

Stony Brook's Guidelines on Promotion and Tenure

Executive Summary

This document updates and replaces the promotion and tenure information that appeared on the Provost's Office website as of September 2025. It incorporates clarifications, revisions, and several substantive changes, including: (a) the establishment of an advisory committee to provide guidance to the Provost and the Executive Vice President for Stony Brook Medicine and Health Sciences (EVP-SBMHS) in the exercise of their existing decision-making authority; (b) adjustments to key deadlines; and (c) the modification of the expedited tenure process to enhance flexibility for units to recruit outstanding faculty at the advanced and senior levels.

The Guidelines have been reorganized and streamlined to improve clarity, transparency, and ease of use. Both the substantive revisions and other updates were informed by multiple rounds of feedback from a broad range of University stakeholders.

We greatly appreciate the efforts of many faculty, Chairs, Promotion and Tenure Committees, Senate representatives, and Deans who reviewed and provided feedback throughout this process. The current document reflects substantial input from these conversations and incorporates structural, substantive, and editorial revisions.

Once any final revisions resulting from the current round of review are incorporated, these Guidelines will be in effect for the 2026–2027 promotion and tenure cycle, for files submitted to the Provost/EVP-SBMHS in Spring 2027.

Formal review and revision of the Guidelines will occur every three years. However, this document may be reviewed and revised at any time in response to faculty feedback or other opportunities to improve the process and related documentation with the goal of balancing responsiveness and consistency for those going through the process.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	II
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. SCOPE AND PRECEDENCE	2
1.2. REVIEW AND REVISION	2
1.3. VERSION	3
2. TIMELINES AND PROCESSES	3
2.1. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR	3
2.1.1. <i>Spring Start Date</i>	3
2.1.2. <i>Midpoint Review</i>	3
2.1.3. <i>Early Consideration</i>	4
2.1.4. <i>Credit for Prior Service</i>	4
2.1.5. <i>Tenure Clock Stoppages</i>	5
2.1.5.1. Details	5
2.1.5.1.a. Family and Personal Circumstances	5
2.1.5.1.b. Professional and Institutional Circumstances	5
2.1.5.1.c. Mandatory and Case-by-Case Stoppages	5
2.1.5.1.d. Mechanism for Tenure Clock Stoppage	5
2.1.5.1.e. Duration of Stoppage	5
2.1.5.1.f. Request and Approval Process	6
2.1.5.2. Impact on the File	6
2.1.5.3. Forms and Resources	6
2.1.5.4. Accounting for COVID-19	7
2.1.6. <i>Reconsideration</i>	7
2.2. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TO PROFESSOR	7
2.3. CANDIDATE RESPONSE	8
2.4. PROCESS ADVISOR	8
3. DEADLINES	8
3.1. LATE OR INCOMPLETE FILES	8
4. THE FILE	9
4.1. MATERIALS PROVIDED BY THE CANDIDATE	9
4.2. MATERIALS PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT, SCHOOL/COLLEGE, OR PROVOST/EVP-SBMHS	10
4.3. LETTERS AND EXTERNAL EVALUATORS	10
4.3.1. <i>Letters from External Evaluators</i>	10
4.3.1.1. Number of Letters from External Evaluators	10
4.3.1.2. Criteria for Selecting External Evaluators	11
4.3.1.3. Initial Consultation and Development of Evaluator Lists	11
4.3.1.4. "Do Not Contact" List	11
4.3.1.5. External Evaluators Selected by the Department	11
4.3.1.6. Conflicts of Interest	12
4.3.1.7. Acceptable Degrees of Relationship	12

4.3.1.8. No Hidden Letters	13
4.3.1.9. Correspondence with External Evaluators	13
4.3.1.10. Joint Appointments	13
4.3.2. <i>Internal Letters</i>	13
4.3.2.1. Internal Letters Attesting to Clinical Service	13
4.4. MATERIAL ADDED SUBSEQUENT TO INITIAL REVIEW	13
5. PROVOST/EVP-SBMHS ADVISORY COMMITTEE	13
5.1. INTRODUCTION	13
5.2. COMMITTEE COMPOSITION	14
5.2.1. <i>Membership Criteria</i>	14
5.2.2. <i>Terms of Service</i>	14
5.3. COMMITTEE OPERATIONS	14
5.3.1 <i>Meeting Schedule and Administration</i>	14
5.3.2. <i>Quorum</i>	15
5.4. CASE REVIEW PROCESS	15
5.4.1. <i>Reader Assignments</i>	15
5.4.2. <i>Consent Agenda</i>	15
5.4.3. <i>Presentation and Discussion of Cases</i>	16
5.4.4. <i>Recusal</i>	16
5.5. POST-REVIEW ACTIONS AND TRANSPARENCY	16
5.6. SCOPE OF COMMITTEE ROLE	16
6. EXPEDITED TENURE AND/OR PROMOTION	16
6.1. ELIGIBILITY	17
6.1.1 <i>Expedited Tenure with Promotion</i>	18
6.1.2 <i>Hires to Higher Rank</i>	18
6.1.3 <i>Approval to Offer Expedited Process</i>	18
6.2 FINALIZING THE CASE	19
6.3. STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT THE EXPEDITED PROCESS	19
6.4. TIMING OF SUBMISSION OF FILES FOR EXPEDITED TENURE.	19
6.5. GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL/COLLEGE	19
6.6 ADVERSE DECISIONS	20

1. Introduction

The promotion and tenure process is central to a university achieving and embodying excellence and rigor and must be approached in a manner that is intentional, clear, consistent, and equitable.

The [Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees](#), specifically Art. XII, Title A, paragraph 4 and Title B, paragraph 2, indicate the elements that should be weighed in the evaluation of Candidates for promotion and/or continuing appointment.

The promotion and tenure process includes several steps, with each step informing the next:

- Step 1: Review by the department or equivalent (e.g., area or division, with “department” encompassing all equivalents throughout this document), including a recommendation from the faculty and a letter from the Chair in accordance with departmental practices and/or by-laws.
- Step 2: Review by the school/college, including a recommendation from the school/college-level committee and a letter from the Dean in accordance with school/college practices and/or by-laws.
- Step 3: Review by the Provost/Executive Vice President for Stony Brook Medicine and Health Sciences (EVP-SBMHS), including a recommendation from the Provost/EVP-SBMHS Advisory Committee and a recommendation from the Provost/EVP-SBMHS to the President. For tenure cases, the President then makes a recommendation to the Chancellor; this additional step does not apply to cases involving promotion to Professor only.

Consistent with SUNY policy and documented departmental and School/College criteria, evaluation should consider evidence of excellence in key domains outlined below, as applicable to the Candidate’s appointment and assigned responsibilities. Excellence should be understood within the context of the discipline and informed by standards at peer and aspirational peer institutions:

- Comprehensive undergraduate and graduate education of the highest quality across all aspects of teaching, clinical supervision, and mentorship;
- Research broadly defined within each discipline and including creative, scholarly, laboratory, community-based, clinical, and entrepreneurial activities;
- Service at various levels across the department, school/college, University, and outside the University, including professional organizations as well as communities locally and globally;

In alignment with the University’s mission of “celebrating diversity and positioning the University in the global community,” evaluation should, where appropriate, value contributions that advance diversity, inclusion, community engagement, and the public good, as demonstrated

through the Candidate's research, teaching, mentoring, clinical work, and/or service.

These evaluation criteria represent core areas of faculty endeavor, tied to core values of the University, and apply to the assessment of promotion and tenure cases at all levels.

While these Guidelines articulate expectations and processes for Provost/EVP-SBMHS review, the standards for excellence and the interpretation of scholarly, creative, clinical, and educational accomplishments remain grounded in the documented criteria of the Candidate's department and school/college and in the norms of the relevant discipline. Where documented departmental or School/College criteria provide greater disciplinary specificity, those criteria govern the evaluation of disciplinary excellence. When disciplinary, clinical, creative, or professional norms require additional context, the Provost/EVP-SBMHS Advisory Committee may request clarification or contextual information from the Dean, Chair, and/or school/college promotion committee.

Our goal is to promote alignment among the University promotion and tenure guidance outlined in this document, departmental and School/College criteria, faculty governance documents, and applicable collective bargaining agreements. When inconsistencies are identified, efforts will be made to understand and, where appropriate, harmonize the relevant documents. Where differences are intentional and justified, they should be clearly identified and documented so that Candidates and reviewers can readily understand the applicable standards and process.

Departments without documented promotion and tenure standards are strongly encouraged to develop them in the interest of transparency, consistency, and equity. Given the importance of departmental and disciplinary norms in guiding the review process, all departments are encouraged to regularly review and update their documented promotion and tenure criteria to reflect evolving disciplinary norms, changes in departmental strategic plans, or other relevant factors.

1.1. Scope and Precedence

The guidelines outlined in this document, departmental and School/College criteria, approved bylaws, faculty governance documents, and applicable collective bargaining agreements should be aligned. Where a conflict or inconsistency is identified, efforts should be made to resolve it promptly. In the event of an unresolved conflict, Federal and State law, SUNY policy, and applicable collective bargaining agreements take precedence.

1.2. Review and Revision

Formal review of these Guidelines will occur every three years. As appropriate, or in response to a request, the Provost's Office may form time-limited, ad hoc faculty working groups to review, recommend changes, or discuss any aspect of the Guidelines. Interim corrections or

amendments may be issued by the Provost's Office when necessary. Each revision will be dated, versioned, summarized, and clearly communicated to the campus community.

1.3. Version

This is the August 23, 2026 draft version of the Guidelines, based on feedback provided over the summer. It will go through another public comment period in late August / early September before being finalized. Be sure to [check the Provost's Office website](#) to make sure that this is the current, up-to-date version of the Guidelines.

2. Timelines and Processes

2.1. Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

Departments are expected to initiate promotion and tenure cases during the Spring semester preceding the formal review year. During that semester, the Chair will consult with the Candidate regarding the preparation of the Candidate's file, the appropriate qualifications for the external evaluators, and the Candidate's do-not-contact list. By the end of the Spring semester, the Candidate's portion of the file must be complete and the list of external evaluators who have agreed to evaluate the file finalized. These activities may proceed concurrently, and departments need not wait for every component of the file to be complete before beginning appropriate outreach to prospective evaluators.

The final decision on the case is ordinarily expected by the end of the Candidate's sixth year. That timeline is adjusted based on several factors including: a) approved start date (Section 2.1.1.); b) early consideration (Section 2.1.3.); c) credit for prior service (Section 2.1.4.); and/or d) approved tenure clock stoppage (Section 2.1.5). In accordance with SUNY policy, if tenure is denied the Candidate receives a notice of non-renewal and their appointment ends at the conclusion of the final year of the contract.

2.1.1. Spring Start Date

For promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor with tenure, Candidates whose initial appointment date is between January 1 and June 30 will have their mandatory tenure date calculated from the following September 1.

2.1.2. Midpoint Review

Approximately midway through the Candidate's first six years on the tenure track at Stony Brook, the Chair, or a designated committee of the senior faculty, must provide the Candidate with an opportunity to receive and respond to feedback about their progress. This should include a discussion of research, teaching/clinical work, and service. The process is formative or developmental rather than evaluative and is intended to provide feedback and guidance for the

faculty member in their pathway to tenure rather than to constitute an additional level of review. A written summary of the conversation must be shared with the Candidate, and the Candidate must be given a chance to respond. The summary and response remain with the department and Candidate only: the department must certify to the School/College and the Provost/EVP-SBMHS that the Midpoint Review has taken place but must not transmit the substantive contents of either the feedback or the response. That certification may be included in a reappointment file or separately documented as appropriate. Neither the summary of the conversation nor the Candidate's response to it will be included in any reappointment file or the eventual tenure file unless the Candidate elects to include them or their inclusion is otherwise required by controlling policy or agreement.

2.1.3. Early Consideration

Based on discussions with their Chair and/or mentors, Candidates may request early consideration (i.e., consideration for promotion and tenure before the date established based on their date of hire), subject to all applicable bylaws and procedures. Based on SUNY Policy, Candidates who pursue early consideration and are not granted tenure move into a terminal year as described in 2.1 above, unless the Candidate withdraws their case before a decision by the Provost or EVP-SBMHS, in which case they can seek promotion and tenure again within the timeframe of their tenure clock. Before the Provost/EVP-SBMHS review of an Early Consideration case begins, the Candidate must receive written notice explaining the consequences of proceeding, including the point after which the case may no longer be withdrawn. The Candidate must confirm in writing whether the Candidate wishes the review to continue. A Candidate may withdraw the case without penalty before that point and may initiate a new case at any subsequent point permitted by the tenure clock.

2.1.4. Credit for Prior Service

If an Assistant Professor is hired after serving in a tenure-track position elsewhere, they may receive "prior service credit" for up to three years, per [SUNY Board of Trustees policies](#), Article XI, Appointment of Employees, Title B, Continuing Appointment. Those who have elected to take prior service credit are still evaluated on a six-year body of work, but 1-3 of those years of work are to be understood as occurring before arrival at Stony Brook. At the time of appointment, the Provost's Office will determine whether an appointee has prior service that may be creditable toward the University's tenure probationary period, and will ensure that the letter of appointment includes language informing the appointee that they must submit the "Academic Employee Request for Prior Service Credit" form along with their other appointment materials. Even those not requesting prior service credit must complete the form in order to document their decision. Department chairs should advise the appointee about how prior service credit affects the tenure timeline and discuss the available options. If prior service is requested and approved, the Candidate's promotion and tenure will follow the same deadlines indicated above (with the time of prior service factored in). Per SUNY Board of Trustees policies, Article XI, Title B, "Waiver of all or part of this service credit shall be granted upon

written request of the employee to the chief administrative officer no later than six months after the date of initial appointment.”

2.1.5 Tenure Clock Stoppages

2.1.5.1. Details

The tenure clock may be stopped because of personal, family, medical, professional, and/or institutional circumstances that substantially impede a faculty member’s ability to make normal progress toward tenure and are beyond that faculty member’s reasonable control.

2.1.5.1.a. Family and Personal Circumstances

Tenure clock stoppages may be requested for circumstances including, but not limited to:

- Birth of a child, adoption, or foster placement;
- Caregiving obligations involving an immediate family member or significant elder; and
- Personal medical circumstances that significantly impede progress toward tenure and are beyond the faculty member’s reasonable control.

2.1.5.1.b. Professional and Institutional Circumstances

Tenure clock stoppages may also be requested when unexpected and extenuating professional or institutional circumstances deprive the faculty member of a reasonable opportunity to demonstrate their abilities and potential as a faculty member. Examples may include:

- Research setbacks resulting from circumstances beyond the faculty member’s control;
- Physical plant or infrastructure problems that substantially inhibit work;
- Unexpected delays in the provision of approved start-up funds or essential resources;
- Delayed laboratory renovations or delayed access to critical equipment;
- Campus relocations or moves that materially disrupt research or scholarly activity;
- Equipment or data destruction;
- Animal or model-system failures; and
- Effects of natural disasters or comparable extraordinary events.

These examples are illustrative and not exhaustive.

2.1.5.1.c. Mandatory and Case-by-Case Stoppages

Requests for tenure clock stoppage related to the birth of a child, adoption, or foster placement are mandatory and will result in an adjustment of the faculty member’s mandatory tenure date, subject to the terms and conditions outlined in Appendix A-42 of the UUP collective bargaining agreement. All other requests may be considered on a case-by-case basis and assessed by the department Chair and Dean, with final review by the Provost’s Office/EVP-SBMHS.

2.1.5.1.d. Mechanism for Tenure Clock Stoppage

An approved tenure clock stoppage results in an adjustment to the mandatory tenure date.

2.1.5.1.e. Duration of Stoppage

- Faculty with academic-year obligations may receive a tenure clock stoppage of either one or two semesters.
- Faculty with calendar-year obligations may receive a tenure clock stoppage of either six or twelve months.

Additional stoppage time may be requested when warranted and will be subject to the same review and approval process as the original request and may result in adjustments to promotion and tenure case submission timelines and deadlines.

2.1.5.1.f. Request and Approval Process

Faculty considering a tenure clock stoppage should consult with their department Chair as early as possible. Mandatory stoppages (see 2.1.5.1.c) need only a written request, sent by the Candidate to the Chair, and forwarded by the Chair to the Dean and by the Dean to the Provost's Office/EVP-SBMHS. This is not an approval process, but a matter of making sure that all levels are aware of the fact of the stoppage.

Prospective or retrospective requests for tenure clock stoppage on a case-by-case basis must be submitted in writing and must include a concise account of the relevant circumstances, their anticipated or documented material impact on the Candidate's progress, and their anticipated or actual duration. Additional documentation may be requested when necessary. The request requires endorsement by the Chair and Dean and is finalized by the Provost/EVP-SBMHS.

Requests on either a guaranteed or a case-by-case basis may not be initiated after the completed dossier has been disseminated for formal review, including dissemination to external evaluators or the relevant departmental review body. Approved clock stoppages will result in corresponding adjustments to promotion and tenure case submission timelines and deadlines.

2.1.5.2. Impact on the File

If a faculty member is granted a tenure clock stoppage, the promotion and tenure file shall identify the Candidate's approved mandatory review date and any resulting adjustment to the submission timetable. The underlying reason for an approved tenure-clock stoppage shall not be included in the evaluative file except when disclosure is required by law or expressly authorized by the Candidate.

Faculty granted an approved tenure clock stoppage shall be evaluated using the same standards applied to all tenure cases. Such Candidates shall not be held to a higher standard or presumed to have had "additional time" for evaluation. When the clock stops, it stops.

2.1.5.3. Forms and Resources

A “[Request for Interruption of Tenure-Track Service](#)” form is available on the Provost’s Office website.

2.1.5.4. Accounting for COVID-19

Faculty employed in a tenure-track position between May 6, 2020, and June 30, 2021, automatically received a one-year extension to their tenure clock, unless the faculty member timely opted out. Please refer to the applicable [SUNY memorandum for additional guidance](#).

2.1.6. Reconsideration

In the event that a file for promotion to Associate Professor with tenure is denied, the Candidate has a “terminal year of appointment” as indicated above in 2.1 and the appointment ends at the conclusion of this terminal year.

If there is substantial new evidence of the Candidate’s achievements, the department and/or Candidate may submit a request for reconsideration to the President within 10 working days of the date of the President’s letter of non-renewal. Reconsideration, sometimes referred to as “Resubmission,” may be pursued when there are compelling reasons to undertake it. In such a case, the Chair or Candidate is expected to establish that the evidence in question could not have been gathered at the time the case was first considered and that it constitutes substantial additional evidence that would likely alter the outcome upon full consideration.

If the request for reconsideration is approved by the President, the Candidate will submit an updated set of materials, including any additional publications, scholarly activity, grants, and evidence of improvement in teaching or service relevant to the period under review. Additional external evaluators will be selected to conduct a fresh evaluation of the case. Any request sent to an external evaluator as part of reconsideration must be neutral and must not disclose or imply the fact or the outcome of the prior review. Internally, the reconsideration file must include the materials from the original review, including the original external evaluations, together with all new materials or evaluations obtained during reconsideration.

As this reconsideration occurs in the “terminal year of appointment,” if it is not successful, the Candidate’s appointment ends at the conclusion of this terminal year.

This process is distinct from the rights conferred as part of the UUP collective bargaining agreement, Articles 32 and 33.

2.2. Associate Professor to Professor

Associate Professors interested in being evaluated for promotion to Professor should discuss the strength of their case and the timing of promotion with their department Chair (or equivalent direct supervisor). Time in rank alone does not establish qualification for promotion to Professor.

Although SUNY policy permits completion of a minimum period of service to be considered (SUNY Board Policies, Article XII, Title B, §3), promotion is based on the Candidate's accomplishments. Timing is individual, and expectations vary by discipline.

If a case for promotion to Professor is denied, the Candidate may resubmit in a subsequent year. The Chair or mentors should provide guidance on how the file can be improved and discuss a timeline for resubmission in a future cycle.

2.3. Candidate Response

In the event that a department recommends against promotion or promotion and tenure, the Chair must inform the Candidate of the recommendation and provide a written explanation of it. Please note that this may be the Chair's letter, appropriately anonymized to preserve confidentiality. The Candidate must be given at least 10 working days to review the nonconfidential material made available for this purpose and submit a written response. The response may address factual errors, procedural concerns, relevant context, or other matters raised by the file. The response will be included in the file as it moves to the School/College level. Subsequent levels of review must consider the response, and any substantiated factual or procedural errors must be corrected or otherwise addressed as appropriate. This opportunity supplements, and does not replace, any rights provided under the applicable collective bargaining agreement, including, but not limited to, Article 31.

2.4. Process Advisor

Following an adverse departmental recommendation, a Candidate may seek advice from a faculty colleague. This colleague, serving as process advisor, may help the Candidate understand the process, identify procedural questions, review materials that the Candidate is authorized to access, and prepare the Candidate Response. The advisor has no independent right to access confidential materials, contact evaluators, solicit advocacy letters, or participate in deliberations. The advisor may review only materials that the Candidate is authorized to access and chooses to share.

3. Deadlines

Deadlines for Steps 1 and 2 of the promotion and tenure process (as outlined in Section 1, above) will be determined by the department (Step 1) and school/college (Step 2), respectively. Deadlines for submission of the file to the Provost/EVP-SBMHS (Step 3) are:

- April 1: Promotion and tenure from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor
- May 1: Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Note: For the 2026-27 cycle, for files submitted to the Provost/EVP-SBMHS in Spring 2027, the May 1 Professor deadline for West Campus represents a change from the West Campus January 15 deadline in previous years.

3.1. Late or Incomplete Files

The deadlines above are firm administrative deadlines. A file is considered submitted when the Dean's Office has released a complete file to the Provost/EVP-SBMHS. If a Dean anticipates that a file will not be complete by the applicable deadline, the Dean must notify the Office of the Provost/EVP-SBMHS in writing before the deadline, identify the reason for the delay and any missing elements, and provide a proposed submission date. If the delay was not reasonably foreseeable, the Dean must provide notice as soon as the delay becomes known.

A mandatory tenure case will not be deferred solely because a department or school/college misses a deadline. Such a file will be accepted and placed on an accelerated or specially scheduled review path as necessary to permit timely final action and compliance with applicable notice requirements. Accelerated or specially scheduled handling may adjust the timing of review but may not omit any required level of review or curtail any procedural right of the Candidate. A Candidate will not be disadvantaged by a delay attributable to the University. Acceptance of a late file does not itself extend the tenure clock or determine the outcome of the review.

Every reasonable effort will be made to ensure that a file for promotion to Professor is not deferred to the next review cycle when the Candidate has met all applicable deadlines and the delay is attributable to the department, School/College, or University. When such a file cannot be included in the regularly scheduled meeting, reasonable efforts will be made to arrange an ad hoc meeting of the Advisory Committee. Acceptance of a late file does not determine the outcome of the review.

If the delay results from the Candidate's failure to provide required materials, the Dean must consult the Faculty Affairs Office of the Provost/EVP-SBMHS promptly. A mandatory review must still be handled in accordance with applicable SUNY policy, collective bargaining requirements, and approved bylaws.

Any material received after a file has advanced beyond a review stage must be clearly identified. When the new material could materially affect an earlier recommendation, the appropriate prior reviewers must be given an opportunity to consider it and indicate whether their recommendation has changed.

4. The File

4.1. Materials Provided by the Candidate

The contents of the Candidate's part of the file may vary depending on the policies of the school/college; but in general, it will include the following:

- CV;

- statements on research, teaching, and service;
- sample publications, talks, and/or creative works;
- list of courses taught;
- honors and awards;
- grants;
- dissertations and/or theses advised;
- sample syllabi/educator portfolio; and
- evidence of service to the department/school/college, University, and profession.

4.2. Materials Provided by the Department, School/College, or Provost/EVP-SBMHS

Materials added by the department, school/college, or Provost/EVP-SBMHS may include internal recommendations and evaluations; records of votes, recusals, and abstentions; external evaluations and related correspondence; peer observations or other evaluations of teaching, clinical work, or service; and documentation of the Candidate's approved mandatory review date and resulting submission timetable, as described in Section 2.1.5.2.

Access to and disclosure of these materials are governed by applicable law, SUNY policy, collective bargaining agreements, and approved bylaws. Materials must be handled to protect confidential sources. The underlying reason for an approved tenure-clock stoppage shall not be disclosed except when required by law or expressly authorized by the Candidate. Nothing in this section expands or limits any right of access or response.

4.3. Letters and External Evaluators

4.3.1. Letters from External Evaluators

External evaluation letters are a critical part of the Candidate's file, essential for documenting that the norms and standards being applied at the University are in alignment with those in the larger discipline and with practices at peer and aspirational peer institutions.

4.3.1.1. Number of Letters from External Evaluators

Ordinarily, a file will include 6 evaluation letters, divided equally between evaluators suggested by the department and evaluators suggested by the Candidate. Because invited evaluators may decline or fail to respond, departments must monitor the process and make timely and substantial efforts to obtain additional letters from both pools when necessary. The Candidate may be asked to provide additional names for this purpose. Every effort should be made to get the requisite 6 letters, but under some circumstances, a case may move forward with only 5 letters. In such a case, the Chair must document the circumstances that prevented the ordinary 6 letter expectation from being met, and the efforts that were made by the department to solicit the full complement of letters. In all cases, there must be a minimum of 3 letters from evaluators

suggested by the department and 2 letters from evaluators suggested by the Candidate. Some schools/colleges may require a higher number of letters. All Candidates and all department leaders tasked with preparing materials for a file should refer to the promotion and tenure policies of their school or college.

4.3.1.2. Criteria for Selecting External Evaluators

External evaluators must be established contributors in a field relevant to the Candidate's scholarship and/or creative work, with the experience and accomplishments necessary to provide a rigorous assessment. If the Candidate's work is interdisciplinary, the overall set of evaluators should reflect the Candidate's particular balance of disciplines.

For promotion to Associate Professor with tenure, external evaluators must be tenured and hold the rank of Associate Professor or Professor. For promotion to Professor, external evaluators must be tenured and hold the rank of Professor. Exceptions may be made only in well-documented cases where there is a paucity of experts in the relevant field at the required rank. Individuals outside academia (e.g., in industry or research foundations) who do not hold these academic ranks may be considered, provided the Chair or committee documents their qualifications and explains why they are particularly well positioned to evaluate the Candidate's work.

External evaluators should hold appointments at institutions that are members of the AAU and/or are considered peers or aspirational peers of Stony Brook University in the relevant field. Exceptions may be made when the Chair or committee documents that the evaluator's reputation and expertise make them particularly well suited to assess the Candidate's work.

4.3.1.3. Initial Consultation and Development of Evaluator Lists

At the outset of the process, the department should consult with the Candidate regarding the nature and scope of the Candidate's work and the types of expertise most appropriate for its evaluation. This consultation is intended both to assist the Candidate in developing their list of potential evaluators and to inform the department's understanding of the fields, subfields, methodological approaches, interdisciplinary areas, creative practices, or professional communities relevant to the Candidate's work. Following this consultation, the department must develop and select the specific individuals on its list independently of the Candidate, as described below.

4.3.1.4. "Do Not Contact" List

In addition to the names that the Candidate provides to the department as potential evaluators, the Candidate may also give the department up to 2 names of people who should not be contacted as evaluators.

4.3.1.5. External Evaluators Selected by the Department

The department's list of external evaluators must be developed and selected without further consultation with the Candidate regarding specific individuals. Other internal or external experts in the discipline may be consulted to ensure a strong and appropriate list of evaluators.

4.3.1.6. Conflicts of Interest

An external evaluator must not have a conflict of interest, or even the appearance of a conflict of interest, that would call into question the unbiased nature of the evaluation. External evaluators cannot have been:

- Direct supervisors or mentors in any official capacity at any stage of the Candidate's training;
- Anyone the Candidate has directly supervised or mentored in any official capacity at any stage of the evaluator's training;
- Co-author or co-editor on any manuscript (book or journal article, published or unpublished), creative work, or grant application (funded or unfunded) at any point in the career of the applicant;
- Family (through birth, adoption, or marriage) or past/current romantic involvement.

In the case of the co-authorship or co-editorship requirement, an exception may be requested only in truly unusual and necessary circumstances and only when permitting the exception is judged to be in the Candidate's best interest. The Chair must document the nature, timing, and extent of the prior collaboration; the basis for concluding that the evaluator remains independent; and why suitable non-collaborating evaluators are not reasonably available. Approval of an exception is not guaranteed.

4.3.1.7. Acceptable Degrees of Relationship

Acceptable degrees of relationship that do not preclude someone from serving as an external evaluator include:

- Co-authors on a manuscript with an extremely large number of authors (including but not limited to position papers from professional organizations and mega-multi-authored research reports) in which there was negligible contact and/or mentoring between the Candidate and the potential evaluator;
- Co-presenters in a research symposium, panel, or exhibition;
- Editor/chapter contributor relationships, series editor/volume editor relationships, or authorship on separate chapters in an edited book (co-editorship would be a conflict);
- An editor/board member relationship on a journal editorial board or equivalent;
- A reviewer/contributor relationship on a creative work.

The Candidate or department may decide to include letters from evaluators who do not meet the standards outlined in Sections 4.3.1.6 and 4.3.1.7, but such letters cannot count toward the required minimums indicated in Section 4.3.1.1 and must be distinguished from the letters that do. If such "conflicted" letters are received, they must, however, be included in the file (per Section 4.3.1.8). If the Candidate is unsure about a conflict, they should consult with their Chair

or committee; if the department is unsure, they should consult with their Dean's Office. If departments have difficulty identifying appropriate external evaluators, they should request assistance from their Dean's Office and the Offices of the Provost/EVP-SBMHS.

4.3.1.8. No Hidden Letters

Any letter solicited and received must be in the file.

4.3.1.9. Correspondence with External Evaluators

The file must include the solicitation template and any substantive correspondence with external evaluators that bears on an evaluator's eligibility, relationship to the Candidate, scope of review, or assessment. The department must maintain an administrative record of all invitations and responses, including declines, and make it available for process review upon request.

4.3.1.10. Joint Appointments

In the case of a Candidate holding a joint appointment, the appointment agreement and applicable bylaws determine which units review and vote. In the absence of such protocols, the promotion and tenure process is handled by the unit with a 50% or greater share of the Candidate's FTE, in consultation with the Chair(s)/Director(s) of the secondary unit(s).

4.3.2. Internal Letters

In addition to the external letters, the file may include internal letters that come from members of the campus community, including but not limited to: faculty or staff; students or mentees; and those who have worked with the Candidate in any capacity. Such letters are optional and must be clearly distinguished from the letters from External Evaluators. They do not count toward the minimum thresholds indicated in section 4.3.1.1. Some Schools/Colleges may require internal letters (for example, letters testifying to a Candidate's teaching or clinical work). Candidates and departments should consult their School/College promotion and tenure guidelines.

4.3.2.1. Internal Letters Attesting to Clinical Service

For some roles (e.g., clinical service), internal letters may be a cornerstone in review of that work. In these cases, the Candidate should seek guidance from their Chair, Dean, and/or mentor as appropriate.

4.4. Material Added Subsequent to Initial Review

For the handling of any material added to the file at any point after the departmental review is complete, see Section 3.1, above.

5. Provost/EVP-SBMHS Advisory Committee

5.1. Introduction

The purpose of the Provost/EVP-SBMHS Advisory Committee is to provide advisory support to the Provost and Executive Vice President for Stony Brook Medicine and Health Sciences (EVP-SBMHS) in carrying out their existing decision-making responsibilities within the promotion and tenure process. The committee does not replace either departmental or School/College review, nor does it establish separate disciplinary criteria. It is not an additional level of review but a rearticulation of the advisory process at the existing Provost/EVP-SBMHS level of review. Its role is advisory and focused on promoting consistency of process and fairness in support of promotion and tenure decisions.

5.2. Committee Composition

The committee consists of 11 members appointed by the Provost/EVP-SBMHS based on recommendations from the University Senate Executive Committee and the Deans. Committee members must be tenured at the rank of Professor.

5.2.1. Membership Criteria

Committee composition shall be guided by the following principles:

- All committee member affiliations shall be determined by their tenure home unit;
- At least six members shall be selected from recommendations made by the University Senate Executive Committee;
- The University Senate Executive Committee shall provide at least two nominations for each open position to be filled from its recommendations;
- Remaining members shall be selected from recommendations made by the Deans;
- Representation shall include no more than seven faculty members from either East or West Campus. This limit is intended to maintain balance between East and West Campus representation while recognizing differences in faculty size and ensuring meaningful representation from both campuses;
- No department may be represented by more than one faculty member whose tenure home resides in that department (non-tenure-home joint appointments or other affiliations shall not be considered);
- No school or college may be represented by more than four faculty members; and
- At least six schools or colleges (including the Libraries) shall be represented.

5.2.2. Terms of Service

For the initial appointments to the committee, members may be assigned one-year or two-year terms to establish staggered membership. Subsequent appointments shall normally be for three-year terms. New appointments will be made at the start of each academic year, unless

unexpected loss of a committee member mid-year requires an off-cycle addition of a new member.

5.3. Committee Operations

5.3.1 Meeting Schedule and Administration

The committee will meet:

- In the Fall to be charged by the Provost and EVP-SBMHS; and
- In the Spring to evaluate files:
 - early Spring to go over process;
 - late April to review cases seeking promotion with tenure to Associate Professor; and
 - late May to review cases seeking promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.

Meetings shall be overseen by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and staffed by the Provost's Office. The Provost and EVP-SBMHS may each designate up to two non-voting representatives to attend and support the operations of the meeting. Meeting dates shall be established at the start of each academic year to allow members to plan accordingly. The Provost's Office will work to ensure that technical review and other procedures take place efficiently and that files are released to their assigned readers in a timely fashion.

5.3.2. Quorum

A quorum shall require the presence of nine committee members for an advisory meeting to be held. As the committee members will have been made aware of the dates of the meetings well in advance, absences should be limited to the extent possible.

5.4. Case Review Process

5.4.1. Reader Assignments

Approximately two weeks prior to each advisory meeting, cases shall be assigned to first, second, and third readers. Reader assignments will prioritize disciplinary expertise to the extent possible.

5.4.2. Consent Agenda

Cases receiving positive recommendations at all prior stages of review and affirmative votes of at least 75% at both the departmental and School/College levels shall be placed on a consent agenda. Abstentions will not be included in calculating the 75% threshold. A case may be removed from the consent agenda when a committee member provides a brief written rationale

for doing so and the request is seconded by another committee member. The purpose of the consent agenda is to move all uncontroversial cases through the process while making sure that controversial cases or cases with significant split votes get attention. The 75% threshold aims to ensure that cases that show a meaningful level of dissent receive consideration at the Provost/EVP-SBMHS level; it does not establish the committee's ultimate recommendation or give the dissenting votes dispositive weight.

5.4.3. Presentation and Discussion of Cases

For cases not on the consent agenda, each of the three assigned readers is responsible for conducting an independent and substantive review of the file. The first reader will lead the presentation of the case; the second and third readers will supplement that presentation with findings, concerns, or perspectives arising from their reviews. Following discussion, the committee will vote by anonymous ballot and provide an advisory recommendation based on a simple majority of the non-recused members voting. Abstentions will be recorded but will not be counted in determining the majority. At least 6 non-recused members must cast an affirmative or negative vote for the vote to be valid. After the meeting, the first reader prepares a brief written summary of the committee's discussion and recommendation that is reviewed by the second and third readers and the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. The summary/recommendation, along with the results of the vote, will be transmitted to the Provost or EVP-SBMHS within 3 days of the meeting.

5.4.4. Recusal

Members shall be recused from cases originating in their home department unless the member did not participate in the departmental or School/College review process and no conflict of interest exists. Recusal is mandatory if the committee member participated in any formal review of the case at another level. A recusal does not count against the number of committee members present to determine a quorum.

5.5. Post-Review Actions and Transparency

Following the advisory meeting, the Provost or EVP-SBMHS may seek additional information from the Dean, the relevant promotion and tenure committee, and/or the department.

In addition to the regular order of operations and notifications required by SUNY policy or applicable governance bylaws, when earlier stages of review support promotion and/or tenure and the Provost or EVP-SBMHS does not approve promotion and/or tenure, a written explanation of the decision shall be included with the decision.

5.6. Scope of Committee Role

The Provost/EVP-SBMHS Advisory Committee provides guidance on cases of promotion and tenure from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor, and cases of promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. The committee does not provide guidance on expedited cases.

6. Expedited Tenure and/or Promotion

Expedited tenure and/or promotion is intended for faculty hired with the expectation of tenure, with the goal of completing the process prior to arrival or within six months of the faculty member's start date. The expedited process may be used in several hiring contexts, with the goal of providing departments with appropriate flexibility to recruit outstanding faculty at the advanced and senior levels.

6.1. Eligibility

The most common expedited cases involve tenure only, and include:

- Individuals currently holding the rank of Professor at their current institution who are hired at the same rank at Stony Brook University with only tenure sought in the expedited process;
- Individuals currently holding the rank of Associate Professor at their current institution who are hired at the same rank at Stony Brook University with only tenure sought in the expedited process.

It is also possible for a department to seek both promotion and tenure through the expedited process. Such cases include:

- Individuals currently holding the rank of Associate Professor at their current institution who are hired at the rank of Associate Professor at Stony Brook University with promotion to Professor and tenure at that rank sought in the expedited process;
- Individuals currently holding the rank of Assistant Professor at their current institution who are hired at the rank of Assistant Professor at Stony Brook University with promotion to Associate Professor and tenure at that rank sought in the expedited process.

While less common, departments may also seek to use an expedited process when a faculty member is hired into a rank higher than their current rank, with tenure sought at that higher rank. Such cases include:

- Individuals holding the rank of Associate Professor at their current institution who are hired at the rank of Professor at Stony Brook University with tenure sought at that rank;
- Individuals holding the rank of Assistant Professor at their current institution who are hired at the rank of Associate Professor at Stony Brook University with tenure sought at that rank.

Note: In all expedited cases, the Candidate is evaluated according to the standards associated with the Stony Brook rank and tenure home for which tenure and/or promotion is sought. Expedited tenure with promotion does not eliminate any required level of review nor does it alter voting requirements or reduce the substantive standards for tenure or promotion.

Expedited tenure is not a process for faculty already employed at Stony Brook University. The expedited case must be initiated at or close to the point of hire. Delays in initiating or completing the process should not be held against the Candidate, convert an expedited case into an evaluation of the Candidate's post-hire performance at Stony Brook, or otherwise alter the basis on which the expedited process was offered. Expedited tenure is also not the same as early tenure consideration or credit for prior service.

The inclusion of expedited tenure and/or promotion in hiring materials indicates that the Chair and/or search committee believes the Candidate presents a body of work commensurate with the standards for the rank and tenure being sought.

Before the possibility of expedited tenure is included in hiring materials, the Chair must consult the appropriate faculty in the proposed tenure home(s), consistent with unit bylaws, to confirm that the Candidate appears to present a viable case at the proposed rank. This preliminary consultation is not a formal tenure vote and does not bind any participant in the later review.

Mention of the possibility of expedited tenure in hiring materials must be expressly contingent on successful completion of all required reviews and approvals.

6.1.1 Expedited Tenure with Promotion

In some cases the expedited process may be used for both tenure and promotion. The expedited promotion and tenure process is intended to provide additional flexibility in competitive hiring situations. As outlined in Section 6.1, this process is for either an Assistant Professor at another institution who is a top candidate for an Assistant Professor position at Stony Brook, to whom the department would like to offer the possibility of an expedited promotion to Associate Professor with tenure at that rank; or an Associate Professor at another institution who is a top candidate for an Associate Professor position at Stony Brook, to whom the department would like to offer the possibility of an expedited promotion to Professor with tenure at that rank. If a department at the offer stage in a search believes they may have a suitable candidate for expedited tenure and promotion, and believes furthermore that the chance of being able to seek expedited tenure and promotion would increase the likelihood of recruiting that candidate to Stony Brook, the Chair should submit to their Dean a request to put the candidate forward for consideration under this process. That request should include the candidate's CV and a written justification. It requires approval by the Dean and Provost/EVP-SBMHS. The request must clearly indicate that the department can absorb any salary increase that may result from the expedited promotion process.

6.1.2 Hires to Higher Rank

The option to hire a faculty member at a rank higher than the one they currently hold (see Section 6.1) also needs to be approved at the offer stage. If a department believes they may have a candidate who meets the qualifications for hiring at that higher rank, the Chair should submit to the Dean a request to put the candidate forward for consideration under this process. That request should include the candidate's CV and a written justification. It requires approval by the Dean and Provost/EVP-SBMHS. The expedited case itself will be for tenure only.

6.1.3 Approval to Offer Expedited Process

In all cases, a department's ability to offer a Candidate the possibility of an expedited process (whether tenure only or tenure plus promotion) requires approval. The Chair should submit a written justification to the Dean, along with a copy of the Candidate's CV. The request must be endorsed by the Dean and Provost/EVP-SBMHS before the offer of an expedited process may be confirmed to the Candidate. The approval to offer an expedited process does not imply anything about the outcome of that process.

6.2 Finalizing the Case

Appointment to tenured positions requires the approval of the Dean, Provost or EVP-SBMHS, President, and Chancellor of the State University of New York and is subject to the Policies of the Board of Trustees.

6.3. Strategies to Support the Expedited Process

- Letter writers from the Candidate's list may include individuals who provided letters during the hiring process.
- External evaluator solicitation templates for expedited cases may include the following language: "This is an expedited tenure [or tenure and promotion] case for a faculty member who has already been offered a position at the rank of [RANK]. As this is an expedited case, please feel free to write a brief letter. We will not take brevity as an indication of your assessment either positively or negatively."
- When challenges arise in obtaining six external evaluations, the hiring context and compressed timeline of an expedited case may be considered in determining whether the documented justification to proceed with five letters is sufficient.

6.4. Timing of Submission of Files for Expedited Tenure.

Because expedited tenure cases are tied to hiring cycles, their timing may be less consistent than regular promotion and tenure cases. The file should be created as soon as possible after the appointment is finalized.

Once the file has been created, the Chair will oversee requests for any materials not already

submitted during the hiring process. The Chair should also alert the department, school/college promotion and tenure committee, and their Dean regarding the anticipated timing of review and submission of the case.

6.5. Guidelines for School/College

The department, school/college committee, and Dean should ordinarily take no more than three weeks each to review and forward the case once submitted.

The Provost's Office will notify the Deans of schools/colleges in a timely manner regarding the status of cases with pending expedited tenure.

6.6 Adverse Decisions

If an expedited tenure and/or promotion case is unsuccessful, the faculty member retains the rank and appointment specified in the offer but does not receive the tenure or promotion sought through the expedited process. The individual may pursue a subsequent tenure and/or promotion review if eligible.

The permissible period of further employment and the timing of any subsequent review depend on the faculty member's retained rank, credited prior service, approved tenure-clock adjustments, and the terms of the appointment. Faculty serving as Associate Professor or Professor without continuing appointment are subject to the three-year limitation established by SUNY policy. Faculty serving as Assistant Professor are subject to the applicable seven-year continuing-appointment framework. All required notice provisions remain applicable.