

**PERSONNEL AND POLICY PROCEDURES**

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED  
SCIENCES  
AND  
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS**

**STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY  
November 2016**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Policies on Promotion and Continuing Appointment
  - 1.1 Criteria
  - 1.2 Mandatory Review
  - 1.3 New Appointments
2. Department Evaluation and Recommendation
  - 2.1 Initiation of Candidacy
  - 2.2 Resubmission
  - 2.3 Announcement of Candidacy
  - 2.4 The Candidacy File
  - 2.5 Evaluation
  - 2.6 Submission to the Personnel Policy Committee
3. New Appointments
4. Evaluation by the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences and Harriman School for Management & Policy Personnel Policy Committee
5. Evaluation by the Dean and the Provost
6. Action by the President
7. Appendices
  - 7.1 Sample Announcement of Initiation of a Candidacy and/or Continuing Appointment
  - 7.2 Sample Letter of Solicitation for Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment
  - 7.3 Sample Bibliography
  - 7.4 Suggested Order of Material in Files

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).

## I. POLICIES ON PROMOTION AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

### 1.1 Criteria

The Policies of the Board of Trustees, State University New York, Art. XII, Title A, paragraph 4 and Title B, paragraph 2 indicate the elements which should be weighed in evaluation of 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 art of publications and reputation among colleagues.

"(d) Effectiveness of University service - as demonstrated in 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 his/her fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility."

To further the commitment to affirmative action at Stony Brook University, 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) also define the regulations on continuing appointment: Professors and associate professors on a three-year term appointment must be granted continuing appointment if reappointed at the end of that term. Assistant professors and instructors reappointed in academic rank positions (professor, associate, assistant and instructor) in the State University 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 Stony Brook University nor submitted a letter of resignation, must be reviewed for continuing appointment not later than the sixth year of service in academic rank.<sup>1</sup>

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 without salary and periods of part-time service shall not be included, but shall not be deemed an interruption of otherwise consecutive service.

<sup>1</sup> *"Visiting" faculty and lecturers of "qualified academic rank" (see Policies, Article II, par. 1 (k)), and service in such rank cannot be credited toward continuing appointment. Part-time service is not counted toward the maximum seven-year period beyond which continuing appointment is mandatory.*

### 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 Committee. 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. EEOC approval or disapproval must be obtained before the file is sent to the Committee.

## 2 DEPARTMENT EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATION

### 2.1 Initiation of Candidacy

2.1.1 The department chair 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 chair 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 chair 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 a continuing appointment is mandatory, the 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.

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

2.1.5 If the department<sup>2</sup> does not approve a faculty member's request for a review, the faculty member may appeal the decision to the Personnel Policy Committee after receiving written notification of the department's decision. The appeal must be accompanied by supporting documents. In the case of a negative decision by the Personnel Policy Committee the case may be appealed to the Dean for a final decision.

### 2.2 Resubmission

2.2.1 If a case is presented again in the academic year directly following a negative or inconclusive outcome of a promotion or tenure recommendation, it shall be considered a resubmission.

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 Personnel Policy Committee.

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, c) additional solicited letters of reference from within and outside the University, d) an updated departmental recommendation, and e) an updated summary letter from the chair with emphasis on the recent achievement of the candidate. 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. Part II (and Part I if supplied by the Department) will be submitted to the Personnel Policy Committee.

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. The department makes its recommendation to the Personnel Policy Committee, which will evaluate whether or not a substantially higher level of achievement has been reached in the intervening year.

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

<sup>2</sup> The term "department" in sections 2.1.3 and 2.1.5 means the appropriate faculty group in the department. See section 2.5.1 following.

## 2.3 Announcement of Candidacy

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

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:

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 Personnel Policy 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 Personnel Policy Committee and higher academic administrators.

2.4.2 The department chair 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 chair is a candidate, the administrator to whom the chair 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 biographic file that will become part of the candidacy file. The biographic file shall include the CEAS standard CV and any other 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) papers (divided into refereed journal papers, refereed conference papers and nonrefereed papers; 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. See appendix 7.3 for a detailed example of bibliographic form.

2.4.3.3 Research that have been performed in collaboration with industry and national laboratories (topics, names of collaborators, years of collaboration, students co-advisement, funding, etc.); contribution to technology transfer; patents; commercial software development; consultancy; if appropriate.

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

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

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

2.4.3.6 Teaching contributions should be well documented. Such documentation might include, but not be limited to, as many of the following categories as appropriate: contributions toward curricular development; design, redesign or teaching of new or existing courses and laboratories; quality of in-class teaching; 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.

A statement of teaching goals and initiatives and a list of courses taught since the candidate's last appointment or promotion shall be supplied. The list must indicate the title and number of the course, the class enrollment, whether it is required or elective, the group of students for which it is intended (e.g., undergraduate majors) and a brief description of the course and its place in the program.

2.4.3.7 The candidate's M.S. and Ph.D. students and their thesis titles shall be listed, together with their dates of graduation. For those graduate students who have not yet completed their degree requirements, a brief account should be given of the status of the students' progress and the anticipated dates of degree completion. If the M.S. or Ph.D. thesis is funded by a project, then the name of the sponsor should be included as well as a statement as to whether any of the work has been performed outside the department or University.

2.4.3.8 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.

2.4.3.9 A list of the membership of the professional societies, technical sessions/meetings organized/chaired, symposium or conference volumes edited, and technical review panels served.

2.4.3.10 The completed biographic file with the dated signature of the candidate should be submitted to the department chair.

#### 2.4.4 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 chair's letter Summarizing the views and recommendations of the appropriate faculty group, and the chair'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, It 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 Personnel Policy Committee on the case.

2.4.4.2 It is assumed that the Department makes a continuous inquiry into faculty teaching performance. This should include, but not be limited to, the use of questionnaires distributed in class and course evaluations done by faculty as described in Section 2.4.5.6.

For internal cases (and to as great an extent as possible, for external cases as well) the chair or a designated representative, such as the undergraduate or graduate program director, shall provide a comprehensive evaluation of the candidate's teaching effectiveness. This should be based on the material described in the previous paragraph and the material provided by the candidate (Section 2.4.3.6), as well as any additional evidence on these matters gathered by the Department. Summaries of student responses to questionnaires distributed in class should be included in this division of the file. They should indicate the course number and title, the semester in which the course was offered, the number of students registered, and the number of responses. A copy of the questionnaire should be attached.

The Department should make it clear to the candidate at the beginning of his or her appointment the importance placed on the teaching record in the promotion and tenure decision.

2.4.4.3 When writers of solicited letters have given permission for the candidate to see their letters<sup>4</sup>, 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 outside referees, colleagues and students.

<sup>4</sup> See sections 2.3, and 2.4.5.4e. 8

#### 2.4.5 The Special Evaluative File

2.4.5.1 This division of the file should contain all solicited recommendations (outside referees, faculty and students) other than those of supervisory of the candidate. It is expected to contain substantive written evaluations from at

least eight authorities from peer or aspirational US institutions in all cases of promotion to higher rank or continuing appointment or both. These letters must be from distinguished scholars who, at minimum, have rank higher than that of the candidate, and preferably have rank of full professor. The letter writers should not be collaborators within last four years, colleagues, members of the candidate's graduate department during the time he or she was a graduate student, or postdoctoral supervisors. Such letter writers will be referred to in this document as mandatory letter writers and their letters as mandatory letters. In addition to these eight mandatory letters, up to six other letters may be solicited from authorities who might not necessarily satisfy the requirements of mandatory letter writers.

Each letter in the file should 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. No letter of evaluation in the candidate's file should be older than two years.

2.4.5.2 The candidate may suggest a list of six to eight mandatory referees from US institutions, from which the department will choose four. In addition, the candidate may suggest no more than six other referees from which the department may choose at most three. At least four mandatory referees from US institutions, and no more than three 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, care should be taken to engage specialists from the several disciplines. A brief sketch of the reviewers' expertise should be included in the file.

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 chair 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 soliciting letter should contain all the substantive points included in the sample provided in (section 7.2.).

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 supply information when possible about the candidate's teaching effectiveness,
- d) to comment on whether the candidate would be granted tenure and/or promotion in the reviewer's own institution,
- e) to 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.

2.4.5.5 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 the file.

2.4.5.6 For internal cases (and if possible for external cases as well) at least 5 solicited, signed letters on teaching shall be included. The Department should solicit opinion from colleagues, from past or present departmental directors of graduate or undergraduate studies and from graduate or undergraduate students who have been taught by the candidate. In requesting letters from students the Department should be careful not to place a student in a conflicting situation



(in particular, a letter should not be requested from a student who is currently an advisee of, or in a class being taught by, the candidate).

At least one of these letters should be from a faculty member who has been designated to evaluate a complete course as it was being taught. This should include direct observation of the candidate in the classroom, an evaluation of material provided to students (for example, syllabus, class notes), an evaluation of the work required of students (for example, homeworks, exams), an evaluation of the students' performance and comments on the candidate's interactions with the students. For this purpose it is preferable that the faculty member be familiar with the course material.

2.4.5.7 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 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 who are of higher rank: than the candidate.

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

2.5.2 If in a case of continuing appointment the candidate's department is not large enough to form an appropriate group of a minimum of 5 members, such a group will be constituted by the Dean after consultation with the candidate's department chair. If in a case of promotion, the appropriate group believes it is too few in number to present an effective file, or that it could use expert advice from other faculty whose field of specialization is close to that of the candidate, an enlarged group will be constituted by the Dean, after consultation with the candidate's chair, the original appropriate group, and the candidate.

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. The file shall carry on its face the names of all those faculty 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.

2.5.4 Each member of the appropriate faculty group, after having examined the candidates file, will express his/her opinion of the candidate in a letter addressed to the chair. The letter should include the reasons for his/her yes, no or abstain vote and a critical review of the candidacy. The vote will be kept confidential, but will be part of the evaluation file when it is sent to the Personnel Policy Committee. The final tally of the vote will be announced by the chair at a meeting of the appropriate faculty group with a summary of observations made by the members of the group.

2.5.5 After all of the vote has been submitted as outlined in 2.5.4, the department chair 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 relate to the mission of the department. To this letter from the chair shall be appended a signature sheet with the typed names of those faculty eligible to read it. Each person on the list shall sign to indicate that she or he has read the chair's letter.

2.5.6 The recommendation letter with its summary of departmental views and any additional letter from the chair 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 shall be responsible for any revision required to preserve confidentiality of solicited opinions. When a case involves continuing appointment, a copy of the chair's summarizing letter shall be released to the candidate immediately following review in the Dean's office and, if necessary, revision.

## 2.6 Submission to the Personnel Policy Committee

2.6.1 . The department chair is responsible for forwarding the completed file with the recommendation letter to the Dean for transmission to the Personnel Policy Committee.

2.6.2 The file should be organized as indicated in section 7.4. The material in the main files (biographic, general evaluative, and special evaluative) must be presented so that it will not become disordered during the review process. A looseleaf binder in which sub-divisions are clearly marked is suggested. Additional materials, such as offprints, books, recent manuscripts may be presented in plainly marked envelopes or boxes.

2.6.3 The chair's recommendation letter is considered a draft until reviewed for confidentiality of solicited opinions (see section 2.5.6).

2.6.4 March 1 is the deadline for submission of all mandatory cases. Departments have the obligation to observe these deadlines. New appointments are not subject to the deadlines for internal cases.

2.6.5 Where situations not covered by the Procedures specified in this section arise, the chair of the Personnel Policy Committee, the chair of the department involved, and the Dean shall consult to devise suitable means to deal with the case.

## 3 NEW APPOINTMENTS

3.1 Files for new appointments at senior rank with or without continuing appointment should contain a range of information commensurate with that required for internal cases. 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 outside evaluations (see sec. 3.2)
- d) letters from outside authorities evaluating the candidate professional work and standing in the field (see sec. 3.2)
- e) a letter from the departmental chair summarizing the case for the appointment (see sec. 3.4)
- f) a tally of the votes and evaluation letters of all those members of the department who would normally vote. If continuing appointment is involved, the voting group must include at least FIVE tenured faculty. If the voting group is not sufficiently large, it will be augmented as for internal cases, as described in sec. 2.5.2.

Departments are encouraged to solicit letters from Stony Brook faculty in other departments 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 to which the candidate is likely to contribute may also be solicited.

3.2 It is expected a minimum of eight formal external letters of evaluation from distinguished scholars from peer or aspirational US institutions that satisfy the requirements of mandatory letters as defined in Section 2.4.5.1. At least four mandatory letters should be chosen by the department. Referees should be chosen with a view to documenting national and/or international reputation of the candidate.

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 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.

3.3 The file must contain information about the candidate's teaching. Ordinarily this will include a list of courses taught in the last 5 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. 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.

#### 4 EVALUATION BY THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES AND HARRIMAN SCHOOL FOR MANAGEMENT AND POLICY PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE

4.1 The Personnel Policy 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 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.

4.2 Members of the Committee who are in the candidate's department shall abstain from voting if he/she has already voted in the department.

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

4.4 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.

4.5 In all cases where files have been submitted by March 1, and have been acceptably completed according to the specifications given in these Procedures, the Committee's recommendation will be forwarded to the Dean not later than April 30.

#### 5 EVALUATION BY THE DEAN AND THE PROVOST

5.1 The file is reviewed by the Dean, normally within two weeks of receipt. If the Dean does not agree with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Personnel Policy Committee, the Dean shall meet with the Committee to allow an exchange of ideas and opinions before completing his/her 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, who, after formulating a recommendation, will forward the file to the President. If the Provost disagrees with, or has questions about, the recommendation of the Personnel Policy Committee, the Provost shall confer with the Committee before formulating a recommendation.

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

5.5 If substantively new information affecting evaluation of the candidate is added to the file after it has been considered by the Personnel Policy 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.

5.6 The Provost will notify the candidate that the file is being forwarded to the President and that it is available for review in the Office of the President in accordance with Article 31.6 of the U.U.P. Agreement.

## 6 ACTION BY THE PRESIDENT

6.1 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.

6.2 If the President disagrees with the Committee 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.

6.3 A copy of the letter announcing the President's decision shall be sent to the Personnel Policy Committee at the time it is sent to the candidate.

## 7 APPENDICES

7.1 Sample announcement of initiation of a candidacy for promotion and/or continuing appointment:

MEMO

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

FROM: (Name of Chair)

SUBJECT: Announcement of the Candidacy of (Name of Candidate)

Professor (Name of Candidate) of the (Department) is a candidate for (enter appropriate terms).

Any member of the University Community, and especially any member of this department, 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 College of Engineering and Applied Sciences Personnel Policy 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.

7.2 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. \_\_\_\_'s 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's 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. \_\_\_\_\_'s qualifications would probably be promoted/receive tenure at your institution. Any other information you can supply regarding the candidate's effectiveness in teaching or her/his national or international reputation in her/his field of research would be greatly appreciated.

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.

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,

### 7.3 Sample Bibliography<sup>3</sup> Books:

A. D. Kraus and A. Bar-Cohen., Thermal Analysis and Control of Electronic Equipment 1st Edition., (Hemisphere Publishing Corporation., New York, 1983), xvi+620 pp.

A. Bar-Cohen and A. D. Kraus (editors), Advances in Thermal Modeling of Electronic Components and Systems, Vol. I (Hemisphere Publishing Corporation., New York, 1988), ii+469 pp.

#### Review Papers:

M. M. Yovanovich and V. W. Antonetti, Application of Thermal Contact Resistance Theory to Electronic Packages, in Advances in Thermal Modeling of Electronic Components and System, A. D. Kraus (editors), Vol. 1 (Hemisphere Publishing Corporation., New York, 1988) pp. 79~128.

M. Quintard and S. Whitaker, One-and Two-Equation Models for Transient Diffusion Processes in Two-Phase Systems, in Advances in Heat Transfer, J. P. Hartnett, T. F. Irvine, Jr., and Y. L. Cho (editors), Vol. 23 (Academic Press, San Diego, 1993) pp. 369-464.

#### Journal Articles:

D. W. Hoffman and J. A. Thornton., Effect of Substrate Orientation and Rotation on Internal Stresses in Sputtered Metal Films, Journal of Vacuum Science and Technology, Vol. 16. pp. 134-137 (1979).

K. H. Muller, Stress and Microstructure of Sputter-Deposited Thin Film: Molecular Dynamics Investigation., Journal of Applied Physics, Vol. 62, pp. 1796-1799 (1987).

#### Other Refereed Papers:

R. P. Ried, D. M. Hong and R. S. Muller, Modulation of Micromachined-Microphone Frequency Response Using an On-Diaphragm Heater, Micromechanical Systems 1993, A. P. Pisano, J. Jara-Almonte and W. Trimmer (editors), DSCNo. 46, (ASME, New York, 1993), pp. 7-12.

T. Nowak, and J. -H. Chun., Flow Visualization of Fiber Impregnation in Resin Transfer Molding, Proceedings, First International Conference on Transport Phenomena in Processing, S. I. Guceri (editor) (Technomic Publishing Co., 1993) pp. 1249-1258.

<sup>3</sup> Form will vary from department to department

Non-Refereed Papers, Reports and Other Articles:

A. K. Noor and S. L. Venneri, Future Flight, Mechanical Engineering, Vol. 116 (9), pp. 86-88, ASME 1994

D. A. Weitz and D. J. Pine, Multiple Scattering Probes of Disordered Materials, MRS Bulletin, Vol. XIX (5) pp. 39-44, Materials Research Society, 1994.

H. Strauss, D. Longcope and E. Hameiri, Magneto Fluid Dynamics Computations on Structured and Unstructured Meshes, AFOSR Grantees and Contractors Meeting, Research in Computational Mathematics, pp. 22-25, 1993.

Miscellaneous including abstract presentations in a suitable format.

7.4 The PPC recommends that promotion dossiers contain the following information.

- CEAS standard CV, with copies of selected publications
- Research statement, teaching statement, and service statement
- Mandatory letters from external reviewers, selected by candidate and selected by department
- Optional letters from external reviewers, selected by candidate and selected by department
- CVs of external reviewers (in the same order as the letters, but in a separate section of the dossier). Brief CVs, brief professional biographies, and full CVs are acceptable.
- Letters from Stony Brook colleagues, especially mentors
- Letters from students
- Teaching evaluation by a colleague
- Student teaching evaluations from all courses taught at Stony Brook University since the most recent promotion or joining the university, whichever came later
- Letter from department chair. If the letter contains quotes from external reviewers, the source of each quote should be identified in the letter with a pseudonym (e.g., Reviewer A), and the dossier should contain a key to the pseudonyms.