The UW School of Medicine Appointments and Promotions Council
Overview of process and What it means for you

KAREN STOUT, MD
PROFESSOR, DIVISION OF CARDIOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE
ADJUNCT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PEDIATRICS
CHAIR, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE APPOINTMENT AND PROMOTIONS COUNCIL
It is a key step in the process of promotion, and not a ‘rubber stamp’

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. **Dean approves packet**

5. **Provost approves packet**
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Departments help define criteria for appointment and promotion

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

All Department voting faculty vote on appointments and promotions to ranks the same or lower.
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 – Trish Kritek is ex-officio member

Communications are confidential
What do we look at?

Promotion criteria for 32 Departments, SOM Guidelines, UW Faculty Code

Individual faculty packets, including CV, letters, scholarship highlights, evaluations, personal statements

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

Review template filled out, will become part of the packet that is forwarded to the Dean and Provost
**Information in the Review Template**

*the review is DETAILED, everything is looked at*

<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>
150+ 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

Over the last 3 years, average 63 proposed promotions to professor per year, all successful
What do you mean by “challenging”?

- Concerns that some aspect of promotion criteria are not met
- Significant number of no votes in division or department
- More than one unfavorable referee letter
- Poor evaluations without evidence of improvement
- Professionalism concerns
- Lack of clearly demonstrated independence
- Unexplained variability
SOME RELATIVELY COMMON ISSUES THAT ARISE THAT HAVEN’T ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED
Professor is NOT mandatory

Clear evidence of meeting criteria is paramount, not time at rank

Evidence of expertise, independence and national/international reputation take time to develop and demonstrate

One amazing accomplishment is rarely enough, it is about the body of work
Your Self-Assessment
A & P Council Version

What I wanted to accomplish
What I (we) did
Where do I plan to go next

Emphasize your strengths & acknowledge weaknesses

Tell us about your career as if we have no meaningful understanding 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

Some alligators can grow up to 15 feet.

But most only have 4.
Forms of scholarship may still be ‘nontraditional’ even when being proposed for promotion to professor

Sometimes scholarship can be nontraditional in a field

Conference Proceedings in informatics can be significantly more competitive than other journal papers

Indicate this in Self Assessment or Chair’s letter

Reveal, a general reverse engineering algorithm for inference of genetic network architectures

S Liang, S Furhman, R Somogyi - ... symposium on biocomputing. 1998 - lacin.uctm.ca

Given the immanent gene expression mapping covering whole genomes during development, health and disease, we seek computational methods to maximize functional inference from the huge data sets. Is it possible, in principle, to completely infer a complex …

Cited by 1276 Related articles All 19 versions Import into BibTeX
Demonstrating Independence and Mentorship

Required in some but not all pathways/tracks, progressive through ranks

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

Highlight in self assessment
Clear enunciation of success if not the ‘usual metrics’:
- PI of multiple grants like RO1s
- multiple senior author publications
- multiple mentees with academic jobs/funding
- study section membership
- invites to give national/international seminars
- guideline committees
- leadership in professional societies
- clinical program development
- teaching awards

Reviewers outside your Department need context to understand success

*Letters and personal statement provide context*
How can you help yourself succeed in the process?

KNOW the criteria in your Department. 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

Remember that most candidates are promoted with no issue
• External letter thing

• Dual appointment and how packets can be regarded differently