

Manual for Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(“ARPT Manual”)

Revised 2019

Appendix III of Bylaws¹

¹ NOTE TO DRAFT: Footnotes in this draft are of two kinds: those intended as part of the document, which simply appear as text, and those explaining some of the changes in the text, which appear with the prefatory term **“EXPLANATION.”** The **“EXPLANATION”** footnotes are for consideration of the draft and will be removed in the final document.

draft

draft

draft

Contents

Introduction and General Information

Part I: Evaluation Criteria

- A. Policies of the Board of Trustees**
- B. Criteria for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion**

Part II: Preparation of Files

Part III: ARPT Authority and Procedures

Part IV: Additional Related Policies (Policies of Board of Trustees, UUP)

Addenda and Additional Resources

draft

draft

draft

INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL INFORMATION

This Manual is primarily for Old Westbury faculty and librarians at the ranks of Assistant and Associate Professor, and equivalent designations within the Library, who are seeking reappointment, continuing appointment (tenure), and/or promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor or from Associate Professor to Professor (and equivalent Librarian designations). ARPT also evaluates and recommends all initial appointments at these ranks, as well as initial but not subsequent appointments as Lecturer. It does not consider initial or subsequent appointments of visiting and adjunct faculty, which are handled by Departments. Nor does it consider nominations for Distinguished Teaching Professor or Distinguished Service Professor, which are handled by the Faculty University Awards Committee.¹

Faculty are charged by the Bylaws with the evaluation of academic employees for reappointment, promotion and tenure in Old Westbury. This evaluation is conducted at two levels: at the Department level and at the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee (hereafter, ARPT).² The primary instrument for evaluation is the reappointment, promotion, or tenure file, which is prepared by the candidate in consultation with a Department Evaluation Committee and contains the Evaluation Committee's, and ultimately the Department's, evaluation and recommendation. ARPT conducts a second-level evaluation, based on the file, and writes its own recommendation, which may endorse, differ from, or disagree with the Department's. Both the Department's and ARPT's evaluations and recommendations, along with a recommendation by the relevant Dean based on the file, serve as advisory recommendations to the Provost, who writes a recommendation to the President. The candidate is entitled to respond at each stage (i.e., to evaluations and recommendations by the Evaluation Committee and Department, by ARPT, to the Dean's and the Provost's recommendations and, finally, to the President's determination), addressing the response in each case to the relevant body. The faculty role in reappointment, promotion, and tenure, therefore, is advisory rather than determinative, but remains the most important input into the

¹ The designations Assistant Librarian, Senior Assistant Librarian, Associate Librarian, and Librarian are equivalent to Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, respectively. ARPT also handles tenure-bearing appointments at Instructor rank (and succeeding reviews), which are now very rare.

² The term "Department" is used throughout this document to refer to the candidate's primary academic unit, which prepares and initially evaluates the file. For faculty candidates, this is usually their academic Department, and for Librarians, it is the Library. For convenience, terms such as "faculty," "Assistant Professor," etc., are used throughout, and should be understood as referring also to the equivalent designations for Librarians. In some cases, faculty of the several Departments in a School may vote as a unit on files of the School's member faculty; "Department" then refers to this voting unit. Deans/directors are not involved in the Department evaluation process, even when the evaluating faculty are those of the whole school. In cases of joint appointment, "Department" in this document refers to the candidate's primary ("home") Department, which, under current procedures, conducts the evaluation and vote, with specified input from the auxiliary Department.

final determination.¹

Stages of Evaluation and Recommendation:²

File location:	Department	ARPT	Human Resources	Academic Affairs	President's Office
Action:	Eval. committee recommendation; department vote/recommendation	ARPT eval. and recommendation	File available for inspection (HR notifies candidate)	Recommendation by Dean to Provost and Provost to President	Determination
Right to Respond?	Yes to both	Yes if negative vote	Yes	Yes	Yes

This Manual, an appendix to the bylaws, offers systematic approaches and forms which are to be followed by those involved in the evaluation process. It has the full force of the Bylaws (see Part III on the authority of this Appendix). Its goal is to provide the necessary information regarding evaluation in a single document. It is the responsibility of candidates, chairs and those academic staff involved in the process of evaluation to use this manual in order to attain consistency in the preparation of evaluation files.

Users of this Manual beginning work on files should bear three points in mind: the timeline for reappointments leading to Tenure/Promotion, as well as for promotions not linked to a tenure decision; the Criteria for each of these actions; and the Evaluation Period associated with each type of evaluation. The Criteria and Evaluation Periods are given in Part I. The timeline is given here. Candidates should be mindful of their timelines to tenure-promotion review and should consult as needed with Department members, faculty mentors, and/or other faculty about maintaining progress in each evaluation area.

Sample Timeline to Tenure—Start Date Fall 2019, Date Tenure Effective Sept. 1, 2026³

	1st review	2nd review	3rd review (“1-Year-to-Tenure-Review review”)	Tenure review
Appointment Term	Sept. 2019-Aug. 2021	Sept. 2021-Aug. 2023	Sept. 2023-Aug. 2025	Sept. 2025-Aug. 2026

¹ **EXPLANATION:** The 2003 Manual reads, “The evaluation of academic employees...is conducted at two levels: at the program level and the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee.” That version makes the Department/ARPT roles appear determinative, or at least, as solely comprising the input to the President.

² See Parts III and IV for more information. There are time limits for responses at each stage.

³ Dates for review are determined by notification provisions contained in POBT and the UUP Agreement. (See Part IV, Additional Relevant Policies, Sec. V, Eligibility for Appointment and Deadlines, below.) The table is based on Academic Year appointments of September to August, which are most typical for teaching faculty, and on appointments of 2, 2, 2, and 1 year, which has been the typical pattern. Some teaching faculty and most Librarians have different start dates and should carefully check their review dates. Three-year and one-year contracts are also possible, though rare, and change the typical pattern shown here. The start date shown here is illustrative and the table can be adjusted for earlier or later start dates.

draft

draft

draft

ARPT Review	Fall 2020	Spring 2022	Spring 2024	Spring 2025
Notification¹	Dec. 15, 2020	Aug. 31, 2022	Aug. 31, 2024	Aug. 31, 2025

Review for Promotion to Associate Professor is usually linked to Tenure review, but can occur earlier or later. Initial hire as Associate Professor (with or without tenure) is also possible.

Review for Promotion to Professor occurs after tenure and after promotion to (or initial hire as) Associate Professor; there is no set interval. Initial hire as tenured Professor is also possible.

Departments are responsible for clearly specifying candidates' date of hire, initial rank, and any previous reappointments or promotions. In cases of promotion to Associate Professor before or later than the tenure date, departments should clearly specify the reasons promotion is sought at this time. Evaluation periods and criteria must be within and consistent with the provisions of this Manual.

The remainder of this Manual covers the following topics:

- **Part I: Evaluation Criteria**—Describes criteria on which evaluations and recommendations for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, at the Department and ARPT levels, must be based
- **Part II: Preparation of Files**—Provides a section-by-section guide to the contents of files
- **Part III: ARPT Authority and Procedures**—Specifies ARPT's responsibilities and procedures, as defined in the Bylaws and as elaborated in ARPT practice over time
- **Part IV: Additional Related Policies (Policies of Board of Trustees, UUP contract)**—Provides additional relevant specifications from these documents
- **Addenda and Additional Resources**—Forms required as part of the file; specification of forms to be used by ARPT; ARPT review of hiring procedures for Temporary and non-tenure track appointments; URLs for Policies of the Board of Trustees, the UUP Contract, and the Bylaws.

¹ "Notification," as used here and below, means notice of nonrenewal. That is, it means the date by which the candidate must be notified if appointment is NOT renewed. The deadline is not applicable if reappointment is granted.

PART I: EVALUATION CRITERIA

Introduction: This part first gives relevant SUNY Board of Trustees criteria, which are binding on all personnel and in all reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases (Section 1).¹ These are followed by the specific criteria for Old Westbury, with associated information.

Section 1. Policies of the Board of Trustees

The criteria for evaluation and promotion specified in *Policies of the Board of Trustees* (hereafter, POBT), Article XII, Titles A and B, are as follows:²

Evaluation of Academic Employees (Title A)

Criteria: In conducting evaluations pursuant to this Title, the chief administrative officer of the college concerned, or designee, may consider, but shall not be limited to consideration of, the following:

- (a) Mastery of subject matter—as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards and reputation in the subject matter field.
- (b) Effectiveness in teaching—as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials or new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation.
- (c) Scholarly ability—as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, publications and reputation among colleagues.
- (d) Effectiveness of University service—as demonstrated by such things as college and University public service, committee work, administrative work and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships.
- (e) Continuing growth—as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other

¹ **NOTE:** Wording in Section 1 is as specified in POBT and cannot be amended.

² **EXPLANATION:** For unknown reasons, the 2003 Manual reversed the POBT order, putting promotion first. This Manual goes back to the POBT order, with evaluation first. Otherwise the wording is the same except for language that POBT has revised.

activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic employee's fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility.

Promotion of Academic Employees (Title B)

Criteria: Recommendations of academic employees, or their appropriate committees, or other appropriate sources may consider, but shall not be limited to consideration of, the following:

- (a) Mastery of subject matter—as demonstrated by such things as advanced degrees, licenses, honors, awards and reputation in the subject matter field.
- (b) Effectiveness in teaching—as demonstrated by such things as judgment of colleagues, development of teaching materials or new courses and student reaction, as determined from surveys, interviews and classroom observation.
- (c) Scholarly ability—as demonstrated by such things as success in developing and carrying out significant research work in the subject matter field, contribution to the arts, publications and reputation among colleagues.
- (d) Effectiveness of University service—as demonstrated by such things as college and University public service, committee work, administrative work and work with students or community in addition to formal teacher-student relationships.
- (e) Continuing growth—as demonstrated by such things as reading, research or other activities to keep abreast of current developments in the academic employee's fields and being able to handle successfully increased responsibility.

Section 2. Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure

- A. Preamble:** Candidates for reappointment and tenure shall be evaluated according to the following criteria, interpreted in terms of the College's commitment to an equitable environment based upon social justice and specific affirmative action goals.¹
- B. Evaluation Periods:**² The evaluation period for each review is the period covered by the review. For each of the three reviews leading to the Tenure review, this is the time since the prior review (for the first review, since initial tenure-track appointment), and for the Tenure

¹ **EXPLANATION:** Revises the following language: "...the college's commitment to an equitable environment based upon specific affirmative action goals (see Article VI Preamble)." Article VII (renumbered from VI in 2003 Bylaws) contains no reference to such an environment or goals. "Social justice" is added in reference to the College Mission Statement's reference to "a more just and sustainable world."

² **EXPLANATION:** This section is new; the 2003 *Manual* did not define evaluation periods, although the concept was in use at the time. The Evaluation periods are derived from the Criteria for the various reviews.

review, it is the whole period since initial tenure-track appointment. Thus the evaluation periods are:

- **1st Reappointment:** From initial tenure-track appointment to most recent completed semester
- **2nd Reappointment:** From semester of prior ARPT review to most recent completed semester
- **3rd (one-year-to-tenure-review) Reappointment:** From semester of prior ARPT review to most recent completed semester¹
- **Tenure Review:** From initial hire to most recent completed semester
- **Promotion Review:** As specified below.

Work from earlier periods should not form part of the evaluation (and evidence of such work should not be included in the file), but may be mentioned for context and background, and should be noted as done earlier than the evaluation period. More recent material (such as an article accepted during or since the Department review) may be included and may be considered by ARPT; if so, it should be noted in the next review as credited during what will then be the prior review.

C. Criteria

Faculty shall demonstrate growth and development appropriate to the specified reappointment, as measured by the specifications and evidence cited in each of the following areas:

1. *Teaching ability.*² Specifications:

- (a) Demonstrated knowledge of the subject-matter field(s)
- (b) Articulate and stimulating presentation of material
- (c) Effectiveness in carrying out teaching objectives
- (d) Effectiveness in evaluating students' work
- (e) Demonstrated capacity to inspire students
- (f) Responsiveness to the distinctive and varied needs of our students through feedback, conferences, advisement, etc.
- (g) Successful experimentation with varied approaches to teaching, including design of new courses / course formats, new preparations, etc.
- (h) Ability to respond positively to criticism

Evidence of teaching performance is to be based on:

¹ **NOTE:** Academic Affairs requires the phrasing “one-year-to-tenure-review evaluation” (or review or reappointment), rather than the commonly used “year-to-tenure evaluation” (or review or reappointment).

² As specified in Library procedures, for Librarians the criterion “Librarianship” is substituted for “Teaching ability.” This substitution is assumed wherever relevant below.

- (a) Student evaluations (anonymous class questionnaires) during the evaluation period
- (b) Peer classroom observations conducted during the evaluation period
- (c) Self-evaluations
- (d) Program related evaluations (curriculum development and course content)

NOTES: (1) All student evaluations and peer observations for a given review period must be included and considered. (2) Departments may supplement official College student evaluations with Department surveys; however, ARPT gives primary weight to official College evaluations.

2. Service, including at the levels of the Department, School, College, University, and Community.¹ The following general considerations should be noted:

- (1) As an institution partly governed collegially by its own faculty, Old Westbury places a high value on service to the institution.
- (2) No distinction in merit is made between service on varied service bodies as listed under College (a) below. Rather, the amount and regularity of service are considered.
- (3) “Active responsibility” (sec. b under “College”) is primarily important in later reappointments, tenure, and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor. It may consist of demonstrated responsibility for various committee functions or documents, as attested by evaluation letters and/or in documentation, and/or of chairing committee(s); the latter is not a specific requirement.
- (4) Candidates need not show equal service in all categories, and not all need appear. The overall amount and quality of service is most important. However, in considering service, the greatest weight will be given to service at the three College levels.
- (5) Provide inclusive dates for all types of service.

Specifications:

Department

- (a) Routine advising, representation of the Department at Open House and similar activities, etc.
- (b) Curriculum planning and development
- (c) Supervision of Department-wide courses or programs
- (d) Search and Reappointment personnel committees
- (e) Work on program accreditation efforts, Five Year Reviews, etc.

School

¹ **EXPLANATION:** In the 2003 Manual, Community Service was considered as part of Professional Activity (see 2003 Manual, p. 4, Professional Activity, and pp. 6-7, Criteria for Promotion). It was required (candidates “shall...be prepared to show evidence” of such activity). More recently, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure files have classified Community Service as a subdivision of Service. Further, changing standards both in Departments/Schools and in Academic Affairs now approach adequate publishing, conference, exhibition, and similar activities as the primary professional activity requirement for progress toward and achievement of tenure and promotion. Community Service is therefore classified here as a subdivision of overall Service.

- (a) Service on working bodies at the level of the various Schools
- (b) Participation in planning other School-wide activities such as Research Days

College

- (a) Membership on Faculty Senate, Standing Committees and Special Committees of Faculty Governance, College-Wide Committees, and other committees and task forces at the College level, whether elective or appointive¹
- (b) Active responsibility on such bodies
- (c) Extracurricular programming for students—talks for students, teach-ins, etc.
- (d) Service in union offices and functions
- (e) Representing the College in community, regional or broader contexts

University

SUNY University Service including Standing Committees of the University Senate, SUNY-wide Task Forces, and similar bodies.

Community

The College recognizes that its commitment to human justice and social change extends across all aspects of a faculty member's professional life, both in and outside of the College. Candidates shall therefore receive credit for activity outside the college that contributes to their overall development and performance at the college.

- (a) Service on specific community bodies, especially in leadership roles
- (b) Presentations and lectures at community forums
- (c) Liaison work with area schools, if undertaken as service rather than as integral to Old Westbury curriculum
- (d) Other public activity

Evidence of service may be based on:

- (a) Department evaluation
- (b) Self-evaluation
- (c) Letters attesting to the service
- (d) Other documentation such as (i) records of relevant committee work through minutes of committee meetings and the Annual Report by committees; (ii) committee reports, documents, etc., prepared by the candidate; (iii) other similar documentation. Candidates and departments are urged to make judicious decisions on what documentation provides sufficient evidence of activity, so as to avoid needless detail. One piece of documentation for each service is usually enough, unless the amount and/or quality of service is disputed.

3. Professional Activity: Faculty shall be actively involved in refreshing, updating, and

¹ **Note on Faculty Senate service:** Representing the Department as Faculty Senator or Alternate may be designated either as Department or College service; service on Senate leadership bodies, as Executive Committee member, etc., is considered College Service

enhancing their own intellectual capacities both for self-improvement and to support the development of undergraduate and graduate instruction in improving students' scholarly capacities and experience and in preparing them for future careers. Specifications may include, but are not restricted to:

- (a)** Publications, including peer-reviewed and other articles, book chapters/essays, and books
- (b)** Conference presentations, including papers, invited talks, posters, chaired sessions/panels, panel and roundtable participation, etc.
- (c)** Exhibits, performances, and other creative work
- (d)** Active participation in professional societies, especially in leadership roles
- (e)** Attendance at conferences, institutes, courses, webinars, etc., that enhance professional growth
- (f)** Grant writing and research or curriculum development under grants
- (g)** Professional reports required for program accreditation
- (h)** Work in the community that draws on or enhances the candidate's professional training

NOTES: **(1)** Distinguish peer-reviewed from non-peer reviewed items if not evident, and especially from intramural presentations such as at Old Westbury faculty research programs, etc. If, however, invited articles/presentations represent a recognition of career achievement for an established scholar, so indicate. **(2)** The importance assigned to activities will vary by discipline; in some specializations, for example, conference papers have greater professional importance than publications. Evaluations should indicate such variations when relevant. **(3)** Departments are responsible to develop, maintain, and update their requirements, convey them to faculty, and apprise ARPT of any changes.

Evidence of professional activity may be based on the following. Candidates are responsible for clarifying which are relevant and for providing copies of relevant written works.

- (a)** Copies of publications and submitted or accepted works, together with evidence of status for those not yet accepted or published
- (b)** Conference programs showing presentations, gallery listings of exhibitions, and the like
- (c)** External evaluation letters assessing the value of the works in the peer community (mandatory in tenure and promotion cases; optional otherwise)
- (d)** The following provisos apply to mandatory external evaluation letters in tenure and promotion cases:
 - (i)** A list of outside evaluators should be developed jointly by the candidate and the department evaluation committee. This list should include names of some individuals who were not co-authors, collaborators, former students, or the Chair of the candidate's dissertation committee. This list may include persons of standing in the candidate's field without prior knowledge of the candidate's work, or who may know the candidate's work as published but have not met her/him, or have done so casually at conferences or the like. Solicitation letters may indicate Old Westbury's

expectations regarding professional development in relation to tenure and/or the promotion being considered.

- (ii) Files should include a minimum of three outside letters of evaluation from the agreed upon list for tenure and promotion to associate professor and five for promotion to full professor.
- (iii) Departments should develop a standard procedure for soliciting outside letters of evaluation. The procedure should include the development of a standard format for letters to evaluators, including at least **(a)** a request to specify the evaluator's relationship with the candidate, if any, and **(b)** specification of the period for which the candidate is being reviewed. A copy of this letter must be included in the candidate's file. The department evaluation committee and the candidate should jointly select the materials to be sent to evaluators to assist them in their consideration of the candidate's work. Materials should be appropriate to the particular candidate and evaluator.

4. *Specific considerations regarding Tenure:* Tenure is seen not as a right conferred simply by a candidate's continued presence at the College, but as a College commitment earned by the candidate's high level of performance in teaching, scholarly inquiry, and service.

Specifications:

- (a)** The criteria, specifications, and evidence in each area are the same as for other reappointments, with the provisos regarding external evaluation letters enumerated above. No expectations for development beyond the qualifications for Assistant Professor are attached to the tenure decision itself, though they are involved in consideration for promotion to Associate Professor which most often occurs simultaneously (below). Evidence of improvement over time should be presented where called for in prior evaluations.
- (b)** The tenure judgment: A tenured appointment carries with it the expectation of continued growth and performance at least at the level of competence and commitment demonstrated by a candidate prior to the tenure decision. Where questions about high level of performance or its continuation exists a candidate should not be granted tenure.
- (c)** Stopping the "tenure clock": The tenure clock may be stopped to provide more time before tenure review. A candidate believing there is legitimate reason for postponing tenure review must apply to the Department, which, if in support and if the stoppage is not violative of the collective bargaining agreement,¹ will make application to the Provost. The Provost will notify the candidate and Department (and ARPT, if review has already been scheduled) of the outcome.² Stoppage entails a temporary leave from the

¹ All references to the collective bargaining agreement are assumed to refer to the agreement current as of the date the Manual is being used. Manual references to the agreement are updated when necessary. In case of conflict, current provisions supersede what is stated here.

² **EXPLANATION:** The 2003 *Manual* specified that the Department must apply to ARPT. Departments have not followed this requirement, applying instead to the Provost, and there seems no good reason to continue it.

tenure track through a one-year appointment as Visiting Assistant Professor,¹ and may be repeated, if the Department and Provost approve, on a yearly basis. NOTE: This provision is different from a stoppage relating to birth, adoption, or foster placement of a child.)²

Section 3. Criteria for Promotion:

The following Criteria apply to candidates for promotion:

1. Promotion from Instructor to Assistant Professor

Faculty appointed at the Instructor level will receive automatic promotion to Assistant Professor on final certification of the terminal degree or equivalent. Equivalence to the terminal degree shall be judged in accord with standardized guidelines established by the College. Faculty may petition for promotion where they can demonstrate such equivalence.

2. Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor

A. Evaluation Period: From initial appointment as (or promotion to) Assistant Professor to most recent completed semester. NOTES: (1) Applies to promotion review at the time of tenure review, prior to tenure review, and subsequent to tenure review. (2) If completion of the terminal degree was a condition of hire, the evaluation period is from initial appointment.

B. Criteria: Faculty with the rank of Assistant Professor are eligible for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor when they have made substantial achievements in the following areas, according to the Bylaws criteria.³ In cases where tenure was granted prior to promotion, specific attention is given to the reasons why promotion criteria have now been satisfied.

(a) Teaching excellence

(b) Service should show active responsibility taken in at least one area of college service and one area of Department service, within the general criteria for Service

¹ **EXPLANATION:** Changed from “as Lecturer” in 2003 Manual. This reflects current practice, which is within Academic Affairs’ discretion.

² The UUP Contract also provides for stopping the Tenure clock for leave following birth, adoption, or foster placement of a child at the discretion of the faculty member and without change in rank (see UUP agreement Appendix A-42, sec. VIII). That provision should not be confused with this one.

³ **EXPLANATION:** 2003 Manual states: “when they have reached the standard of five years of full-time teaching (including teaching prior to appointment at the college) and made...” (etc.). No such standard is stated in POBT, which states that a minimum period of service “may be a consideration but shall not be a qualification for promotion.”

- (c) Continued development in Professional Activity beyond the level established at¹ initial appointment or promotion to Assistant Professor rank should be documented as described in Section 2, no. 3 (Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure).²

NOTE: Faculty who were appointed at Assistant Professor rank without the terminal degree at a time when the College did not use the Instructor rank, and were subsequently tenured as Assistant Professors pending the terminal degree, will be considered for promotion to on completion of the terminal degree.

3. Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Promotion may occur either simultaneously with tenure or subsequently. It may not occur prior to tenure.

- A. Evaluation Period:** From appointment as, or from the semester of successful review for promotion to, Associate Professor rank to the most recent completed semester. **NOTE:** There is no minimum period between promotion to Associate Professor and review for promotion to Professor, but sufficient time should have passed to demonstrate growth since promotion to Associate Professor, as specified in the Criteria.
- B. Criteria:** Promotion of tenured faculty to Professor shall be based on continued achievements in the following areas, according to the Bylaws criteria:
- (a) Teaching must be demonstrated to have been maintained at least at the standard of excellence achieved and required for tenure.
 - (b) Service shall reflect continued involvement in Department and College activities, and in particular, the record should demonstrate active leadership responsibility within the College.
 - (c) Professional activity is seen as a particularly important criterion for promotion to Full Professor. Such promotion shall be given where the faculty members can be demonstrated to have developed significantly beyond the level established at³ promotion (or appointment) to Associate Professor and should be documented as described in Section 2, #3 (Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure).

NOTE: Continued excellence in teaching is required for promotion. Growth in Service and Professional Activity are also required, but it is recognized that faculty may not devote

¹ **EXPLANATION:** 2003 Manual specifies “the level established *for*” Assistant Professor rank; revision clarifies that candidates must show continued development beyond their own level at the time, not beyond a general standard.

² **EXPLANATION:** 2003 Manual specifies: “at least two areas within the general criteria for Professional Activity and Community Service.” Revision (referring to Professional Activity only) is consistent with transfer of Community Service to the Service category.

³ **EXPLANATION:** As for the corresponding change in criteria for promotion to Associate Professor.

themselves equally to activity in each category every year.¹

Section 4: Candidates' Rights²

- A. Candidates may initiate an action by the ARPT Committee by filing with the Committee in writing a proposal for their own reappointment, promotion, or tenure.
- B. When a reappointment is considered within a Department, the candidate has the right to request the ARPT Committee to appoint an outside member to join the Department's evaluation committee, who will be a member of the evaluation committee, with vote.³ The choice of the outside member should meet the approval of the candidate before serving and may be the source of a "minority opinion" in the file.
- C. When a promotion or the granting of tenure is considered within a Department, the candidate has the right to request the ARPT Committee to form an evaluation committee with the inclusion of one representative selected by the Department. This committee shall be composed of three to five members, to be appointed by ARPT, and shall put the file together and to all effects act as a program evaluation committee. The Department may submit its own majority opinion to the ARPT Committee. Until the ARPT Committee submits the file to the Academic Vice President, the file is to be kept in the Faculty Senate Office, where all inspections have to take place.
- D. Candidates have the right to include a response in the file to all the material pertaining to their cases before the file is forwarded to the ARPT Committee. The candidate may choose to respond to the Evaluation Committee findings (the draft Department Evaluation) prior to the Department vote; to respond to the finalized Department Evaluation and any minority reports after the Department vote; or to do both. The candidate's opting not to respond shall not be deemed acceptance of the Evaluation Committee's or the Department's Evaluation or recommendation.
- E. It is the Department's obligation to deposit the file with ARPT and the Department cannot refuse to do so in disputed cases.
- F. Candidates have the right, in case of a negative ARPT recommendation, to appeal to ARPT before the file is forwarded; see Part III, "ARPT Authority and Procedures" (below), sec.

¹ **EXPLANATION:** 2003 Manual additionally allows promotion for faculty hired "under criteria that de-emphasized degree status." There do not appear to be any remaining active faculty whom this would apply to.

² **EXPLANATION:** This new section consolidates previously existing rights specified in the Bylaws (**A**) and in Notes 3-4 following Criteria for Promotion in the 2003 Manual (**B, C, and D, differently arranged**), and at the end of Part III in 2003. An addition in (**B**) is noted.

³ **EXPLANATION:** The phrasing "who will be a member of the evaluation committee, with vote" is added in this draft and was not present in the 2003 Manual.

draft

draft

draft

4(c)(2)(b). Candidates also have the right, in all cases, to review the file and respond after it is forwarded and before it is considered at the next level; see Part IV, “Additional Relevant Policies” (below), sec. VI. Finally, candidates have the right to inspect their Personnel Files as provided under the Collective Bargaining Agreement; see Part IV, Additional Related Policies.

PART II: PREPARATION OF EVALUATION FILES

Introduction. Candidates and Departments will use this section for detailed guidance in preparing files. Its subsections provide guidelines for the Procedures Statement, Department Evaluation, Self-Evaluation, etc., as well as the subfiles containing documentation (here referred to as “evidence”). The following preliminary guidelines may be useful:

(a) In the Evaluation Committee report and the finalized Department Evaluation, all major fact statements and evaluative judgments should correspond to appropriate material in the evidence subfiles.

(b) All evaluations in the Department Evaluation and all evidence materials should be drawn from work during the evaluation period. Earlier work (e.g., important articles in earlier evaluations, or before appointment at Old Westbury) may be referred to as context and background but should not be part of the evaluation, nor placed in the file. Be careful with overlaps—if an article was counted while on submission, during an earlier review, and is now mentioned as published, its inclusion in the earlier review should be mentioned.

(c) Avoid crediting the same work in two categories (“double counting”). For example, decide whether developing a new course should be credited as teaching or as Department service.

(d) Avoid needless documentation. Department and School service attested by the Department Evaluation, School and college committee service attested by peer letters, etc., usually need little or no additional documentation.

(e) Provide specific dates whenever applicable, especially specific inclusive dates for service roles and specific dates for publications, presentations, exhibitions, etc. In case of publication in dual formats, such as online and print, ARPT will consider the earlier as determinative.

(f) Department Evaluations should be clearly organized and as succinct as possible. Descriptive material (e.g., on the distinctive quality of a candidate’s work) should be as brief as compatible with clarity.

(g) To avoid confusion and a need for checking, be sure the file Contents List matches the order of materials; that course numbers, titles, and semesters offered are accurate; that service dates are correct; that article titles, any co-authors, dates, etc., are consistent in the Department Evaluation, Self-Evaluation, and CV, and so on.

(h) Take care over the neatness and orderliness of the file itself.

Section 1. Procedures for Department Evaluation of Faculty

I. Each Department will set up an evaluation committee of at least three members. In small Departments, the entire Department minus the candidate being evaluated may have to serve in this capacity, or a member may have to be coopted from outside the Department.¹

II. If there is a substantial possibility of a “warning” or negative recommendation (a one-year reappointment or dismissal in reappointments; a “no” vote on tenure or promotion), the candidate must be notified at the start of the evaluation process or as soon thereafter as this possibility becomes evident. The candidate may elect to utilize options described in “Candidates’ Rights” (above).²

III. The evaluation committee will be responsible for (a) overseeing the collection of the information listed in Section 2 (The Preparation of Files); (b) evaluating the materials collected; (c) discussing its findings with, and eliciting any additional relevant data from, the candidate prior to submitting a written report to the Department, a copy of which will be given to the candidate.

IV. The Department will hold a formal discussion of the Evaluation Committee report and the file and will vote on the file. The discussion and vote will be scheduled at least one week after these materials are made available to the voting faculty for review (e.g., Friday-Friday), and as soon as practicable thereafter. During this interval, faculty who will vote (not including the candidate) will “sign off” on the Evaluation File as indicated in VII below. In the event that a candidate disagrees with the Evaluation Committee's report, or wishes to amplify it, the candidate may use this time to prepare a written response which will form part of the Department's deliberations and which will be included in the file as submitted to ARPT.

V. A Department vote or consensus must be taken and duly noted in the recommendation which is submitted to ARPT. See the Procedures Statement subsection (below) for particulars.

VI. After the Department vote, the Evaluation Committee Report will be finalized as decided in the Department meeting and retitled “Department Evaluation.”³ This and the Procedures Statement (if separate) will be made available for “sign off” by the faculty who voted on the Department Evaluation (not including the candidate) as provided in VII below. If any Department faculty member or members wish to file a minority report, it must be included in the file to be forwarded to ARPT. A copy must be given to the candidate simultaneously with its placement within the file. If the candidate wishes to respond to the finalized Department

¹ Current Library procedures provide for a File Coordinator, with no evaluation committee.

² **EXPLANATION:** This provision added in this draft; not present in 2003 Manual.

³ Voting units comprising all the Departments in a School may use the title “Evaluation Report.”

Evaluation or the minority report, the candidate will have five working days¹ to include a response in the file. Any minority reports and candidate responses must be acknowledged in the Department's Procedures Statement or, if received after the Procedures Statement is finalized, in a memorandum attached to the report(s) or response.

VII. The "Evaluation File and Department Evaluation Sign-Off Sheet" (See Addendum A) must be signed and initialed in the "Evaluation File" column, prior to the Department meeting, by those members who will vote, and must be initialed by them in the "Department Evaluation" column after the Evaluation is finalized. The candidate shall not sign. This sheet must be included in the file as specified below.

VIII. The Evaluation Committee chair or another Department representative will be scheduled to come to ARPT to present oral summaries of the process followed by their Departments and to answer questions that members may have on either process or materials. Before, at, or following this meeting, ARPT may request additional information or take other intervening steps prior to making a recommendation (see Part III).

IX. Chairs and candidates will receive a copy of ARPT's recommendation to the Administration.

Section 2. Preparation of Files

I. The file shall be subdivided into the following sections, each preceded by a title sheet:²

1. Evaluation File and Department Evaluation Sign-Off Sheet (Addendum A)
2. Detailed Contents List
3. Department Evaluation Subfile:
 - A. Procedures Statement
 - B. Department Evaluation
 - C. Minority Report(s)
 - D. Candidate Response(s)
4. Self Evaluation
5. Current Curriculum Vitae
6. Peer Evaluations Subfile
 - A. Peer Classroom Observation Reports

¹ "Working days," wherever used, refers to Monday-Friday exclusive of holidays.

² These specifications assume that files will be assembled in one or more three-ring binders. Each should clearly identify the candidate, the review being conducted, and the number of the binder (e.g., "Binder 2 of 2"). Recommended: use colored separators between sections, with labeled tabs permitting readers to select sections easily; place pages (front-and-back) in plastic slipcovers; multiple-page items can be placed in a single slipcover, but it is recommended that the Procedures Statement, Department evaluation, Self-Evaluation, and CV be placed page-by-page in successive slipcovers. **NOTE:** Possible future adoption of an all-electronic review system would change many of the specifics indicated here.

- B. Internal Evaluation Letters
- 7. Student Evaluations Subfile
- 8. Syllabi and Examinations Subfile
- 9. Documentation of Service Subfile
- 10. Documentation of Professional Activity Subfile
- 11. External Evaluation Letters Subfile
 - A. External Letters on Community Service
 - B. External Letters on Professional Activity (Mandatory for Tenure and Promotion)
- 12. Previous Department and ARPT Recommendations Subfile

NOTES:

- (1) The “Evaluation File and Department Evaluation Sign-Off Sheet” (Addendum A in this Manual) may be placed in the front binder pocket. If so, its title sheet should be maintained as item 1, with a notation that the sheet has been so transferred.
- (2) The Contents List will use the same numbers and headings as the sections shown above, and will individually list the several items that may be included in each. If there is more than one file binder, the Contents List will indicate where each successive binder begins, and a comparable Contents List for that binder only will be placed at the start of each binder after the first. Use of page numbering is strongly recommended, either continuous throughout the file or beginning over with each file section.
- (3) A Procedures Statement shall be included in the file either as a separate document preceding the Department Evaluation (recommended) or as the first substantive section of the Department Evaluation following the Introduction (see Section 3A).
- (4) If the Procedures Statement is integral to the Department Evaluation, add a notation to this effect to this item (3A) in the Contents. Similarly, if the Procedures note that there are no Minority Report(s) and/or Candidate Response(s), or if any of the later sections has no contents, add the notation “(None)” to the relevant item(s) in the Contents List and omit the relevant title sheet(s) in the file.

Section 3. Department Evaluation Subfile

This section will contain up to four subsections, as follows.

3A. Procedures Statement¹

The Procedures Statement will discuss the procedures followed from beginning to finalization of the Department evaluation, using a chronological organization, and will specifically address the following issues, giving specific or approximate dates. The items below may be used as a template for the Procedures Statement.

¹ Some departments prefer a procedures statement integral to the Department Evaluation. See 3B, Department Evaluation, point 1.

1. Confirm whether an evaluation committee was set up, when, and who the chair and other members were. Explain how the members were selected—e.g., in consultation with the candidate, or through another specified process (describe).
2. Confirm whether a written report was prepared by the evaluation committee and that the report and the overall findings were discussed with the candidate prior to submission to the Department. If so, at what date?
3. Provide date(s) on which the report was added to the file and both were made available for Department review.
4. Specify the date of formal discussion and vote by the Department (must be at least one week from receipt of the report and file); if discussion and voting were on different dates, provide both. Specify whether, under Department rules, the candidate was present for all or part of the discussion or excused from the discussion and vote; whether voting was open or secret; who was eligible to vote. (If other than tenure-stream faculty, specify.)
5. Report the number of votes in favor, opposed, abstaining, and those not present or not voting. If any votes were by absentee ballot or proxy, so specify.¹ The vote total, plus the candidate and any qualified voters not voting, must equal the total number of qualified Department voting members. Additionally, the total number of votes must equal the total number of voting members signing and initialing both columns of the “Evaluation File and Department Evaluation Sign-Off Sheet,” and each member signing must have initialed both columns. Any discrepancies must be explained.
6. Specify whether, following the Department vote and finalization of the Department Evaluation, five working days were allotted for Department and candidate review before the file was finalized.
6. Report whether there are written minority report(s) and whether there is a written response or responses by the candidate to the Evaluation Committee Report, the Department Evaluation, and/or the minority report(s).

3B. Department Evaluation²

The following format is recommended for the Department Evaluation in order to facilitate the evaluation process and promote consistency in evaluations by the various Departments:

I. Introduction (and Procedures Statement, if not separate)

Summarize the candidate’s initial date and method of hire, the specialization(s) for which the

¹ Absentee ballots are those specifying a particular vote; proxy votes are authorization for a present member to vote by her/his judgment in place of an absent voter. Both must be authorized in writing (generally email) before the beginning of the meeting.

² **EXPLANATION:** Much of the content of the Department Evaluation description has been modified to reflect actual practices of most Departments over the last 15 years.

candidate was hired, and which review this is. Specify the review period.

If the Procedures Statement is not a separate document, it will follow this Introduction. Provide all information indicated in 3A above.

II. Analysis of Teaching, Classroom Observations, and Student Evaluations

1. Summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's teaching, including such matters as classroom methods, rigor, availability to students, innovations, courses designed and redesigned, teaching in varied formats, etc., as applicable. Weaknesses may include those of adjustment, particularly in early reviews, as well as more lasting problems. Do not gloss over weaknesses, but assess their importance. A useful standard is whether the weaknesses, if any, in teaching can or cannot probably be corrected by the next review. Specify what steps the Department expects the candidate to take in the meantime.
2. Peer classroom observations and student evaluations: Indicate the peer observers' overall analysis of the candidate's teaching and any range in the assessments of different courses, at different dates, etc. (If no classroom observations were held, so specify.) For Student evaluations, include a table of student evaluations for each semester and course during the evaluation period. For numerical evaluations, the table may either include all the evaluation categories or—especially for evaluation periods covering five or more semesters—may include only the overall rating of the instructor's teaching. Include representative student comments, including criticisms that appear with some frequency, if any. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses indicated by the observations and student evaluations. Do these fairly represent the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as a teacher?
3. If reporting problems in teaching, indicate whether the Department has used conferences with the candidate, mentoring arrangements, or other methods to overcome them.
4. For all reviews, and particularly for tenure and promotion reviews, specifically address the teaching Criteria for the relevant review from Part I above, and whether the candidate has met them.
5. Finally, state whether the candidate meets the Criteria as applied to this particular review, and provide the Department's capsule assessment of the candidate's teaching relative to the expectations for this review, using overall quality terms such as "excellent," "within expectations," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory."

III. Analysis of Service

For each category, include as many of the "Specifications" in Part I, Section 2 Criteria, 2 Service (above), as may be useful.

1. Summarize Department Service roles. Include dates where relevant.
2. Summarize Service to the School (if relevant), with dates. Use bulleted format if useful.
3. Summarize College Service. Include committees and other service bodies with inclusive dates. Note leadership roles if any. (E.g., XYZ Committee, Fall 20— to Spring 20—; Chair, Fall 20— to Spring 20—.) Use bulleted format if useful.¹ Include specific reference to internal peer evaluation letters on College Service. Brief quotations may be useful; lengthy ones are not, as letters will be found in the relevant subfile.
4. Summarize Community Service—specific organizations or activities, with dates. Indicate specific service roles, including leadership roles with dates. Include specific reference to external evaluation letters on Community Service.
5. For Tenure and Promotion reviews, specifically summarize active responsibility in service roles, using relevant evaluation Criteria for the relevant review from Part I above.
6. Summarize whether the candidate meets the Criteria as applied to this particular review, and provide the Department's capsule assessment of the candidate's service relative to the expectations for this review, using overall quality terms such as "excellent," "within expectations," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory."

IV. Analysis of Professional Activity

1. Explain Department expectations at this stage of service, and the degree to which such expectations are fulfilled. Note particular expectations that may be discipline-related, such as initial establishment of the lab in the sciences. Note and explain any variance between Department expectations and the candidate's own expectations.
2. Summarize the candidate's achievements, referring to as many of the "Specifications" in Part I, Section 2 Criteria, 3 Professional Activity, as may be useful. For publications, note type (book, article, book essay/chapter, etc.) and peer-reviewed or non-peer reviewed status as appropriate. For conferences and similar activities, note type of contribution (paper, invited talk, poster, panel/roundtable participation, panel chaired, etc.), and peer-reviewed or non-peer reviewed status. Full listings in bibliographical format are not necessary in the Department summary (they should be present in the CV) but give relevant information such as author(s), title (may be shortened, where published, and date. (For items in the year of initial hire or a prior review, month plus year will be helpful.)
3. If external evaluation letters on Professional Activity were solicited and received, provide a

¹ Note that the Criteria make no qualitative distinction between service on standing or special committees and on other service bodies. Assessments in terms of frequency and intensiveness of the service may be appropriate.

capsule summary of their assessments. Brief quotations may be useful; lengthy ones are not, as letters will be present in the subfile.

4. For Tenure and Promotion reviews, specifically address the Criteria for the relevant review from Part I above, including continued development since initial hire or previous review; provide specific information regarding the external evaluation letters, referring to the requirements stated in Part I, Section 2 Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure, 2 C Criteria, 3 Professional Activity, Evidence (d) i-iv.
 5. Summarize whether the candidate meets the Criteria as applied to this particular review, and provide the Department's capsule assessment of the candidate's Professional Activity relative to the expectations for this review, using overall quality terms such as "excellent," "within expectations," "needs improvement," or "unsatisfactory."
- V. Overall conclusion.

3C. Minority Reports

Include any Minority Reports submitted to the Evaluation Committee Report or to the Department Evaluation. If the Procedures indicate that none were received, add the note "(None)" in the Contents List and omit this file subdivision.

3D. Candidate Response(s)

Include any candidate response(s) to the Evaluation Committee Report and/or to Minority Reports or the Department Evaluation and recommendation. If the Procedures indicate that none were received, add the note "(None)" in the Contents List and omit this file subdivision.

Section 4. Format for Self Evaluation¹

The purpose of self evaluation is twofold. First, it serves as an instrument for specifying one's plans and goals regarding the contribution to the College, honestly assessing the degree to which these plans/goals were acted on, and indicating future plans/goals. Second, it is a means of informing the Department and the College about the actual contributions made. A useful self evaluation shall address all the assessment categories relevant for the evaluation period in the form of a reflective self-assessment. The following format should be used:

¹ **EXPLANATION:** Much of the content of the Self-Evaluation description has been modified to reflect actual practices of most candidates over the last 15 years.

Introduction: Overall goals and expectations and specific goals and expectations at the stage of the present review. Candidates for Tenure, Promotion to Associate Professor, or Promotion to Professor will include discussion of the criteria for those reviews.

I. Teaching

- a. Overall approach and methods, specific methods of in-class teaching (face-to-face or virtual) and non-classroom contacts (office hours, conferences, etc.).
- b. Table of courses by semester for the evaluation period. If course releases or leaves were granted, note this in the applicable semester(s).
- c. Self-assessment of achievements and of strengths, weaknesses, problem areas, and changes or plans for correcting problems. It is not necessary to comment on each course specifically, but it will be natural to speak of particular problems as well as courses and developments in teaching that have been particularly satisfying.
- d. Response to peer classroom observations and student evaluations. Do peer evaluations or student evaluations provide accurate assessments of strengths/weaknesses? If not, why? What steps were taken to correct real problems, if any, identified in peer observations and/or student evaluations?
- e. Reflective self-summary of teaching and goals and expectations for the future.

II. Service

- a. Overall approach to service, including focus as between Department, College, and other service areas. Note any shifts in service focus over the evaluation period or since earlier evaluations.
- b. Table or list of service roles during the evaluation period, with inclusive dates. Divide into Department, School, College, and Community service as relevant. Note that service on a particular body may begin during a prior evaluation period or extend into the future, but is relevant if service was provided during this evaluation period.
- c. Note particular large-scale contributions, such as preparation of Five-Year Review sections, assessment administration, chairing a committee, or others.
- d. Reflective self-evaluation on service. Note particular strengths, satisfying service roles, and/or weaknesses. Note any problems or tradeoffs between service demands and demands of other roles, especially Professional Activity. Indicate goals and expectations for the future. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should specifically address the Criteria for these steps.

III. Professional Activity

- a. Define the area of professional development, including relevant specializations if any. A career arc and any prior accomplishments may be briefly mentioned as background, but the self-evaluation should be based on work during the evaluation period.
 - b. Table or list of professional activity during the evaluation period, based on “Specifications” in Part I, Section 2 Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure, C Criteria, 3 Professional Activity. Information on publications, etc., does not have to be in full bibliographical format as the CV should provide this information in format. Dates for publications, conferences, exhibitions, etc., should be provided (including dates of publication in dual formats if applicable). Mention any relevant metrics of professional activity.
 - c. Reflective self-evaluation of Professional Activity, including conflicts or tradeoffs with other areas of work and goals and expectations for the future. Candidates for tenure and/or promotion should specifically address the Criteria for these steps.
- IV. Overall reflective self-summary, including fulfillment of Criteria for this evaluation, problem areas if any, goals and expectations for the future.

Section 5. Current Curriculum Vitae

Distinct disciplinary norms as well as individual preferences may result in different formats for the CV. ARPT does not mandate a specific format, but note that sections and any subdivisions within sections should be clear to readers. The Department Evaluation should clarify any items likely to be unclear. Publications, conference presentations, etc., should be formatted according to disciplinary norms.

Section 6. Peer Evaluations Subfile

6A. Peer Classroom Observation Reports

Include peer classroom observations reports for all classes observed during the evaluation period, with the most recent first.

6B. Internal Evaluation Letters

Include a sample solicitation letter (individual solicitation letters are not needed unless markedly different) and all letters received in response to solicitations. Letters should be

solicited based on a list developed by the candidate and the evaluation committee. The soliciting letters should be written by an evaluation committee member, never by the candidate.

Letters should pertain to School and College service during the evaluation period and should be specific to that service; general “good citizen” letters are discouraged. Letters must have been written during the last year except in special circumstances (e.g., in a Tenure review, a letter written for an earlier reappointment evaluation may be used if the writer has left the College and no one on the current service body is in a position to attest to the service).

External letters on Community Service, if any, will be placed in the External Evaluation Letters Subfile. In the case of reappointments, internal letters from peers are mandatory while external letters are optional. In Tenure and Promotion cases, both internal and external letters are mandatory. For external letters information, see Section 11 below.

Section 7. Student Evaluations Subfile

This subfile will include:

- (a)** List of all courses taught during the evaluation period, by semester (if not included earlier).
- (b)** Student evaluations (histograms and narrative comments) for the evaluation period. These will be attached in chronological order, starting with the most recent.

NOTE: Where Departments may use specialized evaluation forms of their own, they must also use the official College-wide forms, which will receive the most weight in ARPT’s evaluation.

Section 8. Syllabi and Examinations Subfile

This subfile will include:

- (a)** The syllabi for all courses taught during the evaluation period. For courses taught repeatedly, include only the most recent syllabus. If course design has changed markedly, a sample of the older design may optionally be included.
- (b)** Samples of additional materials that the teacher uses, such as copies of examinations, guidelines for preparing papers, classroom discussion sheets, and any other materials that document interest, motivation, and performance. Coverage should be selective: important additional materials, not all; one example of each type, and so on.

Section 9: Documentation of Service Subfile¹

It is assumed that School and College Service will predominantly be attested by internal evaluation letters, and Community Service by external letters, placed in those subfiles. This subfile will contain such additional documentation as may be necessary, such as evidence of attendance at Academic Standing hearings, committee minutes, a report or resolution drafted for a committee, etc. Candidates and departments are advised to include only what is necessary to attest to a specific service, rather than an exhaustive record of such service.²

Section 10. Documentation of Professional Activity Subfile

This subfile will include the following, as applicable:

(a) Copies of publications

(b) For publications on submission or resubmission, or accepted but not yet published, the text plus evidence of submission/acceptance status, such as contracts, letters, emails, etc.

NOTE to **(a)** and **(b)**: For large-scale works such as a book, photocopies of the title, contents, and a chapter may optionally be included in place of the whole work

(c) Documents regarding exhibitions, performances, public lectures, or media appearances, etc.

(d) For conference papers/presentations: paper text or presentation script; evidence of participation (such as highlighted listing in the conference program). Indicate such items as poster presentations, etc.

Section 11. External Letters of Evaluation Subfile

11A. External Letters on Community Service

Include sample solicitation letter. Include all letters received.

11B. External Letters on Professional Activity (Mandatory for Tenure and Promotion)

¹ **EXPLANATION:** New. For whatever reason, 2003 Manual lacks such a section.

² See discussion of types of documentation in Part I above, under Evidence of Service.

At least three letters are required in reviews for Tenure and/or Promotion to Associate Professor, and at least five in reviews for Promotion to Professor. All letters shall have been written in the last year, except in special circumstances (e.g., the evaluator for an earlier item is no longer able to provide a current evaluation). It is assumed that some letters will focus on specific activities (e.g., a book chapter for which the evaluator was the editor; the candidate's guest-editing of a special journal issue); at least one should be an overall review of professional production during the evaluation period. For guidelines on selecting evaluators, see Part I, Section 2, C. Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure, 3. Professional Activity, Evidence (d) i-iii. The following additional guidelines should be followed:

- a. Send requests for internal and, especially, external letters as soon as possible after the evaluation committee is formed. Use a standard format, which may be varied to include requests for comment on specific work. Include dates of the evaluation period and, for external letters, a request for specification of the evaluator's prior relationship to the candidate, if any. Include a due date, which should be well in advance of the Department's consideration to allow time for lateness and followup requests. Solicitations should specify that letters be on letterhead and sent in hard copy, though electronic transmissions are acceptable pending receipt of hard copies.
- b. In all cases, the request shall be made by a member of the evaluation committee, never by the candidate.
- c. For external letters, the list of potential evaluators should be larger than needed to allow for refusals and nonresponses. The list may be prioritized so that more desirable evaluators are addressed first.
- d. Establish a list of work during the evaluation period that is to be sent to evaluators. The list should include the candidate's CV and may include a statement of Old Westbury's expectations for tenure and/or promotion (to Associate Professor or to Professor, as relevant) regarding professional development.
- e. Establish a method of supplying the listed materials to the evaluators, whether by standard mail or posting to an accessible online link, and mention this method in the solicitation.
- f. Include all received letters in the file.

Section 12. Previous Department and ARPT Recommendations Subfile

All previous Department and ARPT recommendations shall be included (except in the case of the first reappointment), in reverse chronological order, starting with the most recent.

[Sections 13-15 from 2003 Manual are omitted]¹

¹ **EXPLANATION:** Section 13, on format and pagination, is omitted as covered elsewhere, and because it refers to requirements of the Collective Bargaining Agreement not now included in that document. Section 14 is omitted because this material, where relevant, has been integrated into the overall description of file preparation. Section 15 on access to Personnel Files is omitted here as it does not relate to preparation of files; it is transferred to Part IV, Additional Related Policies, and also mentioned under “Candidates’ Rights” above.

PART III: ARPT AUTHORITY AND PROCEDURES

Section 1: ARPT Membership, Authority, and Procedures from Bylaws¹

Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee (ARPT)

1. Purpose:

The ARPT Committee shall review candidates for initial appointment, reappointment, continuing appointment and promotion under strict rules of confidentiality and shall develop policy as follows:

- (a) In cases of reappointment, promotion and tenure it shall review department/school recommendations in terms of the Criteria established by the College for Faculty and listed in the ARPT manual (see Appendix III) and make recommendations based on the Preamble to those Criteria and the categories outlined in the Criteria.
- (b) In cases of initial appointment, it shall review department/school or search committee recommendations in at least two respects: how well proposed appointments fit college-wide and department/school priorities that have been established; how well department/school recruiting procedures and the results thereof have carried out the College's specific affirmative action goals (See Article VII, Preamble).²
- (c) Recommend to the President, through the Academic Vice President, all initial appointments to Academic or Qualified Academic Rank (other than visiting or adjunct staff), reappointment, continuing appointments and promotions.
- (d) Develop and apply instruments for student evaluation of faculty.
- (e) Provide departments/schools and candidates with outlines of the materials and information needed by the Committee to make its recommendations, and provide and keep current a manual containing a format for the collection and submission of such materials.
- (f) Provide departments/schools and candidates with timetables for the submission of recommendations and materials that will allow the Committee to complete its work well

¹ This section is taken from Bylaws, 2016 edition, Article VII, Section B. Footnotes indicate procedures ARPT has adapted in practice, which are elaborated in Section 2, Modifications to ARPT Procedures. **[EXPLANATION:** We can't make changes in this section as language is from the Bylaws. Needed modifications are covered in Sec. 2.]

² NOTE: There is no corresponding language in Article VII, Preamble, in the 2016 Bylaws. In Part I above, see Section 2, Criteria for Reappointment and Tenure, Preamble, for the Criteria Preamble referred to in (a).

within the notification deadlines established in the Policies and the Contract, and allowing time for appeals as provided in this Section.

- (g) Encourage departments/schools to develop useful and regular faculty assessment and support such processes, including processes involving the hiring, assessment and retention of adjunct faculty.
- (h) Ensure uniformity of department/school and college standards in the evaluation of faculty.

2. Membership:

- (a) The Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee shall consist of seven faculty representatives as follows: one representative (tenured) each from the Schools of Business and Education, three representatives (tenured) from the School of Arts and Sciences and two at-large representatives (one of which must be untenured), with no more than one representative from any one department. Faculty representatives to the Committee shall, as nearly as possible, be balanced in terms of the College's affirmative action goals (see Article VII, Preamble).¹
- (b) Faculty with management confidential appointments, whether solely or jointly with a faculty appointment, cannot participate in, or vote in, the faculty governance reappointment, promotion, and tenure process. No faculty may serve during the year in which they apply for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure, following a (1) year reappointment (warning reappointment) or in their terminal year.
- (c) Any member of the Committee who has previously voted on or aided in the preparation of a candidate's file shall recuse him or herself from the proceedings during a review process.²
- (d) The Chair shall receive one course release each semester.

3. Term:

The committee members shall be elected for staggered terms of two years so that three or four members of the committee will be replaced every year. For the initial implementation of this provision, please see 2006 Bylaws.

4. Procedures:

- (a) The specific procedures and procedural requirements for the functioning of this committee are codified in the ARPT Manual (Appendix III), which is part of the Bylaws and must be

¹ NOTE: There is no corresponding language in Article VII, Preamble, in the 2016 Bylaws.

² NOTE: Modified in current ARPT practice; see Section 2.

adhered to for all cases coming under the aegis of ARPT. Subcommittees of the ARPT Committee may be constituted only from within the membership of the ARPT Committee.

(b) Preliminary Screening

- (1) For all cases involving initial appointment (other than visiting or adjunct staff) reappointment, continuing appointment or promotion, a department/school must forward a file containing its recommendation to the ARPT. A three-person subcommittee¹ will review each file for completeness, accuracy and consistency in accordance with the Committee's Manual. If the file is incomplete, the department/school and, in cases of reappointment, promotion and tenure, the candidate will be consulted.
- (2) In initial appointment cases, a department/school (or in the case of departments being introduced, a properly constituted search panel) shall forward a file containing its recommendation, including an explanation of how the appointment will fill the priorities established for the line and documentation on the search and candidate, according to the procedures established in the ARPT manual. In no case shall a candidate, whose nomination has failed to follow these procedures, be appointed to the College Faculty, providing--it is understood--that the Committee shall deal in a timely fashion with the recommendations presented to it.
- (3) In reappointment, promotion and tenure cases, the department/school shall submit a file containing the materials specified by the ARPT Manual:
 - (a) a candidate has the right to respond to the department/school's recommendations or amplify them orally or in writing; a candidate may also initiate an action by the ARPT Committee by filing with the Committee in writing a proposal for his or her own reappointment, promotion, or tenure;
 - (b) additional materials may be added to the file only with the candidate's knowledge; the candidate may add new materials to the file at any time to support his/her reply to a particular stage of the review or recommendation before it is sent to the President.
- (4) When the file is complete, the ARPT subcommittee shall examine the department/school's recommendation to determine that it is consistent with the file and shall make a recommendation for action to the whole committee.

(c) Action

¹ Superseded in current ARPT procedures; see Section 2.

- (1) In all reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases, after action on the case, the Committee shall submit its recommendation, negative or positive, together with its reasons for so recommending, in writing to the candidate, the department/school and the Academic Vice President (for comment and forwarding to the President). In the case of split or negative votes in the department/school in regard to reappointment, promotion or tenure, the committee may request personal reports and/or interview candidates. In initial appointments, if ARPT concurs with the department/school recommendation, it will send the file on with a brief note of concurrence. If not, it will provide a full rationale for disagreement.
- (2) When a negative recommendation is contemplated,
 - (a) in the case of initial appointment, the Committee shall provide opportunity for discussion to be held between the affected department/school or search panel and the Committee before final action;
 - (b) in case of reappointment, tenure and promotion, the candidate shall be informed in writing and given the opportunity to appeal to the Committee before the recommendation is forwarded. For the purposes of this section, a "negative recommendation" is defined as one denying reappointment, promotion or tenure, but not one which recommends reappointment for a term different from that proposed by the department/school or candidate. A notice of intention to appeal shall be timely, but in any case shall be made in writing by the candidate no later than ten days after being formally notified of the anticipated negative recommendation. To permit such appeal and response, a candidate shall be supplied with a written statement providing any pertinent information immediately subsequent to a candidate's notice of intention to appeal. Such an appeal shall be made in writing, except that at the discretion of the Committee, it may be conducted, in whole or in part, in the form of an interview with the candidate. (Normally, candidates who have already been interviewed will not be expected to appear again before the Committee.)
 - (c) candidates shall also have the right to respond to a negative recommendation by the Committee prior to a final decision by the President. Such response shall be made in writing to the President.
- (3) The Committee may, at its discretion, interview candidates. It also may interview other relevant personnel provided the candidate is notified and has access to a summary of the proceedings with sufficient time for a response.
- (4) A copy of the ARPT recommendation shall simultaneously be provided by the Committee to the candidate and to the Chair of his or her department and Dean of his or her school.

(5) The Chair of ARPT shall meet the Academic Vice President to discuss cases prior to the Academic Vice President arriving at a decision.¹

(6) The President or designee shall meet with the Committee or its representatives to discuss decisions prior to issuing them formally. The President must be provided a minimum of fifteen working days to review recommendations and documentation.

(7) Nothing contained herein shall foreclose a candidate from utilizing the grievance procedures provided for in the Contract in cases where applicable.

[Section **d**, Administrator evaluations, is omitted. It is briefly summarized in the general Introduction above. For full text, see Bylaws.]

- 5. Reporting:** The committee shall issue each term a summary report to the Senate of its actions taken, including how these compare with School or Department recommendations and with administrative disposition of the Committee's recommendations. (Such a summary report is not expected to include reasons for the Committee's actions.) In addition, the Committee shall apprise the Faculty Senate of recurrent problems that arise in its work and shall make recommendations for alterations in its composition and procedures or in the Criteria when appropriate.

Section 2. Modifications to ARPT Procedures²

ARPT has found it necessary to modify some procedures over time. This section specifies when and why such changes may be made and lists some changes made since the 2003 Manual that are not reflected in the present (i.e., 2016) Bylaws language.

- 1. Modification of ARPT Procedures.** ARPT may modify procedures for administrative or other reasons provided that **(a)** no modification shall eliminate ARPT oversight of initial appointment or of reappointment, tenure, and promotion, and **(b)** no modification shall create a power for ARPT not stated or implied in the procedures enumerated above.
- 2. Recusals.** For the purpose of avoiding conflicts of interest, the provision on recusal of ARPT members who have previously voted on or participated in preparing a candidate's file (section 2.c above) is now interpreted to provide that any ARPT member who is a member of a candidate's Department shall recuse her/himself.
- 3. Screening by ARPT.** ARPT having found screening by a three-member subcommittee

¹ This and the following provision are modified in current ARPT practice; see Section 2.

² **EXPLANATION:** New. There was no such section in the 2003 *Manual*.

(sections 4.b.1 and 4 above) impractical, initial appointment files are now screened by the ARPT chair and referred to the full Committee if a negative recommendation is contemplated, and reappointment, tenure, and promotion files are now screened by all ARPT members who will vote on the file.

- 4. Compliance with Bylaws and Manual.** To ensure compliance with the Bylaws and Manual, and consistency in Departments' evaluation procedures (sections 1.a and h, 4.a, and 4.b.3 above), ARPT, after preliminary screening (section 4.b above) and before taking action, i.e., making a recommendation on the file, may identify and bring to the Department's attention missing or incorrect information, missing documents, and/or failure to adhere to the evaluation criteria and other requirements specified in this Manual. When possible, the deficiencies shall be corrected before, at, or immediately following the presentation of the file to ARPT. If more substantial revision is required, ARPT may return the file to the Department for revision and, if necessary, a re-vote, and, after revisions have been received, will take action, i.e., make a recommendation and forward the file for administrative consideration (section 4.c above). ARPT shall make every effort to complete action within POBT-collective bargaining-mandated notification dates.
- 5. Administrative Consultation.** The provisions for meeting with ARPT prior to decision-making by the Administrative Vice-President and the President (sections 4.c.5-6 above) are now understood to mean such meetings will occur at ARPT's request, rather than as a required procedure.

Section 3. Forms for the Use of ARPT

ARPT shall maintain a standard form for members' use in note-taking; attendance and ballot forms; and a standard template for preparing ARPT recommendation letters. (See Addendum B.) These may be modified as needed.

PART IV: ADDITIONAL RELEVANT POLICIES¹

Introduction: This section is included primarily for reference. It will not need to be considered during most appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases, in which the candidate, Department, and ARPT must follow the criteria and procedures in Parts I-III. It contains governing policies of the Policies of the Board of Trustees (POBT) and the Agreement between the UUP and the State of New York that are assumed in those sections, and that may be relevant in some cases.²

I. Authority of the POBT and the Agreement

The processes of evaluation, reappointment and promotion are governed by the Policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees and Article 30 of the Agreement between the UUP and the State of New York, sections 1 and 2. The Article states:

30.1 Appointments

Appointments of employees shall be made in accordance with Article XI of the Policies.

30.2 Evaluation and Promotion

- (a) Evaluation and promotion of employees shall be made in accordance with Article XII of the Policies.
- (b) Subject to provisions of this Agreement, the systems for evaluation and promotion of professional employees shall be as specified in the Memorandum of Understanding dated September 30, 1981, between the University and the UUP relating to a system of evaluation for professional employees, and the system of promotion for professional employees shall be as specified in the Memorandum of Understanding dated August 8, 1989, between the University and the UUP relating to a system of promotion for professional employees. Such Memoranda of Understanding shall be statements of mutual intentions and shall not constitute agreements under Article 14 of the Civil Service Law or for any other purpose.³

¹ **EXPLANATION:** Substantively the new section is the same as in 2003, with some sections divided or rearranged. Some less relevant material has been shortened or omitted, with a note, and new or revised headings have been supplied.

² Provisions of POBT and the Agreement are those current as of the date of this Manual. ARPT is charged with monitoring both documents from time to time for updating.

³ **EXPLANATION:** Included in the 2003 but deleted here because not in current contract: “**30.3.** The procedural steps of the Policies involving matters of appointment, evaluation or promotion of employees shall be subject to review in accordance with Article 7. Grievance Procedure.”

II. Provisions on Academic Freedom and Non-Discrimination

Article 9 safeguards academic freedom while Article 10 prohibits discrimination.

Article 9: Academic Freedom:

9.1 It is the policy of the University to maintain and encourage full freedom, within the law, of inquiry, teaching and research. In the exercise of this freedom, faculty members may, without limitation, discuss their own subject in the classroom; they may not, however, claim as their right the privilege of discussing in their classroom controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.

9.2 The principle of academic freedom shall be accompanied by a corresponding principle of responsibility.

9.3 In their role as citizens, employees have the same freedoms as other citizens. However, in their extramural utterances, employees have an obligation to indicate that they are not institutional spokespersons.

Article 10: No Discrimination:

10.1 The State agrees to continue its established policy prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and all forms of illegal discrimination, including but not limited to discrimination with regard to race, creed, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability or marital status.

10.2 UUP agrees to continue its established policy prohibiting discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and all forms of illegal discrimination, including but not limited to discrimination with regard to race, creed, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability or marital status.

10.3 Neither the State nor UUP shall deliberately discriminate against an employee as a result of the proper exercise of the employee's rights guaranteed by the Public Employees' Fair Employment Act.

10.4 Claims of illegal discrimination under Sections 10.1 and 10.2 shall, at the election of the employee, be subject to review, in accordance with State and Federal procedures, established for such purpose, but shall not be subject to review under provision of Article 7, Grievance Procedure, of this agreement.

10.5 Claims of illegal discrimination under Section 10.3 shall be subject to review under either provisions of Article 7, Grievance Procedure, of this Agreement, or provisions of the Public Employees' Fair Employment Act at the election of the employee, but in no event shall the employee be permitted to elect review in both forums.

III. Grievance Procedure, as Related to Appointment, Evaluation, and Promotion

Article 7, Section 2 of the UUP Agreement states:

A grievance is a dispute concerning the interpretation, application or claimed violation of a specific term or provision of this Agreement; provided, however, that with respect to matters involving appointment, evaluation and promotion of employees, a grievance shall be deemed to mean a claimed failure by the State to follow the procedural steps relating to appointment, evaluation and promotion of employees contained in the policies of the Board of Trustees in Article XI, Title A, Section 1; Article XI, Title D, Section 5; Article XII, Title A, Section 3; Article XII, Title B, Section 1; and Article XII, Title C, Sections 3 and 4.

NOTE: Article 7 contains additional procedures for other types of grievance.

IV. Requirement of Consultation

The Board of Trustees in its policies requires the President to seek advice of appropriate bodies in making recommendations for reappointment and promotion to the Chancellor. These policies are also a part of the agreement between UUP and SUNY.

Article XI of the POBT on the Appointment of Professional Staff states:

Procedure. The chief administrative officer of a college, after seeking consultation, may appoint, reappoint or recommend to the Chancellor for appointment or reappointment, as may be appropriate to the nature of appointment provided for herein, such persons as are, in the chief administrator's judgment, best qualified.

Article XII of the POBT on Promotion of Academic Employees states:

Title B. Promotion of Academic Employees

Procedure: The chief administrative officer of a college, after giving consideration to recommendations of academic employees, including the committees, if any, of the appropriate department or professional area and other appropriate sources in connection with the promotion of a specific academic employee, may promote, or recommend to the Chancellor for promotion, such persons as are, in the chief administrative officer's judgment, best qualified.

The bodies involved in the process of reappointment or promotion are identified in Article 33 of the UUP Agreement:

Article 33. Section 33.1

(a) "Initial Academic Review" shall mean a review and recommendation by a committee of academic employees at the departmental level or, in the event academic employees are not organized along departmental lines, at the division, school, college or other academic employee organizational level next

higher than the departmental level, which may exist for the purpose of evaluating an academic employee for continuing appointment.

(b) "Subsequent academic review" shall mean a review and recommendation by a committee of academic employees at the division, school, college or other academic employee organizational level next higher than the initial academic review committee which may exist for the purpose of evaluating an academic employee for continuing appointment.

NOTE: In the context of College at Old Westbury, the initial academic review committee is the Department and the subsequent academic review committee is the Appointment, Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Committee.

V. Eligibility for Appointment and Deadlines in Case of Nonreappointment

The conditions regarding the eligibility for appointment, reappointment (term appointment), and reappointment with tenure (continuing appointment) are specified in Article XI of the Policies of the Board of Trustees:

Eligibility for Appointment and Reappointment

Title B: Continuing Appointment

Definition: A continuing appointment shall be an appointment to a position of academic rank which shall not be affected by changes in such rank and shall continue until resignation, retirement or termination in accordance with these Policies.

Method of Appointment: The Chancellor, after considering the recommendation of the chief administrative officer of the college concerned, and except as hereinafter permitted with respect to appointment of Distinguished, Distinguished Service, Distinguished Teaching and University Professors, may grant continuing appointment to such persons who, in the Chancellor's judgment, are best qualified.

Eligibility: (a) Continuing appointment as Professor, Associate Professor or Librarian ... may be given by the Chancellor on initial appointment or thereafter. Except as provided in subdivision (c) of this section, further employment as Professor, Associate Professor or Librarian after the third consecutive year of service in any one or several of these ranks at any one college must be on the basis of continuing appointment; provided, however, such appointment shall not be made effective until made so by the Chancellor.

(b) Continuing appointment as Assistant Professor, Instructor, Senior Assistant Librarian or Assistant Librarian. Except as provided in subdivision (c) of this section, further employment at any college of an appointee who has completed a total of seven years of service in a position or positions of academic rank of which the last three consecutive years have been in a position of academic rank at that college as Assistant Professor, Instructor, Senior Assistant Librarian or Assistant Librarian must be on the basis

of continuing appointment; provided, however, such appointment shall not be effective until made so by the Chancellor.

(c) Additional Term Appointment. An academic employee holding a continuing or term appointment at one college who is appointed to academic rank at another college may be given that appointment for a term not to exceed three years.

(d) Service Credit. (1) In determining eligibility for continuing appointment under subsection (b) of this section, satisfactory full-time prior service in academic rank¹ at any other accredited academic institution of higher education may, at the request of the appointee and in the discretion of the Chancellor, or designee, be credited as service, up to a maximum of three years, at the time of appointment at a college.

(2) In computing consecutive years of service for the purposes of appointment or reappointment to the academic staff, periods of leave of absence at full salary shall be included; periods of leave of absence at partial salary or without salary and periods of part-time service shall not be included, but shall not be deemed an interruption of otherwise consecutive service.

Title D: Term Appointment

Definition: Except as provided in Section 6 of this Title, a term appointment shall be an appointment for a specified period of not more than three years which shall automatically expire at the end of that period unless terminated earlier because of resignation, retirement or termination as provided for in these Policies.

Eligibility: A term appointment may be given to any person appointed to or serving in a position designated as being in the Professional Services Negotiating Unit.

Method of Appointment: All term appointments shall be made by the chief administrative officer of the college and shall be reported to the Chancellor.

Renewal of Term: Except as provided in this Article, term appointments may be renewed by the chief administrative officer of the college for successive periods of not more than three years each; such renewals shall be reported to the Chancellor. No term appointment, of itself, shall be deemed to create any manner of legal right, interest or expectancy in any other appointment or renewal.

Title F. Temporary Appointment

Definition: A temporary appointment shall be an appointment which may be terminated at any time. Temporary appointments ordinarily shall be given only when service is to be part-time, ... voluntary or anticipated to be for a period of one year or less....²

¹ "Academic rank" includes such ranks as Assistant and Associate Professor and Professor, and equivalent Library ranks. "Qualified academic rank" includes these and similar titles with "visiting" or similar designations, as well as Lecturers. Prior service in a position of qualified academic rank may not count toward continuing appointment. (ARPT note)

² Additional language in this section, omitted here, applies to professional rather than academic employees.

Eligibility: A temporary appointment may be given to any person appointed to or serving in a position designated as being in the Professional Services Negotiating Unit.

Method of Appointment: Temporary appointments shall be made by the chief administrative officer of the college; such appointments shall be reported to the Chancellor.

Deadlines for Notification

The deadline for notification of the employees in case of nonreappointment status is specified by Article 32 of the Agreement and corresponding Article XI of the Policies of the Board of Trustees.

Title D. Term Appointment

Article 32: Notice of Non-Renewal

32.1 Written notice that a term appointment is not to be renewed upon expiration is to be given to the employee by the College President, or designee, not less than:

- a. 45 calendar days prior to the end of a part-time service term agreement;
- b. Three months prior to the end of a term expiring at the end of an appointee's first year of uninterrupted service within the University;
- c. Six months prior to the end of a term expiring after the completion of one, but not more than two years of an appointee's uninterrupted service within the University. For such employees serving on the basis of an academic year professional obligation...notice shall be given no later than December 15.
- d. Twelve months prior to the expiration of a term after two or more years of uninterrupted service within the University.

NOTE: Please see Addendum C for information on evaluation of Temporary and Non-Tenure Track Term Appointment Faculty.

VI. Access to the Personnel File

The rules regarding maintenance and access to the personnel file are stated in Section 31 of the Agreement between UUP and the State of New York. This article pertains to access to the employee's official personnel file in a variety of situations. Sections 31.6 (a) and (c) relate specifically to the candidate's ARPT file. Section 31.6 (d) is also relevant.

31.6a Where, in connection with consideration of an academic employee for appointment, reappointment or promotion, a file of evaluative material is developed by a committee or committees of academic employees which may exist to evaluate and make recommendations with respect to appointment, reappointment or promotion of an academic employee, and where such file is first submitted to the last management administrative officer of the College for consideration, the academic employee to whom the file pertains shall, subject to subdivision (d), have at least five (5) working days to both examine such file and file a statement in response to any item contained therein; provided, however, statements solicited in connection with the employee's appointment, reappointment, or promotion and any documents which would identify the source of the statements, shall not be available to the employee.

c. Examination of the file and response to material contained therein to which the employee has access pursuant to subdivision 31.6(a) ... shall take place after the file has been submitted to the management administrative officer of the College, but prior to this officer's consideration of its content. The management administrative officer of the College, or designee, shall notify the employee as to the specific place, dates and times when the file will be available for purposes of subdivision 31.6(a).... Following expiration of the period allotted for employee's examination and response, the management administrative officer of the College may proceed to consider the content of such file.

d. Nothing contained herein shall prevent the management administrative officer of the College referred to in subdivision (c) or the College President from taking such action as the College President may deem necessary to meet notice requirements in the event of nonrenewal of term appointments.

draft

draft

draft

ADDENDA AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

draft

draft

draft

Addendum A

EVALUATION FILE AND DEPARTMENT EVALUATION SIGN-OFF SHEET*

Department: _____

Candidate: _____

Faculty Name (Print)	Evaluation File		Department Evaluation	
	Initials	Date	Initials	Date
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

*All faculty members who voted on the file must indicate that they have read both the file and the Department Evaluation. The heading "Department Evaluation" refers to the finalized Evaluation and is understood as applying to the Library and to multi-Department voting units.

Addendum B. ARPT Forms

a. ARPT shall maintain the following forms for members' use:

1. Candidate File and Discussion Note Sheet
2. File Readers' Sign-In Sheet
3. Meeting Attendance Sheet
4. Candidate Presentation Attendance Sheet
5. Ballot Form
6. Template for ARPT Recommendation Letter

These may be revised, and other forms added, from time to time as appropriate.

b. Item **2**, with signatures, shall become part of the candidate's file. Items **3-4**, with signatures, shall be maintained for each meeting at which candidates' files were presented, and for each candidate, in the ARPT office. Item **5**, as completed for each case on which a vote was taken, shall be so maintained under seal.

Addendum C. Evaluation of Temporary Faculty and Faculty on Non-Tenure Track Term Appointments

Temporary faculty and faculty on non-tenure track term appointments (see Titles D and F of Article XII of POBT) shall be evaluated by their Departments on a yearly basis. Each Department will develop its own mechanism for evaluation, addressing such work areas as may be determined to be relevant, and shall forward a written copy of the procedures to ARPT.

[Appendices III-V in 2003 Manual are omitted.]¹

¹ **EXPLANATION:** The 2003 Manual, as currently available, includes Bylaws Appendices III-V, as then numbered. However, the 2003 Manual proper consists only of Bylaws Appendix II (now numbered III). The three appendices just mentioned are appendices to other parts of the Bylaws, appear in the 2016 Bylaws as Appendices IV-VI, and are therefore omitted here.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Policies of the Board of Trustees:

<http://www.suny.edu/about/leadership/board-of-trustees/>

On this page, click [Policies of the Board of Trustees](#) [Word Document]

United University Professions (UUP):

uupinfo.org

Old Westbury Faculty Bylaws, 2016 edition:

<https://sites.google.com/site/oldwestburyfacultysenate/bylaws-policies-etc-1>

On this page, click [Faculty Bylaws \(2016\)](#)

Review Committee:

Madeline Crocitto, Dept. of Management, Marketing, and Finance, School of Business

Amanda Frisken, Dept. of American Studies, School of Arts and Sciences

Julio Gonzalez, Dept. of Exceptional Education and Learning, School of Education

Christopher Hobson, Dept. of English, School of Arts and Sciences

Martha Livingston, Dept. of Public Health, School of Arts and Sciences

Kathleen O'Connor-Bater, Dept. of Modern Languages, School of Arts and Sciences