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Why care about the School A & P council?

Because it is a key step in the promotion process

Understanding the process will help you navigate your promotions or provide counsel/mentorship to others

Add transparency and resources for questions
Promotion Process

1. Division (if applicable) votes on proposed promotion
   - Packet is prepared

2. Department votes on proposed promotion based on information in the packet and supporting letters

3. SOM A&P Council Reviews proposed promotions and votes
   - Review is added to the packet

4. MSEC Votes on Packet

5. MSEC approves packet then Dean approves packet

6. Provost approves packet
How is the SOM A&P Council different than Division/Department Process or Committees?

Departmental Appointment and Promotion Committees help define criteria for appointment and promotion within a given Department.

Those criteria have commonalities as dictated by Faculty Code and the SOM.
They are otherwise unique to the Department.
Are approved by A&P Council and the SOM.

All Department voting faculty vote on appointments and promotions (based on rank).
Division regular associate and full professors vote on proposed promotion
If Department doesn’t have divisions, skip this step

Department A & P committee votes on promotion, if positive moves to vote of Department associate and full professors
If Department is small, there may not be a committee per se

If Department vote is positive, moves to School of Medicine A&P Council
Each step involves more people not inherently familiar with the candidate or their work

Who votes and when? Where does the SOM A & P Council fit?
One of a few “governance councils” in the SOM

Professors who are not Department chairs
not more than one per Department, regardless of Department size

It serves as peer review on behalf of the SOM, outside of the home Department

Is observed by ex-officio (non voting) members

Communications are confidential
Individual faculty packets, including CV, letters, evaluations, personal statements

Each packet is reviewed by two members, one primary, one secondary

Review template filled out, will become part of the packet

What do we look at?

Packet
  Departmental promotion criteria
  SOM Guidelines
  UW Faculty Code
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information in the Review Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the review is DETAILED, everything is looked at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate name and other basic information (dept, etc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion being proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental faculty vote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and Recommendation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
140-160 promotions per year, reviewed in fall/winter (this year will be 190)

The vast majority only celebrate the faculty member accomplishments

Over 90% of packets are clearly outstanding or routine, thus do not require in depth discussion

<7% are challenging and require discussion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you mean by “challenging”????</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant number of no votes in division or department</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More than one unfavorable referee letter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor evaluations without evidence of improvement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professionalism concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lack of clearly demonstrated independence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unexplained variability</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns that some aspect of promotion criteria are not met</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trajectory</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOME RELATIVELY COMMON ISSUES THAT ARISE THAT HAVEN’T ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED
Trajectory Matters
And takes time to demonstrate

Non-mandatory = assistant to associate before year 6
Early should be unusual, not the expectation

Non-mandatory need evidence of a strong, obvious upward trajectory (which takes time)
Your Self Assessment

What I wanted to accomplish

What I (we) did

Where do I plan to go next

Emphasize your strengths & acknowledge the weaknesses

Tell us about your career as if we have NO IDEA about your specialty/expertise – because we generally don’t!!

It should add perspective to what will be in Chair’s letter and outside referee letters

But most alligators only have 4 teeth.

Some alligators can grow up to 15 feet.

I plan to...
Some times 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


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

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

STEFANIE FUHRMAN, ROLAND SOMOGYI
Molecular Physiology of CNS Development, NINDS/NINDS, 36/2C02, Bethesda, MD 20892 (http://nih.info.nih.gov/mol-physiology/homepage.html; sfuhrman@cudan.nih.gov; rolande@helix.nih.gov)

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
Demonstrating Independence

Required in some but not all pathways/tracks

Interdisciplinary work and “team science” make attribution of effort and the individual’s contribution more difficult

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
Reviewers outside your Division/Department need context to understand success
Letters and personal statement provide context
How can you help yourself succeed in the process?

Use your mentors! Talk to your Chair.

Understand your story in the context of promotion
where it is ‘usual’ and where it isn’t
make sure we understand your unique contributions!

Know what is in your packet (aside from letters)
highlight your strengths, own your weaknesses and your plan for improving

Know that most candidates are promoted with no issue