec. 2.1.1). When the chairperson or director is a candidate, the administrator to whom the chairperson or program director reports shall be responsible for the preparation of the candidacy file. The candidacy file shall not be circulated to persons other than those specifically authorized to review it in accordance with these Procedures, with the exception that the biographic file may be made available to others at the request of the candidate. The candidacy file shall not be made a part of or be considered a part of the personnel file.

2.4.3 The Biographic File

2.4.3.1 Each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment shall prepare a curriculum vitae including all career information that the candidate believes to be relevant.—References to all scholarly works should be included in the list of publications. Only work already published or accepted for publication should be on this list. References to works accepted for publication but not yet published should be accompanied by evidence of acceptance.

2.4.3.2 The list of publications should be broken down into the following categories: 1) books and monographs; 2) articles (refereed articles must be plainly marked and distinguished from non-refereed articles; invited articles should also be identified;) 3) abstracts, book reviews; 4) miscellaneous published material (optional). If a book is edited, then pages of text that have been written by the candidate should be indicated. Abstracts should be so designated. In all instances, authors should be listed as they are on the title page. If the profession follows a special convention for identifying senior authorship, this should be so indicated. For creative artists, works should be cited in accordance with the usual norms of the artist's profession. Thus, for example, painters

and sculptors will present a record of exhibitions in established bona fide galleries; composers and playwrights will present a record of performances in appropriate professional settings.

2.4.3.3 Presentations that have not been published should be listed in the appropriate place and divided into the following categories:

- 1) invited scholarly lectures and symposia;
- 2) other lectures or presentations.

2.4.3.4 Representative copies of the candidate's scholarly work should be included, along with copies of published reviews and appraisals of the candidate's work. In addition, a scholarship statement should be included. The statement should begin with a brief description of the candidate's scholarly work using language that is accessible to the non specialist. This should be followed by a more detailed description of the scholarly work that may contain more technical language and that will be useful to colleagues in the candidate's field who are evaluating the scholarship. The statement should be substantial enough to give the PTC and other readers a sense of the scope, significance, and future trajectory of the candidate's work.

2.4.3.5 A statement on teaching goals and initiatives and a list of courses taught since the candidate's last appointment or promotion shall also be supplied. This list should indicate the title and number of the course, the enrollment, and the group for which it is intended (e.g. undergraduate majors, non-majors, first-year graduate students, etc.). This section of the file may appropriately contain representative course outlines and special teaching materials developed by the candidate. Any noteworthy initiatives in curriculum development should also be documented here.

2.4.3.6 Service contributions should be arranged in the following categories: a) departmental service; b) University service (College level and above); c) professional

service outside the University; d) community service associated with field of specialization or with the University. The account should plainly indicate dates of service and roles taken (e.g. member, chair of committee) and should mention any special contribution (e.g. prepared 56 page report on undergraduate curriculum reform). When individuals have a lengthy record of service, the list may be limited to a representative selection of activities.

2.4.4 The General Evaluative File

2.4.4.1 The general evaluative file will contain all supervisory evaluations. These include the reports of the Dean and the Provost as well as the chairperson's letter summarizing the views and recommendations of the appropriate faculty group, and the chairperson's own letter (if this is different from the former). These letters should provide a clear and specific summary of the case while still preserving the confidentiality of solicited opinions. This may be done by referring in the letters to "such and such a point raised by Professor X," or "the statement from Referee Y." A key identifying X and Y by name should be provided for these references and included in the special evaluative file, but not seen by the candidate. The general evaluative file will also contain the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee on the case.

2.4.4.2 [Note: Only newly hired faculty beginning in the 1999-2000 academic year will be expected to fulfill the following formulation. Candidates for continuing appointment and/or promotion hired prior to 1999-2000 may choose to have these criteria applied if agreed upon by both the candidate and the department. For those hired prior to the Fall of 1999, the PTC Guidelines in effect as of the Fall of 1998 apply.]

This division of the file will also contain a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness, based on material gathered annually for all faculty members and including both undergraduate and graduate opinion, if applicable. The department should also make a periodic and detailed inquiry into students' perceptions of the

candidate's teaching, including their sense of what they learned, its relation to their other skills, work in the field, or personal growth.

To this end, the documentation of teaching should include the following:

a) Numerical summaries of all evaluations for courses taught since the faculty's hiring or last promotion. These summaries should be clearly labeled with the course number and title, the semester in which the course was offered, the number of students enrolled in the course, and the number of responses to the questionnaire. A list of the course evaluations provided in the file should include a brief description of each course and its place in the program; whether it is required or elective; whether it draws majors, non-majors, or both; whether the candidate taught the whole course or only part of it; whether there was TA assistance and in what form.

b) Copies of individual evaluations with student comments.

c) Syllabi and other sample course material, such as exams and projects may be included but should be limited to examples from the time the course was most recently taught.

d) At least two reports of peer observations of classroom teaching. Both observers should be acceptable to the candidate. Both observers should be (1) selected by the department or committee that is preparing the file, (2) of higher rank than the candidate, (3) members of the candidate's department or in a related field, and (4) acceptable to the candidate. For promotions to full professor, both peer observations must be made within 1 year of the submission of the file. For promotions to associate professor with tenure, at least one peer observation must be made within 1 year of submission of the file. The other observation may have been made earlier (and may be the same one submitted for the pre-tenure review). If the candidate does not want to include the pre-tenure observation, they may request and must be granted a new observation to constitute one of the two required reports. In all cases, the two peer evaluations that will be submitted

as part of the dossier should be provided to the candidate with signed releases by the evaluators. Regarding substantive content of the peer evaluations, it is not sufficient simply to note that the faculty member is a "good" teacher or to provide materials or data without evaluative discussion.

e) The department should solicit opinion from colleagues who have observed the candidate's interaction with students, from present or past departmental directors of graduate or undergraduate studies, and from students who have been taught by the candidate, (current or former graduates or undergraduates).

2.4.4.3 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 source 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 external referees, colleagues and students.

2.4.5 The Special Evaluative File

2.4.5.1 This division of the file should contain all solicited recommendations (referees, faculty and students) other than those of supervisors of the candidate. It should contain substantive written evaluations from at least five authorities external to the University in all cases of promotion to higher rank or continuing appointment or both. The full authority for the selection of these letter writers for promotion and tenure lies with the faculty of the relevant academic unit. Faculty will solicit letters from scholars they deem to be the most qualified to provide an evaluation of the candidate. All of the letters must be from scholars who are not current or former collaborators, departmental colleagues, members of the candidate's graduate department during the time the candidate was a graduate student, or recommended by the candidate. At least two of the letters must be from referees suggested by the candidate. These letters of evaluation should ordinarily not be more than two years old. All letters written in a language other than English must be accompanied by a translation. Each external letter in the file should have attached to

it a statement identifying the writer, explaining why the writer 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. In lieu of a full CV for each external letter writer, an abridged CV, limited to 4 pages is recommended. It should highlight the letter writer's achievements and expertise. Alternatively, a short (e.g., one page) biographical statement for each letter writer may be submitted.

2.4.5.2 The candidate may suggest a list of no more than six and no less than three referees from which the department will choose at least two. At least six other referees are to be chosen independently by the department.

2.4.5.3 The department should take care to choose a group of reviewers who can provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's professional accomplishment. When the candidate's work spans more than one discipline or has a specific international component (e.g. foreign languages, study of foreign governments or social structures), care should be taken to engage specialists from the several disciplines or eminent scholars from the country whose culture is the object of investigation.

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. All correspondence to potential reviewers must be included in the file.

2.4.5.4 The letters sent by the chairperson or the chair of the ad hoc committee to solicit the referees' opinions should be accompanied by the candidate's curriculum vitae as well as by reprints and/or preprints selected by the candidate. The solicitation letter should contain all the substantive points included in the sample provided in section 8.2.

It should request the referee:

a) to include specific evaluation of the candidate's scholarly or professional

achievements, especially with reference to the candidate's most recent work (rather than merely to comment on the general character or promise of the candidate),

b) to compare the candidate's scholarly or professional contributions with those of national or international leaders in the candidate's field who are at a comparable career stage,

c) to evaluate the candidate's scholarly or professional achievements for a specific time period (specific years noted) should the candidate have been given a "clock-stop" or extension,

d) to evaluate the candidate's scholarly or professional achievements in the context of the impact of COVID-19 (beginning Spring 2020 and for as long as is appropriate/necessary),

e) to supply information when possible about the candidate's teaching effectiveness,

f) to comment on whether the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion in the reviewer's own institution.

g) to indicate whether their letter of evaluation is to be held confidential or whether the candidate may read it either as it stands or with all identification of source and writer expunged. Prospective writers must be told that confidentiality will be maintained to the extent possible under current legal principles unless they explicitly specify otherwise.

All letters soliciting opinions from external 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 the file.

2.4.5.5 At least 5 solicited, signed letters on teaching shall be included. The department should solicit opinion from colleagues who have observed the candidate's

interaction with students, from present or past departmental directors of graduate or undergraduate studies, and from students who have been taught by the candidate, (current or former graduates or undergraduates).

Some departments delegate a responsible group of students to gather information and to prepare a comprehensive confidential report. Under no circumstances shall any student be pressured into writing on a case, and particular care shall be taken to ensure that students feel free to choose whether or not to express an opinion.

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

2.5 Evaluation

2.5.1 An appropriate group of faculty, as defined by Article II: Definitions, Section 1: Terms, Sub-section: 'm' of the *Policies of the Board of Trustees*, shall be responsible for evaluating and making a recommendation on each candidate for promotion and/or continuing appointment. The appropriate group will vary according to the type of action being considered.

Promotion: All members of the department or program who are of higher rank than the candidate.

Continuing Appointment: All members of the department or program with a continuing appointment.

2.5.2 If in a case of continuing appointment or promotion the candidate's department or program is not large enough to form an appropriate group of seven members, such a group will be constituted by the Dean after consultation with the candidate's department chairperson or program director, the candidate, and, if applicable, the Advisory Committee of the Program.

2.5.3 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.

2.5.4 The appropriate faculty group, having examined the candidate's file, shall convene to make a recommendation in that case. Individual faculty are strongly urged to expand on their votes by writing letters for the file. Such letters will normally be addressed to the chairperson of the department.

2.5.5 Department members who wish to express their views about a departmental decision in writing may do so. These letters will be treated as solicited letters and must be included in the file reviewed by the faculty voting in this case. Departments should allow a suitable period of time after the meetings and vote on a case for letters stimulated by the discussions or solicited subsequent to them to be added to the file before the deadline for submission to the Committee (Section 2.6.4). In all such cases, the appropriate faculty group shall have an opportunity to review the letters and shall sign a cover sheet to indicate that they have seen the additional material. No department member(s) shall be hindered from contributing to a file while a case is under consideration after the departmental recommendation has been formulated so long as the eligible voting faculty has an opportunity to review the contribution.

2.5.6 A list of the appropriate faculty group bearing a tally of their votes (approve, disapprove or abstain) and their signatures (either physical or digital) shall be part of the special evaluative file. Unless the Department has specific by-laws to the contrary, a positive outcome shall be defined as a positive recommendation by a majority of those eligible to vote. Normally, members of the appropriate faculty group vote to approve or disapprove; abstentions are discouraged under the [Guidelines for Academic Review](#).

2.5.7 After the vote has been taken, the department chairperson or program director or meeting

convenor shall write a letter stating the recommendation and providing a balanced summary of the views of the group. In addition, the letter should indicate how the person's research or creative work, teaching, and other activities reflect the standards within their discipline , and relate to the mission of the department. Everybody on the list shall sign to indicate that they have read the chair's or program director's summary letter.

The chairperson may submit a separate letter commenting upon the recommendation of the department, which shall be subject to review as stipulated in section 2.5.5. Both the summarizing letter and any additional letter from the chairperson form part of the general evaluative file and shall be drawn up in accordance with the guidelines specified in section 2.4.4.1.

2.5.8 The recommendation letter with its summary of departmental views and any additional letter from the chairperson or program director shall be considered a draft until reviewed in the Dean's office for confidentiality of solicited opinions as indicated in sec. 2.4.4.1. The chair or program director shall be responsible for any revision required to preserve confidentiality of solicited opinions. When a case involves continuing appointment, a copy of the chairperson's letter(s) shall be released to the candidate by the department chairperson immediately following review in the Dean's office and, if necessary, revision.

2.6 Submission to the Promotion and Tenure Committee

2.6.1 The department chairperson or program director is responsible for submitting the completed file with the recommendation letter to Interfolio or other faculty review software, where it will be accessible by the Dean and, following a technical review, by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

2.6.2 The file should be organized as indicated in Interfolio or other faculty review software.

2.6.3 The chairperson's or program director's recommendation letter is considered a draft until reviewed for confidentiality of solicited opinions (see section 2.5.8).

2.6.4 File Processing Deadlines. The deadlines listed herein reflect the time needed for files to be vetted by the Dean's office, in accordance with section 2.5.8 of these guidelines, revised (as necessary) by the submitting department, and forwarded to the Promotion and Tenure Committees.. Departments and Programs have the obligation to observe these deadlines. Only in the case of competitive offers will the Committee consider extensions of the deadlines. New appointments are not subject to the deadlines for internal cases. Deadlines are as follows:

- December 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all ~~other~~ cases involving tenure and promotion to associate professor, both academic year appointments (start date Fall semester with 6 years of service) and calendar year appointments (start date Spring semester with either 5.5 years of service or 6.5 years of service).
- September 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all cases involving promotion to full professor.

2.6.5 Where situations not covered by the Procedures specified in this section arise, the chair of the respective Promotion and Tenure Committee, the chairperson of the department or program involved, and the Dean with divisional oversight of the department or program shall consult to devise suitable means to deal with the case. These means will be communicated in writing to the candidate by the Dean.

3. NEW FACULTY & ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS

3.A.1 New Faculty Appointment without existing Continuing Appointment: Files for new appointments at senior academic rank without continuing appointment at their current institution should contain a range of information similar in type to that required for internal candidates.

At a minimum, they must contain:

- a) a complete, current curriculum vitae
- b) information on teaching (see sec. 3.3)
- c) copies of letters soliciting external evaluations (see section 3.2)
- d) letters from external authorities evaluating the candidate's professional work and standing in the field (see section 3.2)
- e) a letter from the departmental chair or program director summarizing the case for appointment (see section 3.4)
- f) a tally of the votes of all those members of the department who would normally vote if this were an internal case (those of equal or higher rank, and all tenured faculty if continuing appointment is involved). If continuing appointment is involved, the voting group must include at least seven tenured faculty. If the voting group is not sufficiently large, it will be augmented as for internal cases, as described in section 2.5.2.

Departments are encouraged to solicit letters from Stony Brook faculty in other departments or programs who are particularly well qualified to comment on the candidate's field of specialization and may expect to interact closely with the candidate. Letters from chairs of departments or programs to which the candidate is

likely to contribute may also be solicited.

3.2 There must be a minimum of five formal external letters of evaluation. At least three of these must be chosen by the department and must be from authorities who have neither worked with the candidate nor been suggested as referees by the candidate. Referees should be chosen with a view to documenting the national and/or international reputation of the candidate. The full authority for the selection of these letter writers lies with the faculty of the relevant academic unit. Faculty will solicit letters from scholars they deem to be the most qualified to provide an evaluation of the candidate.

The other letters may be letters that were solicited by the candidate when they applied for the job at SBU. Those letter writers may simply submit an addendum to their letter that includes any relevant updated information.

The letters soliciting the evaluations must specify the proposed rank and indicate plainly whether or not tenure is involved. They must communicate the conditional nature of the situation ("We are considering a possible offer to Z of appointment as Associate Professor with tenure ..."). The body of the letter of solicitation should cover the same points as those for internal cases (see sec. 2.4.5.4) except that assurances on preservation of confidentiality will be unconditional. As in internal cases, each letter of evaluation should have attached to it a statement identifying the writer, explaining why this writer 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.

3.3 The file must contain information about the candidate's teaching. Ordinarily this will include a list of courses taught in the last five years, and an account of graduate students trained. In addition, letters from colleagues or former students now in the profession, and summaries of student evaluations gathered regularly at the candidate's institution should be provided, where relevant. The department must offer what information it can on expected teaching performance (observance of colloquia, discussions during the interview). This will be particularly important in the case of

candidates who have little or no teaching experience. In all cases the summary letter should detail efforts to evaluate teaching performance.

3.4 The department should formally state its case for making the appointment at the proposed level and indicate explicitly how the candidate is expected to function within the program and interact with colleagues. The expected contribution to both undergraduate and graduate teaching programs should be made clear.

3.B.1 New Senior Scholar & Administrative Appointments with existing Continuing Appointment: Files for new appointments at senior academic rank with continuing appointment at their current institution may qualify for 'Expedited Review' as defined by the Guidelines for Academic Review. The file should contain a range of information similar in type to that required for internal candidates, and as part of the hiring process. This process is intended for senior faculty and administrative leadership hires who hold continuing appointment (tenure) at their current institution at the time of the hiring process, and who are hired with the understanding that they meet the requirements of continuing appointment at Stony Brook and within SUNY at the point of hire.

3.B.2 Expedited Review Stipulations:

- It is not for existing faculty already on campus.
- It is not an opportunity to evaluate the candidates once they have arrived.
- It is not the same as going up for tenure early/credit for prior service.
- It is not meant to reduce the importance of faculty votes at either the initial academic review (department) or subsequent academic review (A&S Senate Promotion and Tenure Committee votes); the respective committees should proceed with similar to same peer review rigor. The clarifications and adjustments are meant to condense the size of the file without impacting the rigor of the process.

3.C.1 Authorization for Expedited Review

3.C.1.a Authorization. Administrative authorization for expedited reviews are required as per the following:

- Hiring administrative leaders (Dean or above) :

During the search, the hiring manager should ask leadership of the potential home department of the candidate whether the department views the candidate as likely to receive tenure and promotion within that department. An email attestation of a discussion/preliminary vote is sent to the hiring manager and included in the candidate's expedited tenure Interfolio file.

- Hiring a senior scholar

Prior to making an offer to a senior hire with "expedited tenure," senior members of the department should hold a preliminary vote on the candidate's likely tenure and promotion, should they accept the offer. To prepare for this discussion, chairs may solicit additional information from the candidate, such as teaching evaluations or letters of recommendation, but must not contact the candidate's home department. The results of this preliminary vote should be documented and saved for the candidate's expedited tenure Interfolio file.

3.D.1 Procedures & Timeline. The following steps are intended to be followed in accordance with established Interfolio system templates:

- Upon receipt of the signed acknowledgement letter, ATC initiates file in the new expedited Interfolio template.
- Department chair or search committee chair alerts department, PTC, and Dean of likely timing of vote and submission.
- The Departmental review should take no more than 3 weeks review and forward

the case to the next review level.

- The PTC should take no more than 3 week to review and forward its recommendation to the Dean.. **Note: If the submission to the promotion and tenure committee occurs outside of the committee's normal work season, committee will charge a smaller sub-committee to review the case.*
- The Dean should take no more than 3 weeks review and forward the case to the Provost

3.E.1 CONTENT

The file need not contain as much information as a regular tenure case as outlined within section 3.A.1. The contents should include:

External evaluators

1. 5 “arm’s length”* letters from peer or better institutions are required, however:
 - a. Chair may request names of external evaluators from the supervisor or chair of the candidate’s most recent department to constitute the department’s list and/or the letters submitted during the search process; candidate’s list can be constituted by previous evaluators;
 - b. If the names are not available or insufficient, department will create a new list of potential evaluators;
 - c. The external evaluator solicitation template for expedited cases should include the following: “As this is an expedited tenure case, please feel free to write a brief letter. We will not take brevity as an indication of your assessment either positively or NEGATIVELY.”

*Arm’s length means the letter writer is sufficiently distanced from the candidate that their evaluation is not, nor is perceived to be, biased by the nature of the relationship.

4. EVALUATION BY THE ARTS AND SCIENCES SENATE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE

4.1 In all cases where files have been submitted, and have been acceptably completed according to the specifications given in these Procedures, the Committee's recommendation will be forwarded in keeping with the [Guidelines for Academic Review](#) as published by the Provost's Office and the related final deadline. Deadlines are as follows:

- December 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all cases involving tenure and promotion to associate professor, both academic year appointments (start date Fall semester with 6 years of service) and calendar year appointments (start date Spring semester with either 5.5 years of service or 6.5 years of service).
- September 15 is the deadline for receipt by the Dean's office of all cases involving promotion to full professor.

4.2 The Promotion and Tenure Committee will review and evaluate the file. Prior to reaching a decision the Committee may seek additional information, either on its own or through the agency of the Dean. Substantively new information affecting the evaluation of the candidate will be shared with the department in keeping with the principle of confidentiality respecting the sources of that information.

4.3 Members of the Committee who are in the candidate's department abstain from voting.

4.4 If a prior recommendation is not likely to be upheld by the Committee, the reasons for such possible action will be summarized in writing and sent to the department chairperson or program director. The Committee will then entertain a written response from the department chairperson or program director within one week of informing the

department or program of its likely decision not to uphold the prior recommendation. After this communication, the Committee will formulate its formal recommendation, which will follow the procedures outlined at the beginning of this section.

4.5 After completing its deliberations, the Committee will report its vote and recommendations to the corresponding divisional Administration. The report may include an explanation of the Committee's recommendations if it is signed by each voting member of the Committee. The Committee will communicate its recommendations to the department chairperson or program director after fourteen days or when the President's action (see Section 7) is known, whichever occurs sooner. The department chairperson or the program director will communicate the Committee's recommendation to the candidate.

4.6 Apart from official communications by the Committee Chair, all members of the Committee are expected to maintain strict confidentiality about the deliberations of the Committee.

5. EVALUATION BY THE DEAN

5.1 The file is reviewed by the Dean, normally within 15 working days of receipt. If the Dean does not agree with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Dean shall meet with the Committee to allow an exchange of ideas and opinions before completing their formal written recommendation.

5.2 When a case involves continuing appointment, a copy of the Dean's letter of recommendation will be released to the candidate immediately.

5.3 The Dean will then send the file to the Provost.

6. EVALUATION BY THE PROVOST

6.1 The file is reviewed by the Provost, normally within 30 working days of receipt. If the Provost disagrees with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the Provost shall confer with the Committee before formulating a recommendation.

6.2 The Provost, after formulating a recommendation, will forward the file to the President.

6.3 When a case involves continuing appointment, a copy of the Provost's letter of recommendation will be released to the candidate immediately.

6.4 If substantively new information affecting evaluation of the candidate is added to the file after it has been considered by the Promotion and Tenure Committee, this information will be communicated to the Committee and to the department. If so requested, the appropriate administrative officers will discuss such information with the Committee, which shall have the right to add to the file its subsequent reaction.

6.5 The Provost will notify the candidate that the file is being forwarded to the President and that it is available for review within Interfolio or other faculty review software in accordance with Article 31.6 of the Agreement between New York State and United University Professions.

7. ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT

7.1 In cases involving the granting of 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.

7.2 When the President disagrees with the Committee recommendation, the Arts and Sciences Senate requests that there be consultation 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.

7.3 A copy of the letter announcing the President's decision shall be sent to the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the time it is sent to the candidate.

8. REVISION AND REVIEW OF THE GUIDELINES

8.1 These Guidelines shall be reviewed by the Arts and Sciences Senate on a regular basis. The Senate may make revisions to the Guidelines at its regular meetings. Proposals for revisions to the Guidelines shall be included in advance in the Proposed Agenda for a regular Senate meeting. Any changes to the Guidelines approved by the Senate will be submitted to the University President for review and comment. Revisions will be submitted to the President for review and approval prior to publication and implementation.

8.2 Biographic File Revision Process

The PTCs are responsible for proposing and implementing any changes to the biographical files. Any of the A&S Senate constituencies who wish to propose changes or customize a template should contact the PTCs' chairs.

9. APPENDICES

9.1 Sample announcement of initiation of a candidacy for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment

MEMO

TO: All Faculty Members of (Title of Department or Program)

FROM: (Name of Chairperson or Program Director)

SUBJECT: Announcement of the Candidacy of (name of candidate)

Professor (name of candidate) candidate of the (department or program title) is a candidate for (enter appropriate terms).

Any member of the University Community, and especially any member of this department/program, is invited to write a letter commenting on this candidacy. Such letters will be made a part of the confidential evaluative file to be drawn up for this case. For your reference, the criteria for promotion and tenure, as stated in the Procedures of the Arts and Sciences Promotion and Tenure Committee, are attached. (Attach a copy of Section 1.1 of these Procedures). Under the collective bargaining agreement, your letter will be held in confidence and placed in the confidential section of the file unless you indicate specifically that the candidate may read your letter, either as it stands or with all identification as to its source deleted. If you state that you do not wish it to be read by the candidate, or if you do not explicitly authorize release to the candidate, your letter will be held in confidence and placed in the confidential section of the file.

9.2 Sample letter of solicitation for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment

Dear Professor _____:

We are considering the promotion of _____ from (rank) _____ to (rank) _____ with/without tenure. In order to help us reach a decision, we would appreciate your candid assessment of Dr. _____ professional achievements and standing in the field of _____. For your convenience a current curriculum vitae and representative sample of publications are enclosed. Please indicate to what extent you have had occasion to interact personally with the candidate.

We would especially value your expert opinion on the quality, originality and importance of the candidate research and your estimation of how she/he compares in professional accomplishments with others at similar stages in their career or holding comparable academic rank. It would also be useful to know whether a candidate of Dr. _____ qualifications would probably be promoted/receive tenure at your institution. Any other information you can supply regarding the candidate effectiveness in teaching or her/his national or international reputation in her/his field of research would be greatly appreciated.

[Optional if appropriate] We ask that you evaluate the candidate on their achievements and contributions during the following time frame: _____. This reflects... [a clock-stop that was granted to the candidate during which expectations for productivity were relaxed – OR – an extension that was given to the candidate due to the impact of _____].

In addition, beginning in the Spring 2020 semester, faculty across the University experienced a significant disruption due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In Spring 2020, as a result of the health crisis, all faculty rapidly moved their courses online; research

facilities including labs, national facilities, archives, and libraries were closed; and travel was suspended, limiting opportunities for professional visibility and service. In conjunction with the disruptions experienced on-campus, many faculty were working out of their homes while simultaneously providing childcare due to closures of daycare facilities and K 12 schooling. With Stony Brook University being at the initial epicenter in the US, several faculty also dealt with personal grief and/or illness of themselves, family members, friends, and students. Research disruptions, significant shifts in teaching modalities, limited childcare, and remote work has persisted. We ask that you take this unprecedented event into consideration when evaluating work performed since spring 2020.

To the extent possible under current legal principles, the candidate will not have access to your letter of reference unless you give us specific permission, in writing, to provide a copy to him/her. Such a written statement of permission from you must specify whether the candidate may see your letter in its entirety, as written, or only with all identification of source or authorship deleted. If you are willing to grant the candidate access to your letter, please include one of the statements below at the end of your letter, following your signature and title:

_____ The candidate may NOT read my letter of recommendation.

_____ The candidate may read my letter of recommendation only if all identification as to its source is deleted.

_____ The candidate may read my letter of recommendation as it stands.

If you do not include any of these statements, the candidate will not be granted access to your letter.

Thank you for your collegial assistance in helping us to reach an informed decision in

this matter. My colleagues and I appreciate the time and care which you devote to this evaluation.

Sincerely yours,

9.3 Suggested Order of Material in Files

Section 1: Biographical file

- a. Identifying information, Education, Dissertation topics, Professional experience, Honors
- b. Research grants and proposals
- c. Publications, Invited Lectures and papers, Exhibits, Performances, Productions (list only)
- d. Documentation of acceptance of work for publication or in press, etc.
- e. Published reviews of scholarship (e.g., book reviews; if applicable)
- f. Current research and other creative activities (description only)
- g. Links to/copies of the scholarship that was provided to the external referees (place at the end of the biographical file)
- h. Teaching activity (list/description only)
- i. Teaching goals
- j. Graduate dissertations, Honors projects
- k. Departmental service, University service, Professional service outside the university
- l. Additional relevant information (if applicable)
- m. References suggested by candidate
- n. Signature page

Section 2: General Evaluative file

- a. Announcement of candidacy
- b. Chair's letter (with identifying information redacted)
- c. Template of solicitation letter
- d. Summaries of course evaluations
- e. Syllabi (optional; if submitted, include only most recent syllabi)
- f. Peer observations of teaching
- g. List of all letters for which authors have given permission for the candidate to view

(organized by external, teaching, and other)

h. External letters for which authors have given permission for the candidate to view

Section 3: Special Evaluative file

a. Chair's letter (non-redacted)

b. Report(s) from tenure/evaluation committee(s) (if applicable)

c. Tally of departmental vote (name, vote, signature)

d. List of all solicited recommendations organized by (a) those suggested by the candidate and (b) those selected by the department. The list should include the name of the referee, their position, their affiliation, whether they agreed to provide a letter or not, reason for declining (if applicable), and the key to their unique identifier (e.g., Prof. A, Prof. B, etc.)

e. Correspondence with referees Abbreviated CVs of referees (4 page limit highlighting achievements and expertise, or a short (e.g., one-page) biographical statement) f.

Referee letters

g. Solicited teaching letters

h. Correspondence with people writing teaching letters

i. Additional unsolicited letters (e.g., colleagues, students)

A list of those who may review the file and comment on its contents should be attached to the complete file.

9.4 Biographic File Template Customization

The PTC recognizes that this means that the committee is now responsible for proposing and implementing any changes to the biographical files. Anyone who wishes to propose changes or customize a college, school or division specific BioFile Template should contact the PTC.

9.5 Definitions

As defined by the SUNY Board of Trustees Policies', *Article II: Definitions, §1. Terms.*, 'As used in these policies, unless otherwise specified, the following terms shall mean:'

- (a) "University." State University of New York.
- (b) "Board of Trustees." The Board of Trustees of State University of New York.
- (c) "Chancellor." The Chancellor of State University of New York.
- (d) "College." A State-operated institution of State University of New York.
- (e) "Contract College." A statutory or contract college of State University of New York.
- (f) "Community College." A locally-sponsored, two-year college established under Article 126 of the Education Law.
- (g) "Council." A council for a college as provided for by Section 356 of the Education Law and the Board of Trustees of the State University College of Environmental Science and Forestry, as provided for by Section 6003 of the Education Law.
- (h) "Chief administrative officer." The head of a college or contract college, as the case may be, whether called president, dean, provost, director, or otherwise.
- (i) "Academic staff." The staff comprised of those persons having academic rank or qualified academic rank.
- (j) "Academic rank." Rank held by those members of the professional staff having the titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, and assistant instructor, including geographic full-time faculty members having such titles, and rank, held by members of the professional staff, having the titles of librarian, associate librarian, senior assistant librarian, and assistant librarian. A geographic full-time faculty member is a person serving on the faculty of a medical center who is not employed on a full-time basis for the purpose of fixing compensation

payable by the State but all of whose professional services and activities are conducted at the medical center or its affiliated hospitals and are available to the State on a fulltime basis for clinical and instructional purposes.

(k) "Qualified academic rank." Rank held by those members of the academic staff having titles of lecturer, or titles of academic rank preceded by the designations "clinical" or "visiting", or other similar designations.

(l) "Professional employee." Professional employees shall mean an employee in the Professional Services Negotiating Unit, other than an employee with academic or qualified academic rank.

(m) "Academic employee." Academic employee shall mean an employee in the Professional Services Negotiating Unit with academic or qualified academic rank.

(n) "Professional staff." All persons occupying positions designated by the Chancellor as being in the unclassified service.

(o) "Professional title." Professional title shall mean the title of a position in the Professional Services Negotiating Unit, other than a position of academic or qualified academic rank, as shown on the budget certificate for the position on file with the State Director of the Budget.

(p) "Qualified professional title." Qualified professional title shall mean a professional title that is preceded by the designation "special."

9.6 Acronyms

CAS. College of Arts and Sciences.

UL or Library. University Libraries.

PTC-J. Promotion & Tenure Committee - Junior.

PTC-S. Promotion & Tenure Committee - Senior

SC&J. School of Communication & Journalism.

SOMAS. School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences.

TA. Teaching Assistant.

10. Revision History

[Expedited Review Process was approved by the A&S Senate at its November 10, 2025 meeting]

[Format, punctuation, syntax, submission dates, Preamble, Articles 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 were approved by the A&S Senate at its November 18, 2024 meeting]

[Amendments to PTC Guidelines Sections 2.4.5.4 and Appendix 8.2 were approved by the A&S Senate at its November 9th, 2020 meeting]

[Amendments to PTC Guidelines to Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.3.2, 2.4.4.2, 2.4.5.1, 2.5.8, 3.2, Appendix 8.3 and to add a Preamble were approved by the A&S Senate at its September 16th, 2019 meeting]

[Corrections of erroneous references to sections or information changed in previous amendments were approved by the A&S Senate at its 25 April 2011 meeting. Amendments to the Promotion and Tenure Committee Procedures regarding external evaluations from referees suggested by candidates (Section 2.4.5.1) and regarding procedures for resubmission of files (Sections 2.2.2, 2.2.3, and 2.2.4) were approved by the A&S Senate at its 25 April 2011 meeting. Changes are indicated in bold.]

[Amendments to PTC Guidelines to 2.4.3.4. on Research Statements and 2.4.3.1 to Biographic file approved by the A&S Senate at its October 27th, 2008 meeting]

[Amendment to PTC Guidelines to 2.4.4.2 b) and 2.4.4.2 d) approved by the A&S Senate at its April 28th, 2008 meeting]

[Amendment to PTC Guidelines for Additional Letters in the Special Evaluative File passed by the Arts and Sciences Senate at the general meeting on March 26, 2007: The following sections of the PTC guidelines are affected: Section 2.4.5.1 and

Section 2.4.5.2]

[As revised by the Arts & Sciences Senate --April 2006 to section 2.6.4. As revised by the Arts and Sciences Senate -- February 1999 --with additional revisions to Section 4.4 and a new Section 7 approved by the Arts and Sciences Senate at its April 2000 Meeting] - Section 2.6.4 revised and approved at 4/24/06 A&S Senate Meeting.]