

SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry
Appointment, Promotion and Continuing Appointment (i.e., “Tenure”)
Policies, Procedures and Standards

Part A: Non-Librarian Faculty Holding Academic Rank on the Syracuse Campus

February 2011

The Policies of the State University of New York Board of Trustees and the Agreement between the United University Professions and the State University of New York are the foundational documents governing appointment, promotion, and Continuing Appointment of individuals holding academic rank at ESF.

This bulletin brings those documents together with institutionally established standards to provide a comprehensive review of the policies, procedures and standards guiding appointment, promotion and tenure for non-librarian faculty holding academic rank on the Syracuse campus. Separate communications describe the policies, procedures and standards relevant to the librarian ranks and to faculty holding academic rank at the Ranger School.

Faculty holding academic rank are defined by the SUNY Board of Trustees (SUNY BOT Policies Sec. II, §1(j)) as “those members of the professional staff having the titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, and assistant instructor... and ... members of the professional staff having the titles of librarian, associate librarian, senior assistant librarian, and assistant librarian”.

Thus, the information described herein does not apply to Visiting professors or Lecturers, who hold “qualified” academic rank, nor does it apply to professional employees without academic rank, including research associates and instructional support staff.

For the remainder of this document, the term “faculty” refers only to non-library ESF staff holding academic rank on the Syracuse campus

1. STANDARDS FOR ACADEMIC RANKS and CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

1.1. General Considerations

1.1.1.Importance of Institutional Purpose and Values.

- 1.1.1.1. The standards for academic rank and Continuing Appointment are the core of an academic institution’s self-concept. They define the qualities, behaviors and achievements we seek in faculty members to promulgate the institution’s purpose and values. They must be consistent with and supportive of the institutional mission – “To advance knowledge and skills and to promote the leadership

necessary for the stewardship of both the natural and designed environments.” Further, they are community standards, based on a shared vision and shared principles. They are standards to which we hold ourselves in dedication to our common cause.

1.1.1.2. Our common cause is the realization of an institution with the following attributes:

1.1.1.2.1. We are first and foremost an educational institution that provides degree-seeking students with knowledge and skills that enable them to lead responsible, productive and fulfilling lives.

1.1.1.2.2. We are a research university advancing the frontiers of knowledge, devising creative solutions to applied problems, and training the next generation of environmental scholars.

1.1.1.2.3. We are a public university with an obligation to aid the people and communities beyond our campus boundaries through the application of our knowledge and skills.

1.1.1.2.4. We are a community that succeeds individually and collectively through mutual respect and a collegial approach to campus governance and work distribution.

1.1.1.2.5. Our efforts are significantly funded by the taxpayers of New York and through our efforts we strive to provide a return to them on their investment.

1.1.2. *SUNY Criteria.* The Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees list five criteria which may be considered in whole or in part in the evaluation of academic employees. They are: (1) Mastery of subject matter, (2) Effectiveness in teaching, (3) Scholarly ability, (4) Effectiveness of university service, and (5) Continued growth. The criteria are presented as guidance; they are not mandatory or necessarily complete. More importantly, they are not standards. The College is responsible for determining standards for promotion and Continuing Appointment.

1.1.3. *Applying the Standards.*

1.1.3.1. *Departmental Standards.* Institutional standards for academic ranks and Continuing Appointment are presented below. They are necessarily general to be applicable across the College’s diverse disciplines. For effective application, the institutional standards must be supplemented with departmental standards that fulfill the institutional standards within the disciplinary context. The departmental standards should provide faculty with sound guidance on expectations for academic ranks, but should recognize that there is no single formula for demonstrating how the standards can be met. To provide grounding, the departmental standards should conform to achievements of successful faculty at peer institutions (typically doctoral granting, public institutions).

1.1.3.2. *Definition of Scholarship.* Scholarship is at the heart of the academic enterprise. Thus, the institutional standards for academic ranks from assistant to full

professor carefully consider scholarly achievement. Scholarship may take many forms, but in an academic setting only scholarship that is shared with peers has value. Generally that means that scholarship is evaluated on written and oral communications that are open to peer examination or are part of the peer review system. Papers, presentations, and reviews of peer papers grant proposals and academic programs are standard products of scholarship, but other forms are possible (see Appendix B). Scholarship may, and should, occur in teaching and public service as well as in research and design. In these arenas, too, scholarship is evidenced by formal scholarly communications with peers.

- 1.1.3.3. *Consideration of Different Work Assignments.* Faculty members of similar academic rank may have different work assignments. This can be expected to affect their productivity in multiple facets of their work. A faculty member's work assignments will be taken into consideration when evaluating whether he/she has met the institution's standards for Promotion and Tenure. It is the Department Chair's responsibility to define a candidate's work assignment. A memorandum that summarizes these work assignments for the period of evaluation, written and signed by the Department chair in consultation with the candidate, will be included in each candidate's Evaluative File
- 1.1.3.4. *Promotion of Instructors.* In most cases, Instructors are hired to teach; time allocated for scholarship is minimal. Instructor work assignments are, thus, by design, not conducive to meeting the scholarship standard for promotion to the professorial ranks and there is no expectation that effective Instructors will be promoted. Nevertheless, Instructors are eligible for promotion to a higher rank if they meet all promotional standards including those related to scholarship (generally through efforts outside of their formal work assignments). Advancement to professorial rank will not, in most instances, result in a change in work assignment.
- 1.1.3.5. *Objectivity and Judgment.*
 - 1.1.3.5.1. Decisions to assign or promote an individual to a particular rank and to confer Continuing Appointment are judgments. No two faculty records will look alike. It is up to the faculty (including those holding administrative positions) to assimilate the evidence presented by the candidate faculty member to determine if the standards have been met. Candidate faculty, faculty mentors and reviewers, and the College administration should have a common understanding of the expectations for academic rank and Continuing Appointment derived from the records of those (internal and external) found to meet the standards.
 - 1.1.3.5.2. While the decision to assign or promote an individual to an academic rank is a judgment, those making the judgment are expected to adhere to practices that foster the greatest degree of objectivity possible. It should be understood that assignment or promotion to an academic rank and

Continuing Appointment are based on achievement and performance as outlined in the standards. Decisions should be based only on factors listed in the standards. In particular, decisions should not be based on personal or professional differences or affinities. Further, as previously mentioned, decisions should be based on a clear understanding of the achievements and performance expected for academic ranks within the scholarly peer group.

1.2. Standards for Appointment to Instructor.

- 1.2.1. The Instructor title is primarily used for members of the academic staff whose principal duties are instructional. As such, at the time of appointment Instructors are expected to have demonstrated or show promise of effectiveness in instruction and an affinity for engagement with students. They are expected to be subject matter specialists in the areas in which they teach, but they are not required to have a terminal degree.
- 1.2.2. Instructors may receive Continuing Appointment without promotion. To receive favorable consideration for Continuing Appointment, Instructors are expected to carry a teaching load commensurate with their work assignment and to demonstrate consistently positive engagement with students and effectiveness in achieving student learning outcomes. Instructors are expected to remain current in their fields of instruction and to demonstrate innovation and evolution in their instructional methods and materials. They are not, however, expected to produce a substantial body of scholarly or creative work.
- 1.2.3. Instructors, regardless of work assignment shall demonstrate a commitment to the functioning of the College and their department. If a candidate's work responsibility also includes professional and public service, the candidate shall demonstrate a commitment to that service as set out in Appendix C.
- 1.2.4. The Instructor title may also be used, temporarily, for academic staff whose work assignment includes significant scholarship and who meet all the qualifications for the Assistant Professor rank except completion of a terminal degree. Such individuals will be promoted to Assistant Professor when their terminal degree is awarded.

1.3. Standards for Appointment/Promotion to Assistant Professor.

- 1.3.1. Assistant Professors are expected to be subject matter experts and to hold a terminal degree in their field of expertise.
- 1.3.2. Assistant Professors are expected to have demonstrated or show promise of effectiveness in instruction and positive engagement with students.
- 1.3.3. Assistant Professors are expected to have produced a credible body of scholarship (e.g., one's dissertation or portfolio) or creative work that is recognized as significant by other scholars in the field and that demonstrates a penchant for original scholarly/creative work.
- 1.3.4. Assistant Professors, regardless of work assignment shall demonstrate a commitment to the functioning of the College and their department. If a candidate's work

responsibility also includes professional and public service, the candidate shall demonstrate a commitment to that service as set out in Appendix C.

1.3.5. Individuals hired as Assistant Professors will not receive Continuing Appointment without promotion, except in the rare case where the individual is uniquely qualified to provide a service in high demand by the College.

1.4. Standards for Appointment/Promotion to Associate Professor.

1.4.1. Associate Professors are expected to be subject matter experts and to hold a terminal degree in their field of expertise.

1.4.2. Associate Professors promoted from within are expected to have carried a teaching load commensurate with the work assignment. Associate Professors having prior teaching experience are expected to have demonstrated consistently positive engagement with students and effectiveness in achieving student learning outcomes. They are expected to be current in their fields of instruction and to have demonstrated innovation and evolution in their instructional methods and materials. Associate Professors not having had prior teaching experience are expected to show promise of effectiveness in instruction and positive engagement with students.

1.4.3. Associate Professors are expected to be engaged and successful scholars as demonstrated by (1) a portfolio of scholarly products that portrays a sustained body of scholarly work, (2) meaningful professional engagement with scholarly peers, (3) recognition by peers of significant scholarly achievements, (4) success in obtaining extramural support for scholarly work, and (5) success in recruiting graduate apprentices. To be promoted to Associate Professor the candidate is expected to have regional, national, or international scholarly recognition. Associate Professors promoted from within should demonstrate scholarly productivity commensurate with the proportion of their work assigned to scholarship.

1.4.4. Associate Professors, regardless of work assignment shall demonstrate a commitment to the functioning of the College and their department. If a candidate's work responsibility also includes professional and public service, the candidate shall demonstrate a commitment to that service as set out in Appendix C.

1.4.5. While not required for appointment, demonstrated success in collaborative work with academic peers is desired in Associate Professors.

1.5. Standards for Appointment/Promotion to Professor.

1.5.1. Professors are expected to be subject matter experts and to hold a terminal degree in their field of expertise.

1.5.2. Professors promoted from within are expected to have carried a teaching load commensurate with their work assignment. Professors having prior teaching experience are expected to have demonstrated consistently positive engagement with students and effectiveness in achieving student learning outcomes. They are expected to be current in their fields of instruction and to have demonstrated innovation and

evolution in their instructional methods and materials. Professors not having had prior teaching experience are expected to show promise of effectiveness in instruction and positive engagement with students.

- 1.5.3. Professors are expected to be recognized as leaders in their fields of scholarship as demonstrated by (1) a significant body of scholarly/creative work that has demonstrably advanced the individual's field of study, (2) appointment or election to leadership positions in scholarly and professional organizations, (3) recognition of scholarly merit through awards and invitations to give scholarly presentations, (4) sustained ability to obtain extramural support for scholarly work, and (5) sustained success in recruiting graduate apprentices. To be promoted to Professor the candidate is expected to have national or international scholarly recognition. Professors promoted from within should demonstrate scholarly productivity commensurate with the proportion of their work assigned to scholarship.
- 1.5.4. Professors, regardless of work assignment shall demonstrate a commitment to the functioning of the College and their department. If a candidate's work responsibility also includes professional and public service, the candidate shall demonstrate a commitment to that service as set out in Appendix C.
- 1.5.5. While not required for appointment, demonstrated success in collaborative work with academic peers is desired in Professors.

1.6. Standards for Continuing Appointment (Tenure).

- 1.6.1. Continuing Appointment is an appointment for individuals holding academic rank that continues until the individual resigns, retires, or is terminated. It is equivalent to tenure in other universities.
- 1.6.2. Decisions regarding Continuing Appointment are separate from promotion decisions, though the two decisions are often made in concert.
- 1.6.3. *Eligibility for Continuing Appointment:*
 - 1.6.3.1. The Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees state that Instructors or Assistant Professors must serve seven years before receiving Continuing Appointment. However, faculty in these ranks may not continue beyond seven years without Continuing Appointment. The decision on Continuing Appointment must be made before six years of qualifying service have been completed.
 - 1.6.3.2. Associate Professors or Professors may be granted Continuing Appointment at any time. However, faculty in these ranks may not continue beyond three years without Continuing Appointment, and a decision on Continuing Appointment must be rendered within two years of service at either rank.
 - 1.6.3.3. Since Associate Professors are eligible for Continuing Appointment at any time, Assistant Professors may be considered for Continuing Appointment prior to six years of service if they concurrently apply for and receive promotion to Associate Professor.

1.6.4. *Standards for Continuing Appointment:*

- 1.6.4.1. Under most circumstances, Continuing Appointment assures life-long employment at the College. The decision to grant Continuing Appointment therefore reflects a judgment that the faculty member will meaningfully contribute to the College mission and fulfill his/her collegial duties throughout his/her academic career. The decision is based on three general criteria:
 - 1.6.4.1.1. Perceived long-term need for the talents provided by the faculty member,
 - 1.6.4.1.2. Demonstrated excellence in performance of the duties demanded by the position, and
 - 1.6.4.1.3. Perception that the excellence will continue and in most cases expand.
- 1.6.4.2. Since Assistant Professors are normally hired with the mandate to meet the standards for promotion to Associate Professor within six years, they will rarely receive Continuing Appointment without earlier or concurrent promotion.
- 1.6.4.3. Instructors, whose duties are primarily instructional, will not be required to receive promotion as a condition for Continuing Appointment.

2. THE DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC)

2.1. The College's faculty bears first responsibility for upholding the standards for academic rank and Continuing Appointment. This responsibility is vested largely in Department Review Committees (DRC) that manage and oversee the review process for promotion and Continuing Appointment, and provide the seminal recommendations on these actions.

2.2. Committee Responsibilities. Each department will have a standing DRC which will:

- 2.2.1. Conduct reappointment reviews for Instructors and Assistant Professors and provide a recommendation to the Department Chair on the candidate's qualifications for reappointment.
- 2.2.2. Conduct promotion and Continuing Appointment reviews. In connection with this responsibility, the committee shall
 - 2.2.2.1. Solicit external and internal letters of evaluation for candidates,
 - 2.2.2.2. Convene a meeting of departmental faculty to solicit input and discuss the candidate's qualifications, and
 - 2.2.2.3. Provide a recommendation to the Department Chair on the candidate's qualifications.
- 2.2.3. Evaluate Associate Professors' progress towards the rank of Professor to the candidate and their Department Chair.

2.3. Committee Composition.

2.3.1. The Department Review Committee will generally consist of three Professors and two Associate Professors having Continuing Appointment. They will be appointed by the Department Chair, generally for three-year terms. Appointments to the DRC should be staggered to ensure continuity. A Professor, with at least one-year of service on the DRC, will be appointed as DRC Chair by the Department Chair. Associate Professors on the DRC will not participate in decisions for promotion to the rank of Professor. Associate Professors may not serve on the DRC while a candidate for promotion.

2.3.2. Department Review Committee members should be drawn from the departmental faculty unless the department has insufficient staff to comprise the committee. In such case, the Department Chair, in consultation with the Provost, will complete the Committee membership with faculty from other College departments.

2.4. DRC for Promotion of Department Chairs. To avoid conflict of interest, if a Department Chair seeks promotion, the Provost will appoint an *ad hoc* Department Review Committee comprised of a minimum of three College faculty members at the Professor rank from outside the Chair's department. In selecting Committee members, faculty working in fields related to the candidate's will be sought.

3. THE COLLEGE REVIEW COMMITTEE (CRC)

3.1. Purpose and Responsibility of College Level Review.

3.1.1. The College Review Committee (CRC) review is designed to protect the interests of the candidate, department, and College so as to ensure that the standards for promotion and Continuing Appointment are applied fairly and uniformly. The CRC's recommendation provides additional guidance for the Provost and President to consider when making recommendations and decisions on promotion and Continuing Appointment.

3.1.2. The burden of evaluating the qualifications and suitability of the candidate for promotion and Continuing Appointment is greatest at the department level of review. The CRC's review shall be completed in accordance with the principle of "deference to initial determination." The CRC will give significant weight to the judgments and recommendations of department review. CRC review is designed to be consistent with this principle, and shall have no greater weight than the DRC's recommendation or the Department Chair's recommendation.

3.2. Committee Responsibilities. The CRC will:

3.2.1. Provide a recommendation to the Provost on the candidate's qualifications for promotion and Continuing Appointment,

3.2.2. Review ESF's Appointment, Promotion and Appointment, Promotion and Continuing Appointment Policies, Procedures and Standards at least every three (3) years and make recommendations to the President and Provost for amendments thereto. The President and Provost shall consult with the CRC when considering amendments to ESF's

Appointment, Promotion and Appointment, Promotion and Continuing Appointment Policies, Procedures and Standards.

3.3. Appointment and Composition of the CRC.

- 3.3.1. The Provost, in consultation with the respective chairs and after a non-binding College-wide vote (with the ballot listing all faculty members with the rank of professor) administered by the Provost, shall appoint one (1) member from each academic Department.
- 3.3.2. CRC members must have the rank of professor and may not be a Department Chair.
- 3.3.3. CRC members shall serve three (3) year terms, with the Provost's initial appointments designed to insure staggered terms so that no more than two (2) CRC members' terms end in any year.
- 3.3.4. In the event an existing CRC member is on sabbatical or otherwise unable to serve on the CRC, the Provost in consultation with the respective chair may appoint another faculty member to the CRC to serve all or a portion of that term.
- 3.3.5. Each year, CRC members shall vote to elect a CRC chair. No CRC member shall serve as chair for more than two (2) consecutive years.

3.4. CRC Voting Procedures.

- 3.4.1. *Meeting and Quorum.* CRC members must be present at CRC meetings; electronic participation (e.g., conference call, video) is prohibited. Of the committee members eligible to vote on a given candidate, no more than one may be absent in order to constitute a quorum. A quorum must be computed individually for each candidate.
- 3.4.2. *Voting and Abstentions.* Unless recused or absent, CRC members, including those with appointments in the candidate's home department, shall vote. No abstentions are allowed.
- 3.4.3. *Recusal.* Recusals are only allowed if a conflict of interest exists. Conflicts of interest shall only exist when the CRC member is or has been in a significant personal relationship with the candidate. CRC members who recuse themselves are not considered eligible voters and may not participate in the discussion or consideration of the candidate's application.
- 3.4.4. *Absentee Ballots.* No absentee ballots are allowed.

4. INITIAL APPOINTMENT

4.1. Process.

- 4.1.1. Initial appointments to academic rank are made by the President of the College with the advisement of the Provost, the Chair of the home academic department, the Search Committee, and the faculty of the home academic department.

4.1.2. The home department faculty will vote on the acceptability of each potential new faculty member. The results of that vote will be included in the Chair's recommendation to the Provost and in the Provost's recommendation to the President.

4.2. Determination of Academic Rank. In most faculty searches academic rank is predetermined in the position description. The Search Committee, home department Chair, and Provost should recommend candidates for appointment only if they meet the standards for the prescribed academic rank. For searches in which no single academic rank is prescribed, the Department Chair, with advisement of the Search Committee, will recommend the academic rank for potential new professorial appointments. If the rank recommended is above Assistant Professor, the departmental Department Review Committee should, within one week, review the candidate's full application package and provide its recommendation on academic rank. The DRC's recommendation will be included in the Chair's recommendation to the Provost and the President.

4.3. Entry with Continuing Appointment. Continuing Appointment may be granted at the time of initial appointment for individuals entering at the Associate Professor or Professor ranks. Upon request of the Department Chair, the DRC should, within one week, review the candidate's full application package and provide a recommendation regarding Continuing Appointment. The DRC's recommendation will be included in the Chair's recommendation to the Provost and the President.

5. REVIEW PRIOR TO PROMOTION and CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

5.1. Faculty Members without Continuing Appointment.

5.1.1. Third Year Review for Instructors and Assistant Professors.

5.1.1.1. Before the end of January of the third year from the initial appointment, Instructors and Assistant Professors will provide the DRC with their Curriculum Vitae, a critical assessment of their activities and progress in teaching, scholarship, and service, and any additional materials required by their department. The DRC will share these materials with all members of the department faculty, who will be invited to provide written evaluative comments to the DRC before March 1. Subsequently, the DRC will call a meeting of departmental faculty members to discuss the progress of the reviewed faculty member toward Continuing Appointment and promotion (as applicable). Departments can add other teaching and scholarship evaluative mechanisms and methods as appropriate.

5.1.1.2. Based on written and oral comments from the department faculty, and the materials provided by the faculty member under review, the DRC will prepare a written evaluation of the performance of the reviewed faculty member. The evaluation will address the faculty member's readiness for Continuing

Appointment and/or promotion and recommend the time of the next DRC review. The DRC evaluation will be submitted to the Department Chair.

5.1.1.3. The Department Chair will prepare an independent written recommendation for submission to the Provost. Where applicable the Department Chair's recommendation may identify special consideration cases (i.e., special hiring circumstances) and explain mixed or negative department faculty input if not explained in the DRC's report. The Department Chair's and DRC recommendations will be copied to the candidate when both are forwarded to the Provost.

5.1.2. *Other DRC Reviews for Instructors and Assistant Professors.* The Department Chair, in consultation with the DRC, may require additional reviews by the DRC for Instructors and Assistant Professors after the third year and before application for Continuing Appointment. Such reviews will be similar to the third year review but will not require formal input from faculty members outside of the DRC and the Department Chair.

5.1.3. *Associate Professors and Professors without Continuing Appointment.* Associate Professors and Professors without Continuing Appointment will be reviewed by the DRC in their first year after appointment, unless they have applied for Continuing Appointment. The review will be conducted in the same manner as the third year review for Instructors and Assistant Professors.

5.2. Faculty Members with Continuing Appointment.

5.2.1. *DRC Review for Associate Professors.* After the third year and, if necessary, the sixth year, following appointment as an Associate Professor with Continuing Appointment, Associate Professors will provide the DRC with their Curriculum Vitae, and a critical assessment of their activities and progress in teaching, scholarship, and service since said appointment, and any additional materials required by their department. Based on the submitted materials, the DRC will prepare a written evaluation of the faculty member's progress toward promotion to the rank of Professor. The Department Chair will prepare an independent written assessment of this faculty member. Both the DRC and Department Chair evaluations will be submitted to the reviewed faculty member.

6. REVIEW FOR PROMOTION AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENT

6.1. Confidentiality. All communications, written and oral, that are part of the evaluation process for promotion and Continuing Appointment must be held in complete confidence among those granted access to such communications as defined below.

6.2. Overview.

6.2.1. Application for promotion and Continuing Appointment is the responsibility of the individual faculty member. Department Chairs, DRC's and/or mentors (formal or informal) may provide advisement, but the process may only be initiated by response to

a College call for self-identification of candidates for promotion and Continuing Appointment. Once the process has begun, it will proceed to its conclusion unless the candidate asks, in writing (to the Provost), to withdraw his/her application.

- 6.2.2. Candidates for promotion or Continuing Appointment will initiate an Evaluative File by preparing a dossier that fully portrays their academic activities and accomplishments and uses them to demonstrate that they have met the standards for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment. The dossier will be reviewed by non-departmental peers external and/or internal to the College who will provide commentary on the case for the requested action. Departments may, at their discretion, solicit comments from current and/or former students about the candidate's teaching and advising performance. Comments from the peer and student reviewers will be added to the Evaluative File before it is reviewed by departmental faculty. The last mentioned faculty will meet to discuss the merits of the candidate's case and then add their individual written comments to the Evaluative File.
- 6.2.3. The DRC will review the Evaluative File after the appropriate departmental faculty have submitted their comments. They will prepare a recommendation on the requested action, add it to the Evaluative File, and submit the Evaluative File to the Department Chair. The Department Chair will, in turn, add his/her recommendation before submitting the Evaluative File to the CRC. The CRC will add its recommendation to the Evaluative File and submit the file to the Provost. The Provost will add his/her recommendation to the Evaluative File and submit the file to the President.
- 6.2.4. Candidates will receive copies of the recommendations prepared by the Department Chair and the Provost at the time they are forwarded to the next level. Once the Evaluative File reaches the President, candidates will have at least five (5) working days to review the Evaluative File contents (except materials excluded by the solicited materials policy §31.2(a) and (b) of the contract agreement made between the Executive Branch of the State of New York and United University Professions), and prepare a response, if they wish, before Presidential review (§31.6 a, of contract agreement made between the Executive Branch of the State of New York and United University Professions).
- 6.2.5. The decision to promote is the President's. The President also makes the final recommendation on Continuing Appointment that is forwarded to the Chancellor. Should the President recommend against Continuing Appointment and that recommendation is contrary to the recommendations of the DRC and the CRC, the candidate may appeal to the SUNY Chancellor under conditions defined in §33.2 - §33.4 of the Agreement Between SUNY and UUP. Otherwise, appeals for promotion and Continuing Appointment are limited to "...failure by the State to follow the procedural steps related to... promotion of employees contained in the Policies of the Board of Trustees..." as prescribed in §7.2 of the Agreement Between SUNY and UUP.

6.3. Candidate Dossier and Evaluative File.

- 6.3.1. The candidate will prepare a dossier containing the following materials: (1) A memorandum that summarizes his/her work assignments for the period of evaluation, jointly written and co-signed by the Department Chair and candidate, (2) a statement by the candidate demonstrating how he/she has met the standard for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment, (3) the candidate's curriculum vitae, (4) teaching, scholarship, and service portfolios, and (5) other information required by the Department. The dossier should be organized according to the outline provided in Appendix A.
- 6.3.2. The Evaluative File, upon which the candidate's credentials will be judged, contains (1) the candidate's dossier, (2) solicited letters of evaluation (hereafter referred to as "solicited materials"), and (3) recommendations from the DRC, the Department Chair, CRC and the Provost, as they are made.

6.4. Solicited Materials.

- 6.4.1. For Instructors, Evaluative Files for Continuing Appointment must include written evaluations from at least five (5) internal reviewers (defined as ESF faculty members from outside their academic department). At the discretion of the department, external or/and student reviews may be sought.
- 6.4.2. For faculty in any of the professorial titles, Evaluative Files for promotion and Continuing Appointment must include written evaluations from at least five (5) external reviewers. At the discretion of the department, reviews from ESF faculty not in the candidate's academic department and/or student reviews may be sought.
- 6.4.3. Evaluations will be obtained through solicitation by the DRC. Materials that are both unsolicited and unsigned will not be made a part of any evaluation and recommendation process.
- 6.4.4. *Selection of Reviewers.* Upon submission of the dossier, candidates should submit names (and contact information) of at least five (5) potential reviewers. Candidates may also identify up to ten individuals who should be excluded as reviewers and include a brief justification for their exclusion. The Department Review Committee, in consultation with the Department Chair, will select the individuals from whom evaluations will be solicited. At least half of the evaluations solicited should derive from the names supplied by the candidate.
- 6.4.5. *External reviewers.* Should be recognized as leaders in the candidate's discipline. Individuals who have mentored or been mentored or have been a primary collaborator with the candidate may not be selected.
- 6.4.6. *Solicitation Procedure.*
- 6.4.6.1. The Chair of the Department Review Committee will request evaluations from the above-mentioned parties. The candidate's dossier, the College and departmental standards for promotion and Continuing Appointment (as

appropriate), and a “Solicited Materials Form” (available online from the Office of Human Resources) must accompany the request to external and internal faculty reviewers.

- 6.4.6.2. External and internal faculty reviewers should be instructed to evaluate the candidate’s case for promotion and Continuing Appointment (as appropriate) based on the College and departmental standards. External reviewers are expected to concentrate on scholarly productivity, significance, and reputation. Internal reviewers, having greater knowledge of the candidate and the institution, are expected to provide substantive commentary on additional dimensions of the candidate’s record. Student reviewers should be instructed to comment on the candidate’s strengths and weaknesses as a teacher and advisor.
- 6.4.6.3. All reviewers should be instructed to identify the nature of their association with the candidate, if any.
- 6.4.6.4. Departments are required to create and maintain a roster of the individuals solicited and to retain copies of all requests for peer evaluation.
- 6.4.7. *Handling of Solicited Materials.*
 - 6.4.7.1. Once a solicited evaluation is submitted to the DRC, the evaluation must be included in the Evaluative File. The Solicited Materials Form must be stapled to the evaluation.
 - 6.4.7.2. Solicited materials may be examined by faculty members reviewing the Evaluative File. However, said faculty members should not disclose information contained in the solicited materials to anyone at any time, except as otherwise allowed in ESF’s Appointment, Promotion and Appointment, Promotion and Continuing Appointment Policies, Procedures and Standards.
 - 6.4.7.3. Solicited evaluations may be shared with a candidate following the Provost’s review and prior to the President’s review, only if the evaluator has indicated so on the Solicited Materials Form. If no form is returned with the evaluation, it is presumed that the reviewer has not authorized the sharing of materials with the candidate.

6.5. Review by Department Faculty.

- 6.5.1. Prior to the DRC review of the candidate’s dossier, (note: the dossier does not include any solicited materials) department faculty members will be invited by the DRC to review the dossier and provide a written evaluation of the candidate to the DRC. Such written evaluations must be accompanied by a completed Solicited Materials Form as described above and will be added to the Evaluative File. Prior to the deadline for submission of this evaluation, the DRC will hold a meeting for all department faculty members to discuss the merits of the candidate’s case. All communications that occur during this meeting are strictly confidential. Following this meeting a vote by ballot that asks whether the personnel action towards the candidate should be favorable is taken by all appropriate faculty, based on this discussion and review of all available

materials. The results of this vote are to be included in the recommendation by the DRC.

6.6. DRC Review.

6.6.1. Following receipt of the written evaluations from departmental faculty, the DRC will review the Evaluative File and prepare a recommendation for submission to the Department Chair. The DRC's recommendation should summarize the strengths and weakness of the candidate's case in relation to the College and departmental standards, and convey the tally of the DRC members' votes for the action(s) requested by the candidate.

6.7. Department Chair Review.

6.7.1. The Department Chair will receive the Evaluative File, including the DRC recommendation, and prepare an independent written recommendation for submission to the Provost. The Department Chair's recommendation should convey the rationale for/against Continuing Appointment and/or promotion, citing the evaluations/recommendations of the departmental DRC and the solicited reviewers. Where applicable, the recommendation may also identify special consideration cases (i.e. early promotion/tenure, delays in promotion/tenure, special hiring circumstances) and explain mixed or negative votes if not explained in the DRC's report. The Chair's recommendation will be copied to the candidate when it is forwarded to the CRC.

6.7.2. If the Department Chair is being reviewed for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment, the Evaluative File will pass directly from the DRC to the CRC without Department Chair review.

6.8. CRC Review.

6.8.1. The CRC will receive the Evaluative File, including the DRC's and Chair's recommendations, and the candidate's departmental guidelines that supplement the policies and procedures set out in this document.

6.8.2. The CRC shall conduct a substantive review. This evaluation shall review the file in light of the principle of "deference to the initial determination" to determine whether the candidate meets the criteria specified in the ESF and departmental guidelines for promotion and Continuing Appointment.

6.8.3. The CRC's recommendation shall be made by a majority vote of the eligible CRC members who are present at the meeting. The CRC shall record the rationale for or against Continuing Appointment and promotion, citing the evaluations and recommendations of the DRC, chair, and the solicited reviewers. This rationale must be in writing and must be transmitted, along with the tally of the vote to the Provost along with candidate's evaluative file.

6.9. Provost Review.

- 6.9.1. The Provost will review the Evaluative File forwarded by the CRC, and prepare an independent recommendation for submission to the President.
- 6.9.2. The Provost's recommendation will be copied to the candidate and the candidate's Department Chair when it is forwarded to the President.

6.10. Presidential Review and Decision. The President will receive the Evaluative File from the Provost. At the time of transmittal, candidates will receive notification that they have five (5) working days to review the Evaluative File, exclusive of Solicited Materials and departmental faculty reviews that have been designated as confidential, and, if they wish, prepare a response (§31.6 Agreement between SUNY and UUP). Following review of the Evaluative File and the optional candidate response to materials in the Evaluative File, the President will decide in favor or against the candidate's request for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.

7. APPEALS

7.1. Continuing Appointment.

7.1.1. Candidates may appeal the President's decision on Continuing Appointment on the grounds of procedural error (§30.3 Agreement between SUNY and UUP). Such appeals will follow the Grievance Procedure outlined in Article 7 of the Agreement between SUNY and UUP.

7.1.2. Further, if the President recommends against Continuing Appointment and that recommendation is contrary to the recommendations of both the DRC and CRC, the candidate may appeal to the Chancellor if (1) the candidate may not continue employment with ESF past the end of his/her current term appointment without Continuing Appointment, and if (2) s/he has requested the reasons for the Presidential recommendation within ten (10) working days of receiving notification of it (§33.2 - §33.4 of the Agreement Between SUNY and UUP).

7.2. Promotion. Candidates may appeal the President's decision on promotion on the grounds of procedural error (§30.3 Agreement between SUNY and UUP). Such appeals will follow the Grievance Procedure outlined in Article 7 of the Agreement between SUNY and UUP. Appeals may not be filed on other grounds.

8. APPOINTMENT AS DISTINGUISHED OR UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR

8.1. Appointment as Distinguished Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, or University Professor may be given by action of the SUNY Board of Trustees on recommendation of the Chancellor and is a Continuing Appointment. The Distinguished Professorship recognizes and rewards the scholarship and research of

SUNY's finest and accomplished faculty. The Distinguished Service Professorship recognizes extraordinary service far beyond the University and the Distinguished Teaching Professorship confers university-wide recognition for consistently superb teaching. An ESF Faculty Governance committee solicits nominations for these positions each year and decides on which nominations if any to forward to SUNY. Only one nomination per title per campus is allowed each year. Self-nominations are not accepted. A candidate cannot be considered for any of these positions until at least three years after reaching the rank of Professor.

APPENDIX A – TIMELINE

A.1. Weekend Dates

A.1.1. If any of the dates below fall on a weekend, the due date will be extended to the following Monday.

A.2. Academic Year Prior to Review

January 8: Human Resources provides to Department Chairs rosters of faculty members that must be reviewed for Continuing Appointment in upcoming review cycle.

January 15: Department Chairs notify (in writing) faculty members who must be reviewed for Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle of same, and notify (in writing) all departmental faculty members of the deadline to apply for review for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle.

January 22: Faculty member requests to be considered for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle due to the Department Chair. Candidate provides names for potential reviewers for peer-review of teaching to DRC.

January 31: Departmental rosters of candidates to be reviewed for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment in the upcoming review cycle due to Provost (from Department Chairs).

A.3. Academic Year of Review

September 30: Candidates' dossiers due to Department Review Committee for review; a list of prospective external reviewers (minimum of five) must be included in the dossier.

October 7: DRC solicit letters from external, and if appropriate internal, peer evaluators for candidates for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.

December 15: External letters and peer evaluations of teaching due to DRC (see Appendix C). DRC begins review of candidate Evaluative Files.

January 17: DRC meets with department faculty to discuss the candidate's case for promotion and/or Continuing Appointment.

January 22: Evaluations by department faculty due to the DRC.

January 31: DRC recommendations and other Evaluative File materials due to Department Chairs.

February 7: Department Chairs' recommendations and other Evaluative File materials due to CRC. Candidates receive a copy of the Department Chair's recommendation.

March 1: CRC's recommendation and Evaluative File materials due to the Provost.

March 22: Provost's recommendations and other Evaluative File materials due to the President. Candidates receive a copy of the Provost's recommendation. Candidates are invited to review evaluative file and comment prior to Presidential review.

April 1: Presidential review begins.

APPENDIX B – CANDIDATE EVALUATIVE FILE

Materials assembled for the Promotion and/or Continuing Appointment Evaluative File include elements provided by the candidate as well as elements added subsequently by a variety of reviewers. The Evaluative File should include the following components organized as listed:

B.1. Provided by Candidate:

- B.1.1.** Cover Page, including;
 - i. Candidate's status;
 - ii. Action under consideration;
 - iii. Checklist of Evaluative File Documents; and
 - iv. Table of contents.
- B.1.2.** Memorandum summarizing the Candidate's work assignments for the period of evaluation, written and signed by the Department Chair after consultation with the candidate;
- B.1.3.** Candidate's Statement;
- B.1.4.** Curriculum Vitae (CV);
- B.1.5.** Teaching Portfolio;
- B.1.6.** Scholarship Portfolio;
- B.1.7.** Service Portfolio; and
- B.1.8.** Other information required by the Department, such as Annual Report(s) and additional supporting information.

B.2. Provided by Reviewers (as applicable):

- B.2.1.** Peer Reviews from Faculty External to ESF;
- B.2.2.** Peer Reviews from Faculty at ESF Outside of Candidate's Department;
- B.2.3.** Peer Reviews by Department Faculty;
- B.2.4.** Student Letters of Evaluation;
- B.2.5.** DRC Recommendation;
- B.2.6.** Department Chair Recommendation;
- B.2.7.** College Review Committee Recommendation; and
- B.2.8.** Provost Recommendation.

B.3. Candidate's Statement. The candidate should prepare a statement, typically no more than three pages in length (maximum length determined by Department):

- B.3.1.** Stating the case for his/her promotion and/or Continuing Appointment; and
- B.3.2.** Referencing the institutional and department standards and the supporting information that he/she has provided in the dossier.

B.4. Curriculum Vitae (CV). A candidate's CV should be concise, and include the following:

- B.4.1.** Education (institutions, degrees granted, dates);
- B.4.2.** Employment (institutions, positions, dates);
- B.4.3.** Courses taught by year;
- B.4.4.** Research projects, grants, contracts (funding agencies, dates, amounts of funding, individual's role as PI, co-PI, other), patents;
- B.4.5.** Department, College, and University service;

B.4.6. Professional offices held and awards received, with dates; and

B.4.7. Papers (refereed vs. not), chapters, books, and presentations (dates; invited or not).

B.5. Teaching Portfolio. The Teaching portfolio should demonstrate contributions and effectiveness in teaching. The Teaching portfolio should include:

B.5.1. A personal evaluation of teaching that may include efforts to upgrade teaching skills, new courses developed, collaborative efforts with other faculty in teaching activities, or innovations in teaching;

B.5.2. A summary table of courses taught, credit hours, and enrollments since the candidate's initial appointment;

B.5.3. A brief description for each course including a list of key concepts, skills taught, and special features (if any);

B.5.4. A summary of master and doctoral students graduated, thesis/project titles, and current employment (for any students with whom the candidate has contact);

B.5.5. A summary of end-of-course student surveys; and

B.5.6. As appropriate, a list of honors and awards for teaching.

B.5.7. Additional Note: Representative class materials (e.g., computer software, exercises or projects) developed by the candidate are optional.

B.6. Scholarship Portfolio. The Scholarship portfolio should demonstrate mastery of the subject area and continued professional growth, as well as discipline-specific achievements, for example, in developing and executing significant research programs. The Scholarship portfolio should include:

B.6.1. A personal evaluation of scholarship and research including a description of what the candidate considers to be his/her most significant accomplishments and impact;

B.6.2. A comprehensive list of publications (classified as: refereed, non-refereed, abstracts, popular);

B.6.3. A list of research proposals submitted and projects conducted (title, \$, sponsor, and graduate students, post-docs, and technicians supported);

B.6.4. If appropriate, a list of scholarly awards and honors, patents pending and awarded, invitations to speak, appointments to national and international committees, licensing or certification by professional organizations, and book or journal editorial service;

B.6.5. If appropriate, a summary of actions taken to learn new concepts and techniques (e.g., professional workshops, classes, sabbatical leaves or involvement in professional societies and meetings).

B.6.6. Additional Notes:

B.6.6.1. Candidates should clarify their role in all collaborative projects and products.

B.6.6.2. Selected proposals and reviews, and selected publications are optional.

B.6.6.3. Candidates may demonstrate scholarly excellence through publication in high quality refereed journals, production of high impact research as indicated by article citations, generation of high-quality proposals as indicated by reviewers' comments and funding especially from external sources, or involvement of undergraduate and graduate students in research.

B.7. Service Portfolio. The Service portfolio demonstrates effective participation and leadership in furthering science and instruction in science for the University, College, profession, and public. The service portfolio should include:

- B.7.1.** A personal evaluation of service including a description of what the candidate considers to be his/her most significant accomplishments and impact;
- B.7.2.** A list of committee membership and chair assignments or administrative service to the University, College, profession or the public;
- B.7.3.** A summary of public service (e.g., public talks, unpaid consulting) and professional activities e.g., referee, manuscript review, organization officer or panel member for professional societies or government agencies;
- B.7.4.** A summary of undergraduate and graduate curriculum and career advising and counseling responsibilities;
- B.7.5.** If appropriate, a summary of contributions related to: student engagement beyond the classroom and research environments, outreach and promotion of ESF and its programs, and efforts towards student recruitment and retention at ESF.

APPENDIX C – ASSESSING TEACHING PERFORMANCE

C.1. The College requires that all of its members seek the highest standards of excellence in teaching. To ensure rigorous and fair evaluation of teaching performance as a criterion for promotion and tenure, a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is assessed from three perspectives: peer, student, and self. The following procedures are used to conduct this assessment.

C.2. Peer Evaluation.

C.2.1. A panel of three faculty members will be identified to perform the evaluation: one faculty member each selected by the department's DRC, the candidate, and the Department Chair. One of the faculty members must be from outside the candidate's department and at least one faculty member must be knowledgeable of the candidate's field of expertise. The DRC coordinates the assembly of the panel. Any DRC member can make arrangements with the candidate to visit any class.

C.2.2. Reviewers will choose a minimum of one lecture and/or discussion/laboratory session at the undergraduate and at the graduate level, as appropriate. Usually one reviewer at a time will observe a given lecture, discussion or laboratory. DRC coordinates the schedule of observation at a time mutually acceptable among the DRC, reviewer, and candidate. At least two courses will be evaluated by each reviewer.

C.2.3. An evaluation should consider the following: (a) clarity and organization of presentation, (b) effectiveness of delivery, (c) knowledge of subject area (this may not be appropriate for all reviewers), (d) interaction with students, and (e) an opinion as to the general quality of the candidate as a teacher (e.g., ineffective, acceptable, outstanding). After the classroom observation, each reviewer will meet with the candidate outside of the classroom to discuss teaching techniques and related topics. The reviewer will summarize, independently, his/her observations in writing to the DRC. To permit a timely formal report to the DRC by December 15, the candidate must provide the names of potential reviewers to the DRC by January 22 of the academic year prior to review.

C.3. Student Evaluation. Student input will be sought either through a College end-of-course survey or student course evaluation developed by the department that should address the following: 1) Comment on the ability of the instructor to clearly organize and structure the course. 2) Did the instructor successfully promote student interest and involvement in the course? 3) How effective was the instructor in creating a productive learning environment and promoting your best work? 4) Did the instructor help you to understand the concepts involved in the topic of this course? 5) Did the instructor stimulate you to pursue the topic of the course on your own? 6) What were the particular strengths of the instructor in teaching the course? 7) What were the weaknesses of the instructor in teaching the course? Should a department chose this later option for student input, the DRC will administer this survey near the end of the semester for each course that the candidate is teaching.