The UW School of Medicine Appointments and Promotions Council
Overview of process and What it means for you
Why care about the School A & P council?

Because to be promoted, it is a key step in the 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. Dean approves packet.

5. Provost approves packet.
Division (if applicable) votes on proposed promotion.

Packet is prepared.

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

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

Dean approves packet.

Provost approves packet.
Departmental Appointment and Promotion Committees 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. Are approved by A&P Council and the SOM.

All Department voting faculty vote on appointments and promotions (based on rank).
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
What do we look at?

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

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
Information in the Review Template
the review is DETAILED, everything is looked at

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 (optional)
Professionalism
Assessment and Recommendation
170-190 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
What do you mean by “challenging”?

- 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
- Concerns that some aspect of promotion criteria are not met
- Trajectory
SOME RELATIVELY COMMON ISSUES THAT ARISE THAT HAVEN’T ALREADY BEEN DISCUSSED
Trajectory Might Matter
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
A & P Council Version

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

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

Emphasize your strengths & acknowledge weaknesses
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

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

STEFANIE FUHRMAN, ROLAND SOMOGYI
Molecular Physiology of CNS Development, NINDS/NIH, 3621 WIC, Bethesda, MD 20892 (http://nih.info.nih.gov/nih-physiat/homepage.html; sfuhrman@codan.nih.gov; rolande@holis.nih.gov)

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

S Liang, S Fuhrman, R Somogyi - ... symposium on biocomputing. 1998 - lacin.uqam.ca

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

Highlight in Self Assessment
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