

**SUNY Old Westbury
Faculty University Awards Committee
Guidelines for Nominations**

The Faculty University Awards Committee (FUAC) evaluates candidates for promotion to the Distinguished ranks, SUNY's highest academic rank and conferred solely by the Board of Trustees. The FUAC reviews nominations for Shared Governance for the campus to be recognized for its work done through Faculty Senate. The FUAC also reviews all internal nominations for the six Chancellor's Awards for Excellence: Teaching; Adjunct Teaching; Faculty Service; Librarianship; Professional Service; and Scholarship and Creative Activities. The Awards for Excellence are System-level honors conferred to acknowledge consistently superior professional achievement (i.e., at the national and international levels) and to encourage the ongoing pursuit of excellence. As required by SUNY, the FUAC is the campus governance structure that elicits nominations, engages in an objective and rigorous campus review of the merits of the nominations, and recommends to the campus President the candidates to forward to the System Administration level. Ensuring best practices, FUAC members from the same department as a nominee, will recuse themselves from the deliberations and vote on the award for which the candidate was nominated. **All deliberations of the campus committee remain strictly confidential. Additionally, consistent with best practices to prevent any conflicts of interest: 1) a nominee for an award should not be nominating another person for another award during the same award cycle; 2) nominators should only nominate one person for an award per award cycle; 3) since the awards are for faculty and staff and are reviewed by faculty and staff, Deans should not nominate anyone and should not offer letters of support; letters of support should come from faculty and peers that can speak specifically to the quality of the work and accomplishments of the nominee under consideration; and 3) in the case where a Department has a smaller group of faculty, faculty are on sabbatical, or other types of leave and senior faculty are unavailable to write a letter of support, a justification in the nominator letter should be made so that an exception can be granted to use a Dean in lieu of faculty to nominate a candidate (i.e., this is the only exception within the best practices guidelines noted above with point 3).**

The FUAC has digitized the nomination files using Interfolio, the same software being used for ARPT files. The Interfolio system ensures appropriate access to the system as well as evidence of the ability to maintain confidentiality. The files will be uploaded and submitted electronically. All inquiries regarding a candidate should be directed to the Chair/Co-Chairs of the FUAC, who will also formally notify candidates and their nominators of the Committees' final decisions.

Table of Contents

Chancellor’s Awards for Excellence Guidelines.....	3-11
<i>Excellence in Faculty Service</i>	3
<i>Excellence in Librarianship</i>	4
<i>Excellence in Professional Service</i>	5-6
<i>Excellence in Scholarship and Creative Activities</i>	7-9
<i>Excellence in Teaching</i>	10-11
<i>Excellence in Adjunct Teaching</i>	12-13
Shared Governance Award.....	14
Distinguished Faculty Ranks.....	15-26
<i>Distinguished Professorship</i>	17-18
<i>Distinguished Service Professorship</i>	19-20
<i>Distinguished Teaching Professorship</i>	21-24
<i>Distinguished Librarianship</i>	25-26

CHANCELLOR'S AWARDS IN EXCELLENCE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

All nominators are required to review and ensure that the candidate they would like to put forth to be considered for a specific award meets the eligibility criteria. If a candidate does not meet the eligibility criteria, the nomination portfolio will be returned without further review and/or feedback. For more details please review the documents at <https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/chancellors-excellence-awards/ChancellorExcellenceAwards-PoliciesProcedures-2020-2022.pdf>

The following sections outline how to construct each nomination portfolio for a specific SUNY-level award

I-EXCELLENCE IN FACULTY SERVICE (EIFS)

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistently superior service with objective evidence.
 - Should clearly organize evidence of service at the campus, the State University, the local community, contributions at the regional, state-wide, national and/or international levels.
 - Should include evidence of service contributions to the discipline or disciplinary and professional organizations and societies.
 - Should include evidence of leadership in local or system-wide faculty governance.
3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - Should clearly describe with evidence how their service exceeds the work generally considered to be a part of the candidate's basic professional obligation (e.g., professional committees, etc.).
 - Should clearly include service that exceeds that for which faculty are normally compensated.
 - Should clearly demonstrate positive evidence of outstanding achievement and skill in providing leadership, outreach, and/or other University and/or community service and/or extraordinary service and leadership in the nominee's professional organizations.
 - Should clearly demonstrate with evidence that the service they engaged in extends over multiple years, geared towards effecting positive change and must involve the generous giving or personal time in service areas.
4. Curriculum Vitae
5. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
6. Evidence of Campus Service
7. Evidence of Faculty Governance Service (Campus & State University)
8. Evidence of Professional Service (Organizations & Societies)
9. Evidence of Local Community Service (Including Outreach)
10. Evidence of State University Service
11. Evidence of Regional Service
12. Evidence of National Service
13. Evidence of International Service

II-EXCELLENCE IN LIBRARIANSHIP (EIL)

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates extraordinary performance in skill in Librarianship with objective evidence. Consideration should be given to the candidate's ability to perform this function that is of outstanding quality.
 - b. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates extraordinary performance in service to the University and to the profession with objective evidence.
 - c. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates extraordinary performance in scholarship and continuing professional growth with objective evidence.
3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their skill in librarianship fulfills librarianship duties beyond the work generally considered to be a part of the candidate's basic professional obligation.
 - b. Should clearly describe with evidence that they are flexible and adapt readily to the needs of constituents served that include contributions to the library, the campus, the State University, the community and to the profession.
 - c. Should clearly demonstrate evidence of keeping abreast of developments in the field and use relevant contemporary data in relation to their work situation.
 - d. Should clearly demonstrate with evidence their scholarship and professional development by including references to publications, membership and work in professional organizations, attendance at meetings, seminars, etc.
4. Curriculum Vitae
5. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
6. Evidence of Campus Librarianship
7. Evidence of Local Community Librarianship (Including Outreach)
8. Evidence of State University Librarianship
9. Evidence of Publications
10. Evidence of Professional Activity (Membership & Work Done)
11. Evidence of Meeting Attendance
12. Evidence of Seminar Attendance

III-EXCELLENCE IN PROFESSIONAL SERVICE (EIPS)

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistently improving themselves within and beyond the position with objective evidence. Consideration should be given to the candidate's ability to perform this function that is of outstanding quality. And by doing so, have transcended the normal definitions of excellence.
 - b. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistently improving their campuses within and beyond the position with objective evidence. And by doing so, have transcended the normal definitions of excellence.
 - c. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistently improving the State University within and beyond the position with objective evidence. And by doing so, have transcended the normal definitions of excellence.
3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their professional service has shown them to serve as professional role models for a University system in the pursuit of excellence beyond the work generally considered to be a part of the candidate's basic professional obligation.
 - b. Should clearly describe with evidence that they are continually performing superbly in fulfilling the job description within the position held.
 - c. Should clearly describe with evidence that they also demonstrate excellence in professional activities beyond the parameters of the job description.
 - d. The ideal candidate will satisfy the standards in a creative and innovative fashion while demonstrating flexibility and adaptability to institutional needs.
 - e. Consideration should be given to capabilities and accomplishments in the areas of leadership, decision-making and problem-solving. Evidence in this category includes, but is not limited to, professional recognitions, initiation of ideas, development of proposals, and committee activities.
4. Nomination Type (Traditional or Special Consideration)
5. Curriculum Vitae
6. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
7. Evidence of Repeatedly Sought Self-Improvement
8. Evidence of Repeatedly Sought Campus Improvement
9. Evidence of Repeatedly Sought State University Improvement
10. Evidence of Superb Performance Within the Position
11. Evidence of Superb Performance Beyond the Position
12. Evidence of Capabilities & Accomplishments (Leadership, Decision-making, & Problem-solving)
13. Evidence of Professional Recognitions (National & International Levels)
14. Evidence of Initiation of Ideas
15. Evidence of Development of Proposals
16. Evidence of Committee Activities

NOTE: The following are restrictions and Special Considerations for the EIPS.

RESTRICTIONS: Individuals serving in the classified services are ineligible for nomination (e.g., positions paid on an hourly rather than salary basis are generally in the classified services).

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: Exclusively for the Excellence in Professional Service Award, nominations may be made by not-for-profit- agencies serving a State University function at one of the organizational units (e.g., the campus Research Foundation Offices, etc.) of the State University of New York. For the purposes of the Professional Service Award, the State University System Administration is considered a campus. The State University System Administration may make one Professional Service nomination drawn from the aggregate of eligible staff at the System Administration, the State University Construction Fund, SUNY Charter Schools Institute, and the SUNY Research Foundation.

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS: The Chancellor can make nominations for additional Professional Service Awards, from either a specific campus, the State University System Administration, the State University Construction Fund, SUNY Charter Schools Institute, or the SUNY Research Foundation provided the individual meets the eligibility requirements.

IV-EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (EISCA)

There are two streams for the EISCA:

- **(A) For Scholarship:** research in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities.
- **(B) For Creative Productivity:** generally, the fine or performing arts or those fields where creative productivity constitutes scholarship (e.g., culinary arts, etc.).

(A) For Scholarship:

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents using the bullets provided as either binder tabs, or if constructed digitally, the organization of folders.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, high quality, and frequent or numerous research and publication in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities. The number of publications should go beyond the minimum requirement for tenure and promotion. Consideration should be given to the candidate's ability to perform this function that is of outstanding quality.
 - b. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, reputable, private and/or public extramural grant funding for their research in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities.
 - c. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, effective use of release time for their research activities in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities.
 - d. Should clearly describe how the candidate's research has been recognized by their field evidenced by honors, awards, and achievements in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities.
3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of research publications in peer-reviewed journals, and/or research monographs, and/or research-oriented texts.
 - b. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of presenting at national and/or international conferences, presentation of papers published in conference proceedings and/or digest.
 - c. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of patents awarded.
 - d. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of research of extramural grants secured.

- e. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of their research that is cited by individuals or groups other than the nominee's collaborators. This would also include the candidate's total number of citations, the h-index, and the i10-index. It is recommended to use www.scholar.google.com to create and compile this information for ease of review.
- 4. Curriculum Vitae
- 5. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
- 6. Evidence of Research Productivity During Release Time
- 7. Evidence of Research Honors, Awards, & Achievements
- 8. Evidence of Publications (Peer-reviewed journals, an/or research monographs, and/or research-oriented texts)
- 9. Evidence of Presentation of Papers (Published in Conference Proceedings and/or digests)
- 10. Evidence of Presentations (National & International)
- 11. Evidence of Patents Awarded
- 12. Evidence of Extramural Grants Awarded
- 13. Evidence of Citation of Work (By Individuals or Groups other than the nominee's collaborators; including the total citations of work, h-index, and i10-index)
- 14. Evidence of Citation of Work from www.scholar.google.com (i.e., bar graph and list of publication by most cited).

(B) For Creative Productivity:

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, high quality, and frequent or numerous creative products. The number of creative products should go beyond the minimum requirement for tenure and promotion. Consideration should be given to the candidate's ability to perform this function that is of outstanding quality.
 - b. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, high quality, and frequent or numerous creative products that takes form of artistic production, performance, composition, art exhibition, etc. Consideration should be given to the candidate's ability to perform this function that is of outstanding quality.
 - c. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, reputable, private and/or public extramural grant funding for their creative products.
 - d. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistent past and present, effective use of release time for their creative products.
 - e. Should clearly describe how the candidate's creative products has been recognized by their field evidenced by honors, awards, and achievements in the fine or performing arts or those fields where creative products constitutes scholarship.
3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their creative productivity has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of creative products that takes form of artistic production, performance, composition, art exhibition, etc.
 - b. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant contribution to their field through an excellent and sustained record of creative products through extramural grants secured.
4. Curriculum Vitae
5. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
6. Evidence of Creative Productivity During Release Time
7. Evidence of Creative Product Honors, Awards, & Achievements
8. Evidence of Creative Products (artistic production, performance, composition, art exhibition, etc.)
9. Evidence of Extramural Grants Awarded

V-EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING (EIT)

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistently superior teaching at the undergraduate and, if applicable, the graduate or professional level in keeping with the State University's commitment to providing its students with instruction of the highest quality.
 - b. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates positive evidence that the candidate performs superbly in the classroom, in the lower and upper division. This should be supported by teaching techniques and representative materials, which demonstrate a flexible instructional policy that adapts readily to student needs, interests and problems. Mastery of techniques must be demonstrated and substantiated.
 - c. Consideration is to be given to the number of substantially different courses taught, the number of students per course, and the different teaching techniques employed in the various courses.
 - d. Student evaluations (in the form of student questionnaires administered and compiled by persons other than the nominee) should be presented for several different courses over a period of several recent years to provide a clear idea of the nominee's impact on students.
 - e. Should clearly describe how the candidate evaluates student's work through a chronological and complete grading distribution table (i.e., marking records) for all students for every class taught for the last two years. This grading distribution table should show accurate and real grading patterns, particularly there must also be evidence that the candidates do not hesitate to give low evaluations to students who do poorly.
 - f. Should clearly describe how the candidate is a teacher/scholar and remains abreast of their own field and who use the relevant contemporary data from that field and related disciplines in their teaching. Evidence in this area includes, but is not limited to, publications, grants, presentations at conferences, artistic productions, etc.
 - g. Should clearly describe how the candidate's superior teaching has been recognized by their field evidenced by honors, awards, and achievements.
3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe their teaching philosophy within 1 page that outlines their pedagogical approaches.
 - b. Should clearly describe their teaching standards within 1 page that outlines their pedagogical approaches. Quantity and quality of work that is more than average for the subjects must be required of the students.
 - c. Should clearly describe their teaching techniques within 1 page that outlines their pedagogical approaches. This should cover techniques employed across a different number of courses.

- d. Should clearly describe how they serve students by being generous with personal time, easily accessible, and must demonstrate a continual concern for the intellectual growth of individual students. The focus here is their accessibility to students outside of class (e.g., office hours, conferences, special meetings, and responsibility for student advising). This student service should exceed beyond the work generally considered to be a part of the candidate's basic professional obligation.
 - e. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how they have continued their professional scholarship and growth. There must be evidence of relevant and contemporary data from their field and related disciplines in their teaching. Should also include grants, peer-reviewed publications, presentations, and other supporting activities.
 - f. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how their scholarship has shown them to be recognized for providing significant teaching and scholarship contributions to their field through honors, awards, and achievements.
4. Curriculum Vitae
 5. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
 6. Evidence of Student Services (Office hours, conferences, special meetings, and responsibility in terms of student advisement)
 7. Evidence of Student Evaluations (Minimum of two up to five years)
 8. Evidence of Teaching Grading Distributions (Minimum of last/most recent two years)
 9. Evidence of Teaching Techniques
 10. Evidence of Teaching Representative Materials
 11. Evidence of Flexible Teaching Instruction
 12. Evidence of Number of Substantially Different Courses Taught & Number of Students Per Course
 13. Evidence of Scholarship & Professional Growth
 14. Evidence of Peer-reviewed Journal Publications
 15. Evidence of Presentations
 16. Evidence of Extramural Grants
 17. Evidence of Creative Product Honors, Awards, & Achievements (National & International Levels)
 18. Evidence of Creative Products (artistic production, performance, composition, art exhibition, etc.)

VI-EXCELLENCE IN ADJUNCT TEACHING (EIAT)

The Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Adjunct Teaching recognizes consistently superior teaching at the graduate, undergraduate, or professional level in keeping with the State University's commitment to providing its students with instruction of the highest quality

Teaching Techniques and Representative Materials – There must be positive evidence that the candidate performs superbly in educational environments. The nominee must maintain instructional policies that adapt readily to student needs, interests and problems. Mastery of teaching techniques must be demonstrated and substantiated. For more details please review the documents at <https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/excellence-in-adjunct-teaching/Adjunct-in-Teaching-Policies-Procedures-2020-2022.pdf>

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the candidate should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates consistently superior teaching at the undergraduate and, if applicable, the graduate or professional level in keeping with the State University's commitment to providing its students with instruction of the highest quality.
 - b. Should clearly describe how the candidate demonstrates positive evidence that the candidate performs superbly in the classroom, in the lower and upper division. This should be supported by teaching techniques and representative materials, which demonstrate a flexible instructional policy that adapts readily to student needs, interests and problems.
 - c. Consideration for how the candidate supports the intellectual growth of individual students should be given.
 - d. Consideration is to be given to the number of students per course, and the different teaching techniques employed in the various courses.
 - e. Student evaluations (in the form of student questionnaires administered and compiled by persons other than the nominee) should be presented for several different courses over the last two years to provide a clear idea of the nominee's impact on students.
 - f. Should clearly describe how the candidate evaluates student's work through a chronological and complete grading distribution table (i.e., marking records) for all students for every class taught for the last two years. This grading distribution table should show accurate and real grading patterns, particularly there must also be evidence that the candidates do not hesitate to give low evaluations to students who do poorly.
 - g. Should clearly describe how the candidate is a teacher/scholar and remains abreast of their own field and who use the relevant contemporary data from that field and related disciplines in their teaching. Evidence in this area includes, but is not limited to, publications, grants, presentations at conferences, artistic productions, etc.

- h. Should clearly describe how the candidate's superior teaching by maintaining instructional policies that adapt readily to student needs, interests, and problems.
- 3. Candidate self-evaluation (approximately 5 pages) describing why they should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe their teaching philosophy within 1 page that outlines their pedagogical approaches.
 - b. Should clearly describe their teaching standards within 1 page that outlines their pedagogical approaches.
 - c. Should clearly describe their teaching techniques within 1 page that outlines their pedagogical approaches. This should cover different teaching techniques employed.
 - d. Should clearly describe how they serve students by being generous with personal time, easily accessible, and must demonstrate a continual concern for the intellectual growth of individual students.
 - e. Should clearly describe with positive evidence how they have continued their professional scholarship and growth. There must be evidence of relevant and contemporary data from their field and related disciplines in their teaching.
- 4. Curriculum Vitae
- 5. Letters of Support (3-5 Internal & 3-5 External; No student Letters should be included)
- 6. Evidence of Student Services (Office hours, conferences, special meetings, and responsibility in terms of student advisement)
- 7. Evidence of Student Evaluations (Minimum of last/most recent two years)
- 8. Evidence of Teaching Grading Distributions (Minimum of last/most recent two years)
- 9. Evidence of Teaching Techniques
- 10. Evidence of Teaching Representative Materials
- 11. Evidence of Flexible Teaching Instruction
- 12. Evidence of Scholarship & Professional Growth
- 13. Evidence of Peer-reviewed Journal Publications
- 14. Evidence of Presentations
- 15. Evidence of Extramural Grants
- 16. Evidence of Creative Product Honors, Awards, & Achievements (National & International Levels)

VII-SHARED GOVERNANCE AWARD

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Each campus may nominate itself annually. One campus each year may be selected for this award. Campuses selected for this award will serve as exemplars of the best practices in shared governance. For more details please review the documents at <https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/shared-governance/Shared-Governance-Award-PoliciesProcedures-2020-2022.pdf>

1. Nomination Portfolio should have a clear Table of Contents constructed digitally through the organization of folders in Interfolio.
2. Through shared governance, administration, faculty, staff, and students engage in a cooperative effort to create timely, inclusive, well-researched and well-supported institutional policies and decisions that benefit from the differing expertise, perspectives and areas of responsibility of those constituents.
3. Nominator letter (approximately 5 pages) describing why the campus should be considered for the award.
 - a. Should clearly describe how the campus demonstrates consistently improving themselves through a formal system of inclusive and participatory decision-making through established and formally agreed upon procedures and structures. Its hallmarks include:
 - i. Engaged constituency representation determined by the constituent group;
 - ii. Well-defined roles for constituencies;
 - iii. Open communication and transparency;
 - iv. Clear bylaws and procedures;
 - v. Well-defined structures (such as committees) and lines of responsibility, commitment to collegiality and collaboration, and to respecting formal processes; and
 - vi. Shared accountability.
4. Evidence of outstanding achievement in shared governance must demonstrate either:
 - a. The long-term effectiveness of the campus' established shared governance structures and processes in fulfilling the institution's mission and goals, or
 - b. A major or significant improvement to the shared governance system or the culture of shared governance and its effectiveness within the institution.
5. To be considered, a campus must have significantly advanced the culture, principles and practices of shared governance. Such advancement will be evidenced and demonstrated by successful and sustained governance-related campus activity of lasting value over a meaningful period of time that includes significant shared leadership and decision-making involving faculty/staff and student governance, as well as campus administration. Supporting documentation for the nomination should include, but is not limited to, the following:
 - a. Evidence of excellence in shared governance as defined above, and either;

- b. Evidence of the long-term effectiveness of the campus' shared governance system in fulfilling the institution's mission and goals; or
- c. Evidence of a major or significant improvement t the shared governance system or the culture of shared governance and its effectiveness within the institution.

VIII-DISTINGUISHED FACULTY RANKS

Note: Under no circumstance, may faculty apply or self-nominate for these programs. The nominator should present a convincing argument within 5-pages that clearly outlines how the candidate meets and/or exceeds the following specific program to be considered for the honor of Distinguished Faculty Ranks.

NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS

Eligibility is limited to faculty having attained the rank of Full Professor. There is no limit as to the number of campus nominations for Distinguished Professor or Distinguished Librarian. For Distinguished Teaching Professor and Distinguished Service Professor, however, campuses may make nominations only on a ratio to full-time, full professorial lines indicated for the campus during the previous fall. Campuses having 124 or fewer full-time, full professors shall receive one nomination allocation annually. Campuses with 125 or more full-time, full professors shall receive two nomination allocations annually. The number of nominations allocated to each campus for the Distinguished Teaching Professor and Distinguished Service Professor shall accompany the annual program announcement.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

The following are special conditions, applicable to all programs that limit eligibility:

- Faculty holding Distinguished Faculty Rank – Distinguished Professor, Distinguished Service Professor, Distinguished Teaching Professor, and Distinguished Librarian – may not be nominated for another Distinguished Faculty Rank designation;
- Faculty holding qualified academic appointments (as defined in Board of Trustees policies: individuals holding titles of academic rank that are preceded by the designation ...“visiting” or other similar designations) may not be nominated;¹
- Faculty holding a concurrent administrative appointment above the level of department chair for which they receive extra compensation are ineligible for the DSP;
- Faculty who have retired or faculty serving in part-time capacities are ineligible; and
- Posthumous nominations are not permissible.

¹ *The State University of New York Policies of the Board of Trustees – January 2019 Article II § 1 (k)*

For more details please review the documents at [Distinguished Faculty Ranks - 2019-2021 Policies and Procedures](#)

Distinguished Faculty Rank programs encourage ongoing commitment to excellence, kindle intellectual vibrancy, elevate the standards of instruction and enrich contributions to public service. They demonstrate the State University's pride and gratitude for the consummate professionalism, the groundbreaking scholarship, the exceptional instruction and the breadth and significance of service contributions of its faculty.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DISTINGUISHED FACULTY RANKS

Appointment constitutes a promotion to the State University's highest academic rank, and it is conferred solely by the State University Board of Trustees.

- (A) The **Distinguished Professorship** is conferred upon faculty having achieved national or international prominence and a distinguished reputation within the individual's chosen field through significant contributions to the research and scholarship, or through artistic performance or achievement in the fine and performing arts.
- (B) The **Distinguished Service Professorship** is conferred upon instructional faculty having achieved a distinguished reputation for service not only to the campus and the University, but also to the community, the State of New York or even the nation, by sustained effort in the application of intellectual skills drawing from the candidate's scholarly research interests to issues of public concern. It is bestowed on faculty in any of the disciplines or fields of study.
- (C) The **Distinguished Teaching Professorship** is conferred upon instructional faculty for outstanding teaching competence at the graduate, undergraduate, or professional levels. Teaching mastery is to be consistently demonstrated over multiple years at the institution where the Distinguished Teaching Professorship is bestowed.
- (D) The **Distinguished Librarian** is conferred upon librarians whose contributions have been transformational in creating a new information environment by providing access to information, sharing or networking information resources, and fostering information literacy. The Distinguished Librarian rank honors and promotes the achievement of personal excellence, groundbreaking professional progress, and wide-ranging benefit to the academic community.

(A) Distinguished Professorship

- The person's work must be of such a character that the individual's presence will elevate the standards of scholarship of colleagues both within and beyond the individual's respective academic field.
- The individual must have achieved national or international prominence and a distinguished reputation within the individual's chosen field through significant contributions to the research literature or through artistic performance or the creative arts, beyond that which is expected for a full professor.
- The individual must have obtained national or international awards that provide evidence of distinguished research, scholarship, or other creative activity.
- Individuals who are also inventors should have achieved prominence as assessed by the extent their discoveries have had measurable benefit to society.
- **Academic Rank** – Candidates must have attained the rank of full Professor.
- **Length of Service** – Candidates must have held the rank of full Professor for at least five years and must have at least three years of full-time service at the nominating institution.
- **Criteria for Selection** – A candidate for Distinguished Service Professor must demonstrate substantial distinguished service **both**:
 - **A.** At the local campus level and/or local community or regional level; and
 - **B.** At the state and/or national- and/or international level.
- Distinguished service must exceed the service generally considered to be part of a candidate's basic professional work (professional committees, etc.) and should include service that exceeds that for which professors are normally compensated. *Thus, faculty with a concurrent administrative appointment – above the level of department chair/director or equivalent – for which they receive extra compensation are ineligible.* Furthermore, it is not appropriate to build a nomination dossier of a former administrator based upon service while in an administrative appointment. Distinguished service must extend over multiple years and involve the application of intellectual skills drawing from the candidate's scholarly and research interests to issues of public concern, and may include, but not be solely based upon, exceptional leadership in local and system-wide faculty governance.
- **Curriculum Vita** – An up-to-date and moderately comprehensive *vita* that should have separate sections for educational background, academic/visiting appointments, honors and awards received, national academy memberships, publications, external funding, invited/keynote presentations, other presentations, teaching accomplishments (including

lists of graduate dissertations, theses and research directed and other mentoring), and service contributions to the University, the community, and the profession (work with learned societies, editorial boards, conferences organized, and other relevant activities). Entries for awards should indicate significance of each item. ***Specific data must include the date of the last update, the candidate's department, the date of appointment to the SUNY system, highest rank attained and date of appointment to that rank.***

- **Distinguished Professor** – Articles in refereed and non-refereed journals should be clearly distinguished from one another and, preferably, listed separately with full pagination and ordered by date of publication. Books should be listed separately from articles. Publications with multiple authors should indicate the senior author, if there is one, either by a note at the beginning of the publications list (if senior author position is consistent throughout) or by an asterisk indicating the senior author in each entry. External funding entries should indicate agency, amount, dates, and, if there are multiple named researchers, who is the principal investigator (PI). If available, citation information from Google Scholar or other sources should be provided.
- ***Internal Letters of Recommendation*** – In addition to the President's Letter of Endorsement, at least five, but no more than eight, letters are needed, including one from the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) and one from the candidate's Dean/Division Head that provide detailed information and the specific rationale – preferably in lay's terms – for the candidate's nomination. Letters from those holding Distinguished rank are strongly encouraged.
- ***External Letters of Recommendation*** – At least five but no more than eight, are needed to validate the stature of the candidate proposed for appointment. **Each external letter of recommendation should be accompanied either by the author's full and current curriculum vita or a very detailed description of the author's stature sufficient to provide review panelists a context for the recommendation submitted.**
- ***Distinguished Professor*** – These letters should be from individuals whose own status or accomplishment is appropriate to a promotion at this level. They should be persons sufficiently acquainted with both the candidate's work and the profession to be able to write *an informed* letter specifically locating the candidate's standing in and contribution to the discipline, and explaining the significance of the candidate's awards and honors. ***Letter writers should be disinterested, that is, generally individuals who have not collaborated, co-authored, co-taught, or been in a student-teacher relationship with the candidate.*** If the letter writers have collaborated with the candidate in the past, they should pass the same distance test used by the major funding agencies in the candidate's field: if the relationship is recent or close enough that the proposed letter writer would have to recuse himself/herself from a funding panel considering an application for that candidate, then the proposed letter writer is too recent or close for this promotion dossier.

(B) Distinguished Service Professorship

- **Academic Rank** – Candidates must have attained the rank of full Professor.
- **Length of Service** – Candidates must have held the rank of full Professor for at least five years and must have at least three years of full-time service at the nominating institution.
- **Criteria for Selection** – A candidate for Distinguished Service Professor must demonstrate substantial distinguished service **both**:
 - **A.** At the local campus level and/or local community or regional level; and
 - **B.** At the state and/or national- and/or international level.
- Distinguished service must exceed the service generally considered to be part of a candidate's basic professional work (professional committees, etc.) and should include service that exceeds that for which professors are normally compensated. *Thus, faculty with a concurrent administrative appointment – above the level of department chair/director or equivalent – for which they receive extra compensation are ineligible.* Furthermore, it is not appropriate to build a nomination dossier of a former administrator based upon service while in an administrative appointment. Distinguished service must extend over multiple years and involve the application of intellectual skills drawing from the candidate's scholarly and research interests to issues of public concern, and may include, but not be solely based upon, exceptional leadership in local and system-wide faculty governance.
- **Distinguished Service Professor** – In these letters, the recommenders should: comment briefly about their relationship to the candidate, corroborate the candidate's merit for appointment, describe the candidate's stature in the profession and/or community, catalog the candidate's most important professional achievements, speak to the influence and impact of the candidate's contribution on the profession and/or community, and explain the significance of the candidate's service awards and honors.
- **Curriculum Vita** – An up-to-date and moderately comprehensive *vita* that should have separate sections for educational background, academic/visiting appointments, honors and awards received, national academy memberships, publications, external funding, invited/keynote presentations, other presentations, teaching accomplishments (including lists of graduate dissertations, theses and research directed and other mentoring), and service contributions to the University, the community, and the profession (work with learned societies, editorial boards, conferences organized, and other relevant activities). Entries for awards should indicate significance of each item. ***Specific data must include the date of the last update, the candidate's department, the date of appointment to the SUNY system, highest rank attained and date of appointment to that rank.***
- **Distinguished Professor** – Articles in refereed and non-refereed journals should be clearly distinguished from one another and, preferably, listed separately with full pagination and ordered by date of publication. Books should be listed separately from articles.

Publications with multiple authors should indicate the senior author, if there is one, either by a note at the beginning of the publications list (if senior author position is consistent throughout) or by an asterisk indicating the senior author in each entry. External funding entries should indicate agency, amount, dates, and, if there are multiple named researchers, who is the principal investigator (PI). If available, citation information from Google Scholar or other sources should be provided.

- **Distinguished Service Professor** – Relevant professional and community service should be detailed.
- ***Internal Letters of Recommendation*** – In addition to the President's Letter of Endorsement, at least five, but no more than eight, letters are needed, including one from the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) and one from the candidate's Dean/Division Head that provide detailed information and the specific rationale – preferably in lay's terms – for the candidate's nomination. Letters from those holding Distinguished rank are strongly encouraged.
- ***External Letters of Recommendation*** – At least five but no more than eight, are needed to validate the stature of the candidate proposed for appointment. **Each external letter should be accompanied by a one to five page detailed description of the author's stature sufficient to provide review panelists a context for the recommendation submitted.**
- ***Distinguished Service Professor*** – These letters should be from individuals whose own status or accomplishment is appropriate to a promotion at this level. They should be persons sufficiently acquainted with both the candidate's work and the profession to be able to write *an informed* letter specifically locating the candidate's standing in and contribution to the discipline, and explaining the significance of the candidate's awards and honors. ***Letter writers should be disinterested, that is, generally individuals who have not collaborated, co-authored, co-taught, or been in a student-teacher relationship with the candidate.*** If the letter writers have collaborated with the candidate in the past, they should pass the same distance test used by the major funding agencies in the candidate's field: if the relationship is recent or close enough that the proposed letter writer would have to recuse himself/herself from a funding panel considering an application for that candidate, then the proposed letter writer is too recent or close for this promotion dossier.

(C) Distinguished Teaching Professorship

- **Academic Rank** – Candidates must have attained the rank of full Professor.
- **Length of Service** – Candidates must have held the rank of full Professor for at least five years and must have at least three years of full-time service at the nominating institution.
- Nominations must be drawn from faculty members who have regularly carried a full-time teaching load, both in terms of the number of semester hours taught and the number of students served, as defined by the campus for full-time faculty. The definition of a full-time teaching load varies from campus to campus, but each campus should be satisfied that there could be no question that its nominee meets this criterion.
- Department chairs/directors or equivalent may be nominated for the Distinguished Teaching Professorship contingent upon the individual carrying the campus-defined full-time teaching load for all persons performing such administrative responsibilities (e.g., if a campus defines 15 hours as a full-time teaching load for full-time faculty and 12 hours as a full-time teaching load for department chairs, then an individual serving as a department chair teaching the 12 hours and meeting the other eligibility requirements would be eligible for nomination). Administrators with less than a campus-defined teaching load (e.g., dean, associate dean) are ineligible.
- **Criteria for Selection** – The primary criterion for appointment to the rank is skill in teaching, with evidence that the nominee's work has elevated the standards of colleagues at their institution or the field in general. Consideration shall also be given to mastery of subject matter, sound scholarship of teaching or distributing knowledge, service to the University and the broader community, and to continuing growth. The following criteria are to be used in the selection of persons to be nominated for the Distinguished Teaching Professorship:
 - **Teaching Techniques and Representative Materials** – There must be positive evidence that the candidate performs superbly in the classroom. The nominee must maintain a flexible instructional policy that adapts readily to student needs, interests, and problems. Mastery of teaching techniques must be demonstrated and substantiated. Consideration should be given to the number of substantially different courses taught, the number of students per course, and the teaching techniques employed in the various courses.
 - Student evaluations (in the form of student questionnaires administered and compiled by persons other than the nominee) should be presented for several different courses over a period of several recent years to provide the local selection committee with a clear idea of the nominee's impact on students.
 - **Scholarship and Professional Growth** – The candidate must be a teacher/scholar who keeps abreast of and makes significant contributions in his or her own field and uses the relevant contemporary data from that field and related disciplines in teaching. Examples

of evidence in this category may include publications or artistic productions, grant awards, and presentations at symposia in one's discipline.

- **Student Services** – In relating to students, the candidate must be generous with time, be easily accessible, and must demonstrate a continual concern with the intellectual growth of individual students. For this category, consideration should be given to the accessibility of the nominee to students outside of class (e.g., office hours, conferences, special meetings, student advisement, and teaching-related services to students).
- **Academic Standards/Requirements and Evaluations of Student Performance** – The candidate must set high standards for students and help them attain academic excellence. Quantity and quality of work that is more than average for the subject must be required of the students. The candidate must actively work with students to help them improve their scholarly or artistic performance. The local selection committee should consider the quality, quantity, and difficulty of course-related work. Evidence of academic standards and requirements may be assessed by the accomplishments of students, including placement and achievement level.
- The candidate's evaluation of students' work must be strongly supported by evidence. Expert teachers enable students to achieve high levels of scholarship. Consequently, it is possible that the candidate's marking record may be somewhat above the average of colleagues. But, there must be evidence that the candidate does not hesitate to give low evaluations to students who do poorly. Grading practices should be evaluated by the local committee. *In particular, grade distribution for all courses in recent academic years should be included in the packet and any seemingly unusual grading patterns explained.*
- In order to clarify the difference between the Distinguished Teaching Professorship and the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Teaching, the files for candidates must provide evidence that they have been involved, for a substantial period, in developing or promoting excellence in teaching through pedagogical methods and/or principles in substantive educational enhancement either in their disciplines and/or to meet community needs on a regional, national, or international level.
- **Distinguished Teaching Professor** – In these letters, the recommenders should: comment briefly about their relationship to the candidate, corroborate the candidate's merit for appointment, describe the candidate's teaching techniques, catalog the candidate's most important achievements, speak to the influence and impact of the candidate's contribution to teaching in general or in the discipline, and explain the significance of the candidate's awards and honors. One of these letters should be from a former student of the candidate attesting to the candidate's teaching ability, dedication and service to students
- **Course Evaluations and Grade Distributions**– Numerical summaries of selected student course evaluations and grade distributions should be included. Consideration will be given to grading patterns for all courses in at least two recent years. An explanation must be added if this information is not included.

- ***Curriculum Vita*** – An up-to-date and moderately comprehensive *vita* that should have separate sections for educational background, academic/visiting appointments, honors and awards received, national academy memberships, publications, external funding, invited/keynote presentations, other presentations, teaching accomplishments (including lists of graduate dissertations, theses and research directed and other mentoring), and service contributions to the University, the community, and the profession (work with learned societies, editorial boards, conferences organized, and other relevant activities). Entries for awards should indicate significance of each item. ***Specific data must include the date of the last update, the candidate's department, the date of appointment to the SUNY system, highest rank attained and date of appointment to that rank.***
- **Distinguished Professor** – Articles in refereed and non-refereed journals should be clearly distinguished from one another and, preferably, listed separately with full pagination and ordered by date of publication. Books should be listed separately from articles. Publications with multiple authors should indicate the senior author, if there is one, either by a note at the beginning of the publications list (if senior author position is consistent throughout) or by an asterisk indicating the senior author in each entry. External funding entries should indicate agency, amount, dates, and, if there are multiple named researchers, who is the principal investigator (PI). If available, citation information from Google Scholar or other sources should be provided.
- ***Internal Letters of Recommendation*** – In addition to the President's Letter of Endorsement, at least five, but no more than eight, letters are needed, including one from the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) and one from the candidate's Dean/Division Head that provide detailed information and the specific rationale – preferably in lay's terms – for the candidate's nomination. Letters from those holding Distinguished rank are strongly encouraged.
- ***Distinguished Teaching Professor*** – At least two of these letters should be from current students attesting to the candidate's teaching ability, dedication and service to students.
- ***External Letters of Recommendation*** – At least five but no more than eight, are needed to validate the stature of the candidate proposed for appointment. **Each external letter should be accompanied by a one to five page detailed description of the author's stature sufficient to provide review panels a context for the recommendation submitted.**
- ***Distinguished Teaching Professor*** – These letters should be from individuals whose own status or accomplishment is appropriate to a promotion at this level. They should be persons sufficiently acquainted with both the candidate's work and the profession to be able to write *an informed* letter specifically locating the candidate's standing in and contribution to the discipline, and explaining the significance of the candidate's awards and honors. ***Letter writers should be disinterested, that is, generally individuals who have not collaborated, co-authored, co-taught, or been in a student-teacher relationship with the candidate.*** If the letter writers have collaborated with the candidate in the past, they should pass the same distance test used by the major funding agencies in the candidate's

field: if the relationship is recent or close enough that the proposed letter writer would have to recuse himself/herself from a funding panel considering an application for that candidate, then the proposed letter writer is too recent or close for this promotion dossier.

(D) Distinguished Librarian

- **Academic Rank** – Candidates must have attained the rank of full Librarian or, for community colleges, the rank of full Professor with clear and direct full-time responsibilities pertaining to library service.
- **Length of Service** – Candidates must have held the rank of full Librarian or, for community colleges, full Professor for at least five years and must have at least three years of full-time service at the nominating institution.
- **Criteria for Selection** – Academic librarians demonstrate unique talents as faculty who promote and facilitate access to information, create knowledge-based solutions, and guide all sectors of the community toward informed judgments about the quality and the principled use of information. They enhance student learning, inquiry, and success via classroom teaching, research consultations, and the development of instructional guides. In addition, they leverage their distinctive position on campus to facilitate collaborations across campus.
- The pathways to the rank of Distinguished Librarian are many and diverse. To attain the rank of Distinguished Librarian, a candidate must exhibit all of the following qualities and levels of accomplishments:
- Candidates must have made contributions to the profession of librarianship that are of national or international significance.
- They must have achieved stature and distinction beyond their own library, beyond their own college or university, and indeed, beyond SUNY. They may achieve this stature and distinction through formal scholarship, research, and publications or other paths including forging alliances, creating resources or networks, or shifting the understanding of core precepts of the field.
- Candidates will have performed with excellence and innovation in a domain of librarianship, including but not limited to realizing the potential for access to world-wide information resources, information and knowledge creation, resource sharing, information literacy, data management, technical services, system and/or facilities design, or leadership and administration.
- They will have earned the respect of members in their field of the information professions as well as their professorial counterparts by the quality, vigor, and innovative nature of their thinking, their standards of performance, and the effectiveness of their initiatives.
- **Distinguished Librarian** – In these letters, the recommenders should: corroborate the candidate's merit for appointment, describe the candidate's stature in the discipline, catalog the candidate's most important achievements, speak to the influence and impact of the

candidate's contribution on the discipline, (in lay's terms where possible) and explain the significance of the candidate's awards and honors.

- ***Curriculum Vita*** – An up-to-date and moderately comprehensive *vita* that should have separate sections for educational background, academic/visiting appointments, honors and awards received, national academy memberships, publications, external funding, invited/keynote presentations, other presentations, teaching accomplishments (including lists of graduate dissertations, theses and research directed and other mentoring), and service contributions to the University, the community, and the profession (work with learned societies, editorial boards, conferences organized, and other relevant activities). Entries for awards should indicate significance of each item. ***Specific data must include the date of the last update, the candidate's department, the date of appointment to the SUNY system, highest rank attained and date of appointment to that rank.***
- ***Internal Letters of Recommendation*** – In addition to the President's Letter of Endorsement, at least five, but no more than eight, letters are needed, including one from the Provost (Chief Academic Officer) and one from the candidate's Dean/Division Head that provide detailed information and the specific rationale – preferably in lay's terms – for the candidate's nomination. Letters from those holding Distinguished rank are strongly encouraged.
- ***External Letters of Recommendation*** – At least five but no more than eight, are needed to validate the stature of the candidate proposed for appointment. **Each external letter should be accompanied by a one to five page detailed description of the author's stature sufficient to provide review panelists a context for the recommendation submitted.**
- ***Distinguished Librarian*** – These letters should be from individuals whose own status or accomplishment is appropriate to a promotion at this level. They should be persons sufficiently acquainted with both the candidate's work and the profession to be able to write *an informed* letter specifically locating the candidate's standing in and contribution to the discipline, and explaining the significance of the candidate's awards and honors. ***Letter writers should be disinterested, that is, generally individuals who have not collaborated, co-authored, co-taught, or been in a student-teacher relationship with the candidate.*** If the letter writers have collaborated with the candidate in the past, they should pass the same distance test used by the major funding agencies in the candidate's field: if the relationship is recent or close enough that the proposed letter writer would have to recuse himself/herself from a funding panel considering an application for that candidate, then the proposed letter writer is too recent or close for this promotion dossier.