# APT COMMITTEE CHECKLIST

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

Dossier must be submitted in Interfolio.

# 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.

A tally sheet indicating departmental approval

* Must include the total number of faculty members who voted and the number who agreed, disagreed or abstained
* Must include names and signatures of those who voted or a notation that the individual voted electronically, but not how each member voted. (Note that department chairs cannot vote.).
* 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 (APT) format and signed by the candidate

Contribution to teaching, administration, and/or patient care form

Personal statement (optional, maximum of 3 pages)

Educator Portfolio (optional; suggested for Educator Scholar Track)

Scholarly Activity Portfolio (optional; suggested for candidates with a limited number of scholarly activities)

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 refereesthat is 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.

The following information should be included for each referee: Name, Degree, Rank, Tenure status (if applicable), Department, Institution, Address, Email address, and relationship to the candidate (e.g., mentor, collaborator, no substantive relationship)

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 (if applicable), which must be equivalent to or higher than that proposed for 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 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. If this information is not specifically stated, the letter will not be able to be read by the candidate.
* 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 describe how the candidate’s achievements compare to those of others in a similar position and career stage.

# 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)**

* + Requirements for referees letters will be the same as those for the corresponding full-time faculty rank and tenure status as described above

# 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