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Goal of this presentation

- To have an understanding of the A&P Process at the School of Medicine
- To add transparency to the process to reduce any concerns
- To help you prepare for an upcoming promotion and promote success
- Disseminate information regarding efforts to ensure equal access to appointments and promotion to populations historically underrepresented
Departments prepare packets and may have meetings to provide feedback to candidate
  - Contents of packet are not described here but include CV, personal statement, teaching reviews (peer and student), clinical reviews, internal and external letters, etc.

> Voting department faculty of equal or higher rank will vote or abstain on faculty promotion packet
  - Department Chair writes high level letter summarizing the packet and departmental support – including results of vote

> A&P Council reviews packet and results of review are added to packet

> Dean approves packet

> UW Provost approves packet

> Promotion approved
Available Resources

- UW Faculty Code
- UW School of Medicine A&P Guide
- Special though Spring 2022 – Covid-19 voluntary clock stoppage
- Faculty Promotion Website
  - https://faculty.uwmedicine.org/promotions/
A&P Committees

- Each department has an A&P Committee that votes on appointment, promotion and the criteria that defines them
- If committee is separate from all faculty, there will be a vote by all voting faculty in the department
- Those criteria are specific to a department and approved by the A&P Council and the School of Medicine
School of Medicine A&P Council

> One of several governance ‘councils’ from the school
> Composed of Professors who are not Department Chairs
> Review by ‘peers’ but not from the same department
> May be observed by ex-officio non-voting members
> Brings together 31 departmental criteria, SOM Guidelines and reviews
> Reviews for consistency with School of Medicine, UW Faculty Code and harmonizes the process
> All Council communications are confidential
Some high level data

> Council reviews around 120-150 promotions per year

> For the vast majority of packets, the committee really celebrates the success of the faculty member

  – As a committee member – this is very satisfying, it is amazing to see all the awesome work our faculty are doing

  – When you are promoted to Professor, please consider volunteering to be considered for election

> A small percentage (7% or less) are more challenging and require more discussion
Non Mandatory Promotions

Mandatory vs Non-mandatory Promotions

> For Assistant Professors, promotion to Associate before the sixth year is Non-mandatory.

> The Faculty Code states that promotion should not be defined only by time in rank.

> It is normal to go up on the normal timeline and going up as non-mandatory should be unusual.

> Non mandatory promotions should show a strong trajectory while in rank (which requires time) and to clearly exceed departmental minimum criteria.

  – Discuss with your chair but in general these promotions should be unusual.
How do Council reviewers review?

> Each packet has a primary and secondary reviewer
> The primary reviewer fills out a template
  – Candidate name and other basic information (dept, etc)
  – Promotion being proposed
  – Departmental faculty vote
  – Educational Background
  – Research
  – Teaching
  – Clinical
  – Service
  – Letters of evaluation
  – Contributions to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion
  – Professionalism
  – Assessment and Recommendation
You don’t have to be equally excellent in all domains
  – Depends a lot on your track and activities
  – Read departmental criteria carefully
  – Discuss with your chair

If not formal, I highly recommend leveraging your informal mentor network of faculty
Things to watch out for

Pitfalls in the process

> “No” votes in the department
> More than one unfavorable referee letter
> Poor teaching reviews and no sign of improvement
> Comments related to unprofessional conduct
> Lack of demonstrated independence
> Lack of an upward trajectory
A strong Chair letter is very helpful

Well organized and strong

> Address all of the key areas of promotion
> Explain areas that are not routine
  – Weaknesses that are made up for in another way
  – Non-traditional scholarship
  – Contributions to the function of the department
  – Problems with letters of support or evaluations
    > Showing trajectory of improvement
> Call out specific strengths that should be highlighted
The Self Assessment is Deeply Important

> Tell your story / journey to get you here
> Paint the other story that ties your CV and rest of your portfolio together
> Don’t just repeat items that will be in your chair’s letter

> Some advice:
  – Being an Assistant Professor is my favorite period of my career, lots of doing what I love and why I got into research
  – As an Assistant Professor, resist getting distracted by things that take time but don’t contribute to your promotion
  – Get strong, unfiltered feedback halfway through (at about 3 years)
Forms of scholarship

> Sometimes scholarship can be nontraditional in a field
> For example, Conference Proceedings in informatics are full journal papers and can be significantly more competitive than journal papers
> Indicate this in Self Assessment or Chair’s letter


REVEAL, A GENERAL REVERSE ENGINEERING ALGORITHM
FOR INFERENCE OF GENETIC NETWORK ARCHITECTURES

SHOU DAN LIANG
SETI Institute, NASA Ames Research Center,
Moffett Field, CA 94035 (sliang@mail.arc.nasa.gov)

STEFANIE FUHRMAN, ROLAND SOMOGYI
Molecular Physiology of CNS Development, LRP/NINDS/NIH, 36/2C02, Bethesda, MD
20892 (http://rsb.info.nih.gov/mol-physiol/homepage.html;
xfuhrman@codon.nih.gov; rolandt@helix.nih.gov)

[PDF] Reveal, a general reverse engineering algorithm for inference of genetic network architectures
S Liang, S Fuhrman, R Somogyi - ... symposium on biocomputing, 1998 - lacim.uqam.ca
Forms of scholarship

> Sometimes scholarship can be nontraditional in a field
> For example, Conference Proceedings in informatics are full journal papers and can be significantly more competitive than journal papers
> Indicate this in Self Assessment or Chair’s letter
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Demonstrating Independence

- Required in some but not all pathways/tracks
- Tension between independence and value to program/laboratory/collaboration
- Clear enunciation of the candidate’s contribution and impact on a scientific program is essential
- First and senior author publications are important, PI of grants, invites to give national seminars, etc. all good evidence of independence
- Highlight in Self Assessment
Last slide advice

> Most candidates are promoted with few, if any, issues

> Spend time on the self assessment
  – Be clear about your strengths
  – Acknowledge (major) weaknesses
  – Include something about your future plans

> Promotion is institution’s affirmation of your long term value and potential

> Use the promotion website: https://faculty.uwmedicine.org/promotions/