# APT COMMITTEE CHECKLIST

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Candidate’s name:** | **Department:** |
| **Proposed rank:** | **Specify track:** |
| * **Appointment**
 | * **Promotion**
 | * **Tenure**
 |

Dossier must be submitted in Interfolio, with one copy of each document in the general and track-specific requirements, in order.

# GENERAL REQUIREMENTS:

 Memorandum of support from the appropriate department chair or dean

* Must include the track and title of proposed appointment/promotion.
* Must include a description of the candidate's professional citizenship. (This refers to interactions and participation as a member of the department, school, and university community and not the country of citizenship.)

 A tally sheet indicating departmental approval

* Must include the total number of faculty members who voted and the number who agreed, disagreed or abstained but not how each member voted. (Note that department chairs cannot vote.)
* Must include signatures of those who voted or note that voting was electronic.
* Must include a description of how the department determined who was eligible to vote (e.g., "Eligible voters included all faculty at or above the rank and tenure status of the candidate," "Eligible voters included members of a standing departmental APT committee")

 Curriculum vitae in the correct format and signed by the candidate

 Contribution to teaching and patient care form

 Personal statement (optional, maximum of 3 pages)

 Educator Portfolio (optional, suggested for promotion on Educator Scholar track)

 Scholarly Activity Portfolio (optional, suggested for non-tenure Clinical Associate Professor)

 Copy of the announcement of candidacy (only for an initial tenure-track promotion, not for initial appointments or subsequent promotions of already tenured individuals)

 Sample letter from the chairman to the referees (1 letter only)

* Must include a statement from the UUP Agreement (Article 31) regarding the candidate reading the letter.

 List of referees (including their titles and institutions) divided into two sections:

1) referees chosen by the Chair from a list supplied by the candidate

2) referees chosen independently by the Chair without input from the candidate.

 Letters from the referees (originals) appropriate to the candidate’s track. In each letter, the referee:

* Must include the specific academic rank and tenure status to which the candidate is being appointed or promoted.
* Must state the referee's academic rank and tenure status, which must be equivalent to or higher than that proposed for the candidate.
* Must specifically state whether the letter can be read by the candidate, whether the letter can be read by the candidate if all identification as to its source is deleted, or whether the letter cannot be read by the candidate.
* Must state whether he or she has worked with the candidate and the capacity in which they have worked together (e.g., papers, grants, mentor, colleague).
* Should discuss the referee's current knowledge of and assessment of factors relevant to the proposed appointment or promotion.
* Should state whether or not the referee supports the appointment/promotion to the specific rank and tenure status proposed for the candidate.
* Should state whether or not the candidate would likely meet the criteria for appointment/promotion to this rank and tenure status at the referee's institution.

# TRACK-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS (SELECT ONE):

 ***For tenured or tenure-equivalent positions***

* A minimum of 6 letters are required
* At least 4 of the letters must be outside letters. (For initial appointments, outside letters cannot come from the candidate's most recent place of employment.)
* At least 1 of the letters is from a referee chosen by the candidate
* At least 3 of the outside letters must be from referees not chosen by the candidate who have had no direct association with the candidate as substantive collaborators or mentors. (In the event of questions about whether a collaboration or mentorship is substantive, the committee will follow the guidelines used by NIH for grant reviewers: https://grants.nih.gov/grants/peer/Grant-Reviews-508.pdf)

***For non-tenured or non-tenure-equivalent positions***

 **For Research Faculty (non-tenured)**

* + A minimum of 4 letters will be required
	+ At least 1 of the letters is from a referee chosen by the candidate
	+ At least 3 of the letters are from referees not chosen by the candidate
	+ At least 2 of the letters must be from referees not chosen by the candidate who are outside Stony Brook or its affiliates and have had no direct association with the candidate as a substantive collaborator or mentor. (For initial appointments, outside letters cannot come from the candidate's most recent place of employment.)

 **For Clinical Educator (non-tenured track**, full time faculty) and for **Basic Science Educator (non-tenure track**, full-time faculty)

* + A minimum of 4 letters will be required
	+ At least 1 of the letters is from a referee chosen by the candidate
	+ At least 3 of the letters are from referees not chosen by the candidate
	+ At least 2 of the letters must be from referees who are outside of the candidate's department in the Stony Brook SOM. (For initial appointments, outside letters cannot come from the candidate's department at the most recent place of employment.)
	+ Letters may come from individuals who have worked with the candidate as a mentor or colleague and may be from individuals at Stony Brook or any of its affiliates.

 **For Voluntary Faculty (non-tenured track)**

* + A minimum of 4 letters will be required
	+ At least 1 of the letters is from a referee chosen by the candidate
	+ At least 3 of the letters are from referees not chosen by the candidate
	+ Letters may come from individuals who have worked with the candidate as a mentor or colleague and may be from individuals at Stony Brook or any of its affiliates.

#  Dean’s Office

 Submitted to the Dean for review Date:

 Ad hoc committee appointed Date:

 Submitted to APT committee Date:

# APT Action: Approved \_Disapproved Deferred