

**School of Public Health
University of Washington**

Academic Affairs Handbook

Always use the most recently updated version of the handbook,
available online at the SPH web site:
sph.washington.edu/faculty/faculty-council

Last updated: May 12, 2024

Part 1	Introduction and General Academic Affairs Information	3
Section 1	—Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose of the Academic Affairs Handbook	3
1.2	Foundation Underlying the Academic Affairs Handbook	3
1.3	Principles Followed in the Academic Affairs Handbook	4
1.4	The Academic Affairs Handbook and the Role of the SPH Faculty Council	5
Section 2	—Values and Expectations of the School of Public Health Academic Community	6
2.1	School of Public Health Values	6
2.2	SPH Commitment to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Anti-Racism	6
2.3	Academic and Personal Conduct Expectations	7
Section 3	—Qualifications for Appointments and Reappointments for Academic Tracks and Ranks, and Changes in Faculty Appointments	8
3.1	Introduction	8
3.2	Qualifications for Appointments for Professorial Tracks and Ranks	9
3.3	Qualifications for Appointments for Other Academic Tracks and Ranks	11
3.4	Faculty Appointment Actions	12
Section 4	—SPH’s Budget Model and Faculty Compensation Plan	14
Section 5	—Faculty Recruitment and Appointment Process	15
5.1	Introduction	15
5.2	Best Practices for Effective Faculty Searches	15
5.3	Opening a Position and Creating the Search Committee	16
5.4	Search/Recruitment Process	16
5.5	Use of Data and Records Retention in Search Processes	17
5.6	Appointment of New Faculty	17
Part 2	Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty in Professorial Titles	18
Section 6	—Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty in Professorial Titles	18
6.1	Introduction	18
6.2	Overall Assessment of Faculty Effectiveness in the Promotion Review	19
6.3	Approach to Evaluating the Candidate’s Effectiveness	20
6.4	Overall Process for Academic Review and Reappointment	21
6.5	Overall Process for Granting of Tenure	22
6.6	Identifying and Mitigating Bias in Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review	23
6.7	Evaluation of Effectiveness in Scholarship/Research	25
6.7.1	Introduction	25
6.7.2	Elements to Consider in Evaluating Effectiveness in Scholarship/Research	26
6.7.3	Demonstration of Effectiveness in Scholarship and Research	27
6.8	Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching	27
6.8.1	Introduction	27
6.8.2	Elements to Consider in Evaluating Effectiveness in Teaching	28

6.8.3	Demonstration of Effectiveness in Teaching	29
6.8.4	Types of, and Venues for, Teaching Activities	29
6.9	Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service	31
6.9.1	Introduction.....	31
6.9.2	Demonstration of Effectiveness in Institutional and Professional Service.....	32
Section 7—Expectations for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion: Tenured, Tenure-Track, and WOT Tracks		33
7.1	Reappointment to Assistant Professor	33
7.2	Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor	35
7.3	Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor.....	37
Section 8—Expectations for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion: Research Track...39		
8.1	Reappointment to Assistant Research Professor	39
8.2	Appointment or Promotion to Associate Research Professor	41
8.3	Appointment or Promotion to Research Professor	43
Section 9—Expectations for Reappointment and Promotion: Teaching Track.....		45
9.1	Reappointment to Assistant Teaching Professor.....	45
9.2	Appointment or Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor.....	47
9.3	Appointment or Promotion to Teaching Professor.....	49
Part 3 Navigating the Promotion and Tenure Process		51
Section 10—Introduction		51
10.1	Summary of the Promotion and Tenure Process.....	51
10.2	Faculty Advancement and Success	53
10.3	Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review—Role of the Faculty Candidate	54
10.4	Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review—Role of the Faculty Mentors.....	62
10.5	Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review—Role of the Department Chair	63
10.6	Promotion and Tenure Review Process—Role of the Department-Level Review..	65
10.7	Promotion and Tenure Review Process—Role of the Department Academic Human Resources Staff	66
10.8	Promotion and Tenure Review Process—Role of the SPH Office of the Dean, SPH Faculty Council, and the UW Office of the Provost	66

Part 1 Introduction and General Academic Affairs Information

Section 1—Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Academic Affairs Handbook

The Academic Affairs Handbook (AAH) of the School of Public Health (SPH or the School) at the University of Washington (UW or University) is a school-specific document describing policy and procedures regulating academic affairs within the SPH. The purpose of the AAH is to aid faculty in understanding processes related to academic recruitments, appointments, and promotions as implemented in the SPH.

1.2 Foundation Underlying the Academic Affairs Handbook

All appointment, reappointment, and promotion processes in SPH are guided by the [UW Faculty Code and Governance](#) (FCG or Faculty Code), the policy that specifies the organization and functioning of the University's faculty and the [Office of Academic Personnel](#) (OAP) policies and procedures. The SPH Academic Affairs Handbook is not intended to replace the FCG, but rather to add a layer of specificity to how the FCG applies to faculty in the School.

The following Faculty Code sections within the FCG pertain to expectations for the reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty which serve as the foundation for SPH appointment, promotion, and tenure (APT) criteria.

Faculty Code Section	Topic covered
24-31	General Appointment Policy
24-32	Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members
24-34	Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles
24-40	Faculty Without Tenure by Reason of Funding (WOT)
24-41	Duration of Nontenure Appointments
24-51	Responsibility for Appointments
24-53	Procedure for Renewal of Appointments
24-54	Procedure for Promotions
24-57	Procedural Safeguards for Promotion, Merit-Based Salary, and Tenure Considerations

1.3 Principles Followed in the Academic Affairs Handbook

Revisions reflected in this version of the handbook (as of May 12, 2024) have been made to respond to faculty concerns regarding attention to anti-racist principles, and to provide faculty greater transparency in the processes of academic affairs. The AAH now explains the life course of faculty positions and expectations for faculty with respect to appointments and promotions. Case examples are also now provided in the Appendices.

The principles followed in this version aim to:

- Ensure an inclusive AAH that recognizes the diverse areas and approaches to scholarship being conducted by faculty that reflect the values of the SPH. This revision includes expanding the range of activities considered for promotion and strives for inclusivity in its definition of scholarship.
- Incorporate academic public health practice (APHP) into the scholarship activities in the AAH rather than considering this a separate domain. APHP is now included within scholarship activities and faculty are reminded to distinguish APHP activities from service activities.
- Integrate principles of equity, diversity, inclusion, and anti-racism throughout the AAH. The SPH has embraced a mission and value system that prioritizes diversity of professional and lived experiences to generate innovation and advance social justice in public health, reflected in our [strategic plan](#). This approach calls for cultivating *inclusive excellence*. According to the Association of Schools and Programs of Public Health ([ASPPH](#)), inclusive excellence is defined as the “cohesive, coherent, collaborative, and measurable integration of inclusion, diversity, and equity, while centering the naming and dismantling of white supremacy culture, in the pursuit of excellence across the research, teaching, and practice mission of academic public health, including all activities by leadership, faculty, learners, staff, alumni, and the broader community.” Faculty pursuit of inclusive excellence, specifically, is evidenced by approaches to incorporate anti-racism, equity, diversity, inclusion (EDI), and decolonizing principles into scholarship/research, teaching, and service activities.
- Expose the *hidden curriculum* and help faculty understand how the promotion process works. In other words, this revision strives for transparency and clarity. (Please see Glossary in Appendix for definitions.)
- Articulate expectations for effectiveness by track and rank. The FCG refers to both effectiveness and excellence. We focus here on defining effectiveness and recognize that all SPH faculty strive for inclusive excellence, per the definition above.
- Adopt a language and perspective used in the FCG, specifically:
 - Refer to “scholarship and research” as one domain, where scholarship includes research. In this revision, this is often shortened to “scholarship/research.”
 - Reflect FCG’s recognition that contributions to diversity and equal opportunity are explicitly considered among professional contributions for appointment and promotion (FCG [Section 24-32](#)).

- Limit details (at this time) on appointments other than professorial track. Department level guidelines and expectations for some of the other types of faculty appointments are currently in development, and more time is needed to provide the same attention to the principles addressed here for these tracks. Section 3 includes a brief reference to non-professorial appointments with links to UW guidance.
- Eliminate duplication, redundancy, and possible discrepancies by referencing existing policies rather than including them in the body of the AAH. Broad summaries are provided only as needed.
- Add a glossary of definitions in the appendix to improve clarity of understanding.

1.4 The Academic Affairs Handbook and the Role of the SPH Faculty Council

The SPH AAH is maintained, updated, and revised by the SPH Faculty Council (FC). The SPH FC is an elected body of the SPH faculty that contributes to the shared governance of the School and its academic affairs. Its membership comprises voting faculty across departments and programs in SPH, and across faculty titles restricted to the associate professor or professor rank. The authority of the FC is provided by the [SPH Faculty Bylaws](#), which detail the responsibilities, membership, elections, officers, procedures and meetings, written records, and vacancies of the FC. Briefly, the FC advises the dean on matters of faculty promotion and tenure, and advises the dean on matters involving academic policy, including priorities, resource and salary allocation, and budgets (FCG [Section 23-45C](#)). The SPH FC has additional responsibility for providing secondary review of new appointments at the rank of associate professor (tenure/tenure track/research/teaching) and above, as well as promotions in the tenure/without tenure (WOT)/research/teaching tracks. Based on these reviews the FC shall, in a timely fashion, make recommendations to the dean regarding these proposed appointments and promotions.

The SPH FC revises the AAH as needed to reflect changes in the UW Faculty Code and changes to the policy and procedures regulating academic affairs within the SPH. At minimum, the FC will review promotion criteria every five years to confirm that these criteria reflect the breadth of scholarly activities of SPH faculty. Anytime modifications are made to the AAH by the SPH FC, the FC will assess which constituents are involved and will decide whether the vote of approval of the modification can be at the level of the FC (for house-keeping and minor changes) or at the level of the SPH voting faculty (for substantive changes). At the request of any FC member, the vote will go to SPH voting faculty. A proposed action of the School of Public Health faculty under the authority of the Faculty Code, Sections [23-43](#) and [23-44](#), is effective if passed by a majority of its eligible voting members.

Section 2—Values and Expectations of the School of Public Health Academic Community

2.1 School of Public Health Values

In 2022, SPH revised its [mission, vision, and values](#) for the School. The vision is “a world of healthy people.” The mission is: “Our mission is to solve our greatest public health challenges and co-create health equity with communities in the region and the world. We do this by centering community as we rigorously pursue knowledge, put learning into practice, and train the next generation of visionary public health professionals.”

As a member of the SPH community, all faculty must conduct themselves and their interactions with UW peers, staff, and students in a way that shows respect for the individual and the SPH community. The values for the School are:

- Collaboration
- Community
- Equity, Justice, and Anti-Racism
- Meaningful Positive Impact
- Innovation
- Shared Learning

2.2 SPH Commitment to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Anti-Racism

As indicated above, through its mission, vision, and values, SPH is committed to equity, diversity, inclusion, and anti-racism. More information can be found on the School’s [mission, vision, and values](#) web page as well as the [strategic plan](#) web page.

The guidelines for appointment and promotion, defined and outlined in the SPH AAH, reflect and embrace core principles stated in the SPH mission, vision, and values. The AAH embraces these principles not only as ethical principles, but because they are integral to the foundation of rigorous and impactful public health science, and the development of the public health workforce. These core values provide a roadmap to organizing and leading project teams, designing research projects and interventions, training the next generation of visionary health professionals, disseminating findings, and engaging in advocacy for policy change to maximize impact of scholarly knowledge production. The AAH criteria and expectations for promotion have been developed to support faculty implementation of these principles throughout their professional activities in research and scholarship, teaching and mentoring, as well as University and community service.

Embracing these principles also entails that faculty actively engage in building and sustaining a diverse, equitable, and inclusive professional workplace committed to anti-racism and social justice. The AAH provides extensive examples for how faculty can prepare for reappointment and promotion in support of these core values. The AAH helps faculty understand the various ways they can include EDI activities in their promotion packet materials, if they choose, in order to acknowledge ‘hidden labor.’

2.3 Academic and Personal Conduct Expectations

All members of the academic community, including faculty members, must comply with the rules of the University and its schools, colleges, and departments. The UW provides a [policy directory](#) which should be referred to when there are questions related to appropriate policy or procedure.

UW also provides a “[Guide to Ethics Policies](#)” web page for faculty and staff. Additionally, for faculty, there is a ‘Standard of Conduct’ included in the FCG [Section 25-71](#). Compliance with all rules, regulations, and policies is mandatory.

Section 3—Qualifications for Appointments and Reappointments for Academic Tracks and Ranks, and Changes in Faculty Appointments

3.1 Introduction

Section 3 is intended to briefly summarize information about professorial and non-professorial positions in the School of Public Health. While this section refers to positions in SPH, note that these positions are University-wide rather than specific to the School. [At the time of this writing (May 2024), this section mainly covers professorial positions. The next update to the AAH, planned in the forthcoming academic year, will include more information for non-professorial titles and ranks.]

Members of the faculty at the UW SPH are scholars in their respective disciplines in public health. The UW SPH uses four professorial track titles:

- Tenure/tenure-track and without-tenure- (WOT) track faculty, both of which have the same teaching and research responsibilities.
- Research track faculty, who have primarily research responsibilities.
- Teaching track faculty, who have primarily teaching responsibilities.

Some of these appointments are clock-managed, and some have defined terms. Clock-managed tracks are those that have a mandatory timeframe to be reviewed for promotion and/or tenure decisions (i.e., assistant professors in the research, WOT and tenure tracks, and associate professor and professor tenure track). Teaching and research tracks at all ranks are multi-year and fixed-term appointments. This means they hold a specific end date (determined by track and rank as established by the Faculty Code) and are reappointed based on the appointment term. The reappointment process and criteria are determined at the departmental level. Details are provided below in Section 3.2.

We also have a variety of other academic titles, which are discussed briefly in Section 3.3 below. The Office of Academic Personnel's (OAP) "[Academic Titles and Ranks](#)" web page lists all academic titles that are professorial, non-professorial, and postdoctoral scholar titles. Choosing any linked title from that list provides further details in a table, including service period, what can be full- and/or part-time, tenure eligibility, and voting rights eligibility, etc. FCG [Section 24-32](#) gives the scholarly and professional qualifications of faculty members. Further details regarding the qualifications for appointments at a specific rank within a track can be found in the FCG [Section 24-34](#).

3.2 Qualifications for Appointments for Professorial Tracks and Ranks

This section gives a general overview of appointments in the professorial tracks and provides links to the key sections in the FCG and OAP. The specific qualifications SPH uses for appointment or promotion into the various tracks and ranks are listed in the *Expectations for Effectiveness* tables below in Sections 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 9.1, 9.2, 9.3. Those in professorial tracks are eligible for appointment to the [UW Graduate Faculty](#), and may be eligible for [doctoral endorsement](#), and are [eligible to Principal Investigator](#) (PI) grants and contracts in SPH.

Promotion Clock

Assistant professors in the WOT, tenure, and research tracks have a mandatory promotion clock of six years, meaning they are “clock-managed” and the promotion and tenure (if applicable) decision must be made in the final year of the appointment. Assistant professors in the WOT, tenure, and research-tracks have an initial term of three years, and, if reappointed to a second three-year term, will be required to go through a mandatory [academic review](#) during their second appointment term. There are several possible outcomes: favorable promotion; favorable promotion with award of tenure; postponement; unfavorable due to denial or unfavorable due to withdrawal. More information is outlined on the OAP [Promotion/Tenure Review Process Possible Outcomes](#) web page.

Clock Waiver

Faculty in clock-managed tracks and ranks are reviewed for consideration of promotion and/or tenure in a mandatory and specified timeframe or probationary period. Generally speaking, if the faculty member works less than six months during an academic year (July 1-June 30), the year will be waived and will not count toward the promotion and/or tenure clock. Thus, faculty who begin July 1-January 1, that year counts on their clock (and years in rank) since that means they are working six months or more, but faculty starting January 2-June 30 have a clock that doesn't begin until the following July since they aren't working a full six months. Candidates are encouraged to talk with their Academic Human Resources (AHR) manager if they have questions about clock starts and waivers. The six-year timeframe is otherwise known as a faculty member's “promotion and/or tenure clock”. A [clock waiver](#) extends the faculty's mandatory clock and can be requested for reasons such as birth or adoption of a child, a serious health condition, providing care for a family member with a serious health condition, and other extenuating circumstances outside the faculty member's control. Faculty who may wish to explore a clock waiver should reach out to their department AHR manager for details.

Qualifications for Appointment and Promotion in the Tenure and WOT Tracks and Ranks

- Qualifications for appointment at the level of assistant professor in the tenure/tenure-track and WOT track are noted in FCG [Section 24-34A.1](#). This is a clock-managed position and the required academic review for this position is detailed on the OAP's [Academic Reviews](#) web page.
- Qualifications for appointment or promotion to associate professor in the tenure/tenure track and WOT track are noted in FCG [Section 24-34A.2](#).
- Qualifications for appointment or promotion to professor qualifications in the tenure/tenure track and WOT track are noted in [Section 24-34A.3](#).
- Criteria for tenure related to these appointments are identified in the FCG [Section 25-32D](#).

In this AAH, all WOT appointments are assumed to be “without tenure by reason of funding”. Noted in FCG [Section 24-40](#), faculty members appointed as WOT do not hold tenure because all or part of their annual University administered salary is derived from sources other than regularly appropriated state funds. Except for this distinction, WOT faculty members have the same rights, responsibilities, and obligations as tenure-track and tenured faculty members at those ranks. Criteria for appointment and promotion are the same as tenure/tenure-track, except WOT appointments have additional funding-related expectations noted in Section 24-40 of the FCG. In addition, [Executive Order 45](#) states that teaching is an essential qualification for the granting of tenure.

Qualifications for Appointments in the Research Title and Ranks

Research faculty appointments are identified in the FCG under [Section 24-35](#). Additional information on these appointments can be found on OAP's web page for [Professorial Tracks](#).

- Additional information related to the qualifications and duration of research assistant professor appointments is in FCG [Section 24-41](#). This is a clock-managed track and rank that requires a reappointment after the initial three-year term, but does not require an academic review at that time. See the previous section for additional information about clock-managed positions.
- Additional information related to position qualifications and duration for research associate professor and research professor appointments are in the FCG under [Section 24-34A](#) and [Section 24-34B.5](#).
- Appointment lengths are also reviewed on OAP's web page for [Professorial Tracks](#). These are multi-year appointments with no limit to the number of reappointments. This track is not eligible for tenure.

Qualifications for Appointments in the Teaching Tracks and Ranks

Information about teaching professor appointments is available in the FCG under [Section 24-35B](#) and on OAP's web page for [Professorial Tracks](#). Teaching faculty are multi-year fixed-term appointments and are not clock-managed (meaning there is no mandatory promotion clock). This track is not eligible for tenure. Terms are provided in FCG [Section 24-41](#).

- Additional information about the qualifications and duration of appointments for assistant teaching professor is in [Section 24-41C.1](#) of the FCG; [Section 24-34A.1](#) reviews qualifications for appointments in this rank.
- Qualifications for appointments and promotions to associate teaching professor are noted in FCG [Section 24-34A.2](#); [Section 24-41C.2](#) has additional information related to the duration of these appointments.
- Information about appointments and promotion to teaching professor is provided in FCG [Section 24-34B.3](#) and [Section 24-41C](#).

3.3 Qualifications for Appointments for Other Academic Tracks and Ranks

The [Academic Titles and Ranks](#) web page from OAP provides considerable detail about all other relevant non-professorial academic positions used at the SPH, including:

- Acting Titles
- Affiliate Titles
- Clinical Titles (Salaried and Non-Salaried)
- Non-Professorial Instructional and Other Related Titles
- Postdoctoral Scholar Titles
- Residents and Fellows
- Visiting Titles
- Emeritus Appointments and Re-Employed Retirees

Each title on the web page provides a table of information, including service period, length of appointment, full- or part-time, reappointment eligibility and terms, tenure and voting status, and many other key details. Additional information for these titles is also available within the FCG in the following sections:

Faculty Code	Topic covered
Section 24-34B	Qualifications for Appointments with Specific Titles
24-41	Duration of Nontenure Appointments
24-45	Appointment of Part-Time Professors
24-53	Procedure for Renewal of Appointments

Each department also has the right to determine more specific academic qualifications, both educational and experiential, of non-professorial appointments to their department. Faculty should check with their department chair or AHR representative for this information.

3.4 Faculty Appointment Actions

Joint Appointments

A joint appointment is one that recognizes a tenure/tenure track, WOT, research, or teaching faculty member's long-term commitment to (and participation in) two or more UW departments. Joint appointments are secondary appointments whose title and rank match that of the primary appointment. Only professorial faculty may hold a joint appointment. One department is designated the primary department; the others are secondary. This designation can be changed only with the concurrence of the faculty member and the appointing departments; the same is true of relinquishing a joint appointment. Personnel determinations (salaries, promotions, leave, etc.) originate with the primary department but may be proposed by a secondary department; all actions must have the concurrence of the secondary departments.

If a faculty member is being proposed for a joint appointment, the joint department faculty must vote specifically whether or not to offer voting privileges with the appointment. The outcome of that vote is shared through an agreement in writing and will be used for determining the quorum for faculty votes. The agreement can be revised with the concurrence of the faculty member and the department involved. Faculty with joint appointments are expected to be full members of both departments, with the expectation that they will meet the service requirements in both departments, unless negotiated differently between departments. Faculty with joint appointments should discuss their service responsibilities with both department chairs to ensure an appropriate workload. Faculty are required to meet expectations in both departments, including appointment and promotion criteria.

Adjunct Appointments

An adjunct appointment denotes an appointment extended only to a tenure/tenure track, WOT, research, or teaching faculty member who holds a primary appointment in another UW department to recognize their contributions to a secondary department. It does not confer governance or voting privileges or eligibility for tenure. Appointment terms are annual.

Endowed Appointments

Endowed appointments recognize formal endowments made to the University and often carry a monetary component and honorific title awarded to the recipient (e.g., the Acme Distinguished Professor of Chemistry). Endowed appointments are dependent upon the primary appointment. Visit the [Endowments Appointments](#) web page for more details.

Appointment to the UW Graduate Faculty

The [Graduate Faculty](#) consists of those members of the University faculty who have been designated by the dean of the Graduate School as actively participating in graduate education. Graduate Faculty members who substantively engage in doctoral education must also have a specific “doctoral endorsement.” A doctoral endorsement is required to chair a doctoral supervisory committee or to serve as a Graduate School Representative (GSR) to doctoral supervisory committees. Powers and duties of the Graduate Faculty are given in FCG [Section 23-42](#) and [Section 23-44](#). Additional information can also be found on the Graduate School [web site](#). Refer to local level processes for obtaining Graduate Faculty status and endorsement to chair.

Appointment and Full-Time Employee changes

There are several personnel actions through which UW faculty or other academic personnel might permanently reduce their appointment or temporarily reduce their Full-Time Employee (FTE). Information is provided on the OAP [Appointment and FTE Reductions](#) web page.

- **Voluntary FTE Change:** A voluntary FTE change is a permanent adjustment to the contracted appointment. If an appointment is reduced, the appointment percent (“roster” in Workday) cannot be increased for the remainder of the appointment term. Some academic personnel titles and ranks are not eligible for a reduction; others have limitations to the extent they may be reduced. Decisions about a reduction in teaching load and other faculty assignments are determined at the local level and are generally commensurate with the reduction in FTE.
- **Reduced Responsibility:** Many SPH faculty members are responsible for securing a portion of their salary through external sources. When such faculty are temporarily unable to meet this obligation, they are placed in the Reduced Responsibility status. UW’s Office of Research oversees this policy and process. Information can be found on the web page that covers [GIM 38](#): ‘Faculty Reduced Responsibility Status Involving External Funding’.
- **Leave-Related FTE Changes:** Academic personnel who have been approved for a full or partial leave of absence require an FTE change in Workday. Instructions on how to submit this information are on the [UW Employee Workday Help](#) web site (requires UW log in to access). The OAP web site also provides information on [Time Off and Leaves](#).

Changing Professorial Tracks

There are a variety of reasons why faculty members in professorial tracks may wish to change to a different track. It is expected that a faculty member approved to change tracks will enter the new track at the equivalent rank. For example, an associate professor WOT changing to the research track would come in as an associate research professor. Faculty considering a track change should discuss the associated obligations and risks with their chair. More information is also provided on OAP’s [Changing Professorial Tracks](#) web page, including which track changes are allowable and the associated requirements and approvals.

Section 4—SPH’s Budget Model and Faculty Compensation Plan

UW utilizes a method of budgeting called [Activity Based Budgeting](#) (ABB), which distributes revenues and budget authority directly to the unit (i.e., school on the Seattle campus) responsible for generating that activity. Each unit then follows their own methodology on distributing ABB revenue. Beginning in FY21, SPH developed a funding model to support department operations and faculty activities. At the core of this model is the [SPH Faculty Compensation Plan Table](#), which provides specific levels of salary support for tenured/tenure-track, without tenure, research, and teaching faculty (the Plan and FAQs can be found on the [Faculty Resources](#) web page).

The plan describes specific expectations for teaching; mentoring; service; scholarly leadership; equity, diversity, and inclusion; and grant/contract writing in relation to the level of provided salary support. The plan also details ways in which faculty may—with chair approval—buy-out of some teaching expectations, participate in the plan’s research incentive, and understand expectations for bridging or over-the-cap salary coverage. Departments may develop additional policies and guidance to further clarify local faculty expectations.

All activities in the compensation plan directly map onto promotion expectations, but the criteria for faculty salary support are distinct from the criteria for promotion. The faculty compensation plan, generally speaking, defines amounts of teaching, research, and service expected in order to receive corresponding salary support by faculty track.

While the Appendix does provide minimum teaching and research expectations for promotion by track, this handbook focuses on quality, rather than quantity, of teaching, research, and service expected by track.

Please note that the amount of teaching required by the faculty compensation plan may exceed the minimum required teaching for promotion in a specific track.

Section 5—Faculty Recruitment and Appointment Process

5.1 Introduction

The UW has documented policies and procedures for the faculty recruitment and appointment processes. All UW personnel are required to follow these policies and procedures. Schools and colleges at the UW can also create additional policies and procedures, provided it is in alignment with the FCG and the OAP.

This section of the AAH provides information for the faculty recruitment and appointment processes that apply to tenure, tenure-track, WOT, research, and teaching faculty in the SPH. All voting faculty have an important role to play when recruiting and hiring new faculty positions in their primary and joint departments.

The information provided here is intended to be a broad overview, rather than to provide specific details. Where appropriate, links to where specific information can be found are provided, rather than repeating language here. Faculty can also contact their department chair, department administrator, or AHR manager if there are further questions.

For the School of Public Health, all appointment processes are guided by the FCG and the SPH Bylaws. The following table includes links to relevant Faculty Code sections that pertain to the recruitment and appointment process:

Faculty Code Section	Topic Covered
24-31	General Appointment Policy
24-32	Scholarly and Professional Qualifications of Faculty Members
24-34	Qualifications for Appointment at Specific Ranks and Titles
24-35	Research Personnel Appointments
24-51	Responsibility for Appointments
24-52	Procedure for New Appointments

5.2 Best Practices for Effective Faculty Searches

The UW and the SPH recognize the importance of, and are committed to, diversity, equity, and inclusion for all faculty, staff, and students. Resources for conducting faculty searches include:

- The UW Office of Faculty Advancement ([OFA](#)) [Handbook of Best Practices for Faculty Searches](#).
- The vice dean for faculty, in the Office of the Dean, provides an OFA-developed search committee workshop that addresses best practices for faculty searches. During the workshop, best practices for conducting effective faculty searches, including the following topics, are reviewed:
 - Developing the job ad with an equity lens.

- Designing thoughtful rubrics and assessment plans that strive to reduce unintended biases that can enter the review and interview process.
- Asking candidates for personal written statements on diversity, equity, inclusion, and anti-racism, and how these principles relate to their work.
- Tips for recruitment of faculty with diverse backgrounds, with personal interactions and discussions of our faculty development resources.
- Preparing questions for candidates about how they might support under-represented minority students, staff, and faculty.
- Developing regular communications to update the department on proceedings of the committee.
- Establishing search committee working norms for committee operations and decisions, including establishment of processes for identifying and mitigating any potential conflicts of interest.
- Working with student members of search committees.

5.3 Opening a Position and Creating the Search Committee

UW has an annual hiring request cycle managed by the Office of the Provost. To plan for the following academic year, each year, SPH department chairs submit proposals for positions to include in the overall hiring plan, managed within the Office of the Dean, after obtaining input from all of the department's voting faculty, as part of shared governance. The dean also solicits input from the directors of interdepartmental degree programs about their hiring priorities, which should be informed by consultation by the program director with the program faculty. Before submitting the final hiring request to the Office of the Provost, the Office of the Dean leadership consults with department chairs, Faculty Council, and the Dean's Advisory Council of Students (DACs). Joint searches with affiliated institutions and joint appointments at UW where funding will be committed from the joint unit are included in planning

While searches cannot officially be launched until the hiring plan has been approved by the Provost, chairs typically work with the Office of the Dean to appoint and charge search committees as soon as the hiring plan has been submitted by the Office of the Dean. Search committee membership should reflect the expertise required to choose the best qualified applicant for the position. When possible, the committee should reflect a variety of backgrounds, experiences, and expertise with diversity, equity, and inclusion (i.e., race/ethnicity, gender, academic specialization, years of experience), and include students.

5.4 Search/Recruitment Process

Search committees work with their departmental AHR manager to follow both UW and SPH faculty search policies and procedures, including using the 'SPH Search and Hire Overview' guide that encompasses required steps of a faculty search from both UW and SPH. When a member of SPH faculty is appointed to a search committee, the departmental AHR manager or search manager will provide members with the current policies and procedures for search committees, as well as templates and sample materials to work from.

The departmental search committees are responsible for: writing the job ad; advertising the position; creating interview questions, assessment plans, and rubrics; and interviewing applicants. Voting faculty should discuss their desired level of involvement in the faculty search through a shared governance discussion. Search committee members and the committee chair are expected to mitigate conflict of interest, with the AHR manager and the vice dean for faculty available as needed to consult.

The department chair will provide the search committee with a charging letter, which will include how the committee should report about the top candidates. Following the SPH search process, the search committee identifies top candidates via a committee search report that is then presented to the voting faculty and department chair.

Based on the search committee's recommendations, the department chair makes a recommendation to the dean and requests approval to move forward with an offer to a specific candidate, pending a faculty vote. The offer of appointment requires pre-approval from the dean. (According to FCG, if the dean wishes to offer to a different candidate than the one selected by the department, the dean must first consult with the affected faculty.) In cases of an appointment being at the level of associate or full professor, the SPH Faculty Council provides a secondary review, as outlined in the SPH Bylaws. The director of Human Resources in the Office of the Dean will partner with the department on developing the offer letter, consult on negotiations, and help answer questions.

5.5 Use of Data and Records Retention in Search Processes

The University of Washington uses the [Faculty Search](#) module (from [Interfolio](#)) to conduct searches to fill faculty positions. Interested candidates apply via Interfolio, and committees review and assess candidate materials within the module.

As a state institution, UW and its personnel are required to comply with state records management laws. Details can be found on the UW [Records Management](#) web site. Candidate information, other than published writings and research, should be considered confidential and treated as such.

The UW Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action ([EOAA](#)) also provides information on UW policy regarding affirmative action in the State of Washington. Data for affirmative action is collected in both Faculty Search and UW's [Workday](#) system. Guidance for collection of these data is provided by UW [Human Resources](#).

5.6 Appointment of New Faculty

Departmental Academic Human Resources staff will work with the department chair and candidate to gather all necessary materials to complete the hiring process in UW's Workday system.

Part 2 Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty in Professorial Titles

Part 2 of the handbook focuses on providing an in-depth discussion of how reappointment, promotion, and tenure criteria can be demonstrated and evaluated, with detail given by faculty track.

This part of the handbook describes the reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty in professorial titles, which include tenure/tenure track, without tenure (WOT), teaching, and research professors by rank (i.e., assistant professor, associate professor, and professor).

Appointment processes for professorial faculty are described in Section 5 above. (As noted in Section 1, appointment, reappointment, and promotion processes for other faculty titles are not included in this version of the handbook.)

Section 6—Guidelines for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Faculty in Professorial Titles

6.1 Introduction

University guidelines for the reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty members are found in FCG [Chapter 24](#) and are followed by the SPH. Listed below are further guidelines for SPH faculty developed in consultation with the faculty of all SPH departments.

In the sections that follow, the handbook provides an overview of guidelines for the qualitative and holistic review of a candidate's promotion and tenure files, which will vary from discipline to discipline. The sections below outline the overall elements to consider in evaluating and demonstrating effectiveness of scholarship/research, teaching, and service. Specific expectations for reappointment, promotion, and tenure for tenure/tenure-track, without tenure (WOT), research, and teaching tracks are provided in Sections 7, 8, and 9, respectively.

There are three domains of activity that all faculty, regardless of title or rank, are expected to engage in: **scholarship (which includes research), teaching, and service**. However, the type of activities and the relative time engaged across these domains will vary by faculty track, rank, and interest. **Competence, strength, and excellence** are the expectations for progression across ranks, moving from assistant, to associate, then to full professor. Competence involves a minimum level of mastery of the domain; strength demonstrates increased levels of mastery of the domain; and excellence refers to inclusive excellence as defined by ASPPH (definition provided above in Section 1.3). Example faculty activities across the domains of scholarship/research, teaching, and service are provided in Appendix 2. Track-specific minimum expectations for promotion into the associate and full professor ranks are provided in Appendix 3. Note that, according to the definition of a minimum, most faculty will exceed the minimum

expectations at the time of promotion.

Sections 6.2 through 6.5 describe overall considerations for assessment of faculty candidates' work, section 6.6 covers identification and mitigation of bias in faculty assessments, and sections 6.7-6.9 cover assessment details for each faculty activity: scholarship/research, teaching, and service.

6.2 Overall Assessment of Faculty Effectiveness in the Promotion Review

Assessment of the effectiveness of a faculty candidate, for appointment, reappointment, promotion, or tenure is, ultimately, qualitative, and based on the materials provided by the candidate. This section focuses primarily on promotion and tenure reviews, as the tenure-only assessment mirrors the promotion review process.

For promotion and tenure reviews, the primary documents that reviewers (both internal and external) will consider are the CV, self-assessment, teaching evaluations, promotion consideration worksheet (cover sheet), and the candidate's scholarship/research examples. The self-assessment provides the qualitative narrative that accompanies the CV, and helps the reviewers understand the quality and impact of the candidate's work, in addition to the productivity that is apparent from the CV. Teaching evaluations include student and peer evaluations conducted regularly (annually for assistant professors, every three years and the year leading up to promotion for associate professor and every three years for full professors) while in rank. The scholarship/research examples include copies of three to five articles or other scholarship products such as educational materials, technical reports, policy documents, or peer-reviewed practice articles that show evidence of the candidate's scholarly contributions. This is a curated subset of the candidate's scholarship contributions selected to highlight the quality and impact of their scholarship. The scholarship/research examples cover statement provides the reviewers with a deeper understanding of, and context for, the scholarly products.

Reviewers of promotion and tenure packets consider how criteria are met based on the rank- and track-specific appointment criteria listed in the [Faculty Code](#), and the expectations for effectiveness in faculty role summarized below in Sections 7 through 9. The complete set of reviewers includes: the external reviewers; departmental appointment and promotion committee (APT); departmental eligible voting faculty; department chair; Faculty Council; SPH vice dean for faculty, on behalf of the SPH dean; and the UW Provost. (Section 10 below provides further details on each of these roles during the process.)

Four key criteria are considered in the qualitative review of promotion packets: productivity, quality, impact, and sustainability. These need to be evaluated holistically, rather than in isolation. Attention to all four of these criteria should be woven through the candidate's self-assessment. Candidates should review these with their mentor prior to assembling a promotion package.

- **Productivity**
 - Has the faculty member been productive in their current rank?
 - The assessment of productivity is based on a diverse array of scholarship/research, teaching, and service activities. In other words, it is neither a single activity nor a single threshold metric.
 - Faculty candidates should consider and highlight metrics that reflect their productivity.
- **Quality**
 - Given the productivity, is the faculty member's work of sufficient quality to justify promotion?
 - If the scholarship is research, is there evidence of a high degree of scientific rigor?
 - If the scholarship represents non-research activities, is there evidence of a high degree of substance in these activities?
 - Evidence of innovativeness and/or inclusive excellence (See Section 1.3 above and Glossary (in the Appendix) for discussion of this term) in the faculty member's contributions should be considered as part of the evidence of quality.
- **Impact**
 - Has the faculty member's contributions made an impact in each specific domain (scholarship/research, teaching, service)?
 - How has the influence of the faculty member's contributions been shown?
 - Has the impact of the faculty member's work been enhanced by their leadership or supportive role on the project?
 - How has the faculty member's scholarship improved the health of the communities or the practice of public health?
- **Sustainability**
 - Has the candidate invested in one or more disciplinary areas over time, and how is this expected to continue in the future?
 - Is there evidence that the faculty member will be able to sustain their work in the future, e.g., through funding or ongoing collaborations?
 - What is the candidate's expected trajectory?

6.3 Approach to Evaluating the Candidate's Effectiveness

The specific overarching expectations for effectiveness in the faculty role for a specific track and rank are given below in the *Expectations for Effectiveness in Faculty Role* tables in Sections 7 through 9.

These tables are divided into the three domains (scholarship/research, teaching, and service). Within each domain there are one to four distinct expectations. Each expectation is aligned with one or more of the four criteria listed above.

The SPH minimum expectations for promotion into the associate and full ranks are listed in Appendix 3. These should be considered as the minimum expectations for promotion, i.e., meeting the minimum expectations alone is not sufficient to justify promotion. The second part of Appendix 3 has tables documenting metrics demonstrated by recently promoted faculty. While they are not criteria for promotion, these tables should be considered in conjunction with the minimum expectations to determine a candidate's readiness for promotion. Ultimately, reviewers will decide if a candidate meets promotion expectations in each of the three domains.

There are many different kinds of activities and elements that can be used to inform this qualitative assessment of a candidate's effectiveness. The example activities in Appendix 2 map to specific expectations in the *Expectations for Effectiveness in Faculty Role* tables in Sections 7 through 9. These activities incorporate SPH's values of collaboration, community, equity, justice, anti-racism, meaningful positive impact, innovation, and shared learning. The following subsections address the elements that can be used to assess effectiveness in the three domains of scholarship/research, teaching, and service. The lists of elements are not meant to be exhaustive, and not all elements on the list are required. These should be applied to each rank as appropriate to that rank. Further, reviewers should consider balance. Specifically, qualitative promotion reviews can be based on a subset of activities and elements within any domain, or a balanced consideration of all activities and elements.

Sections 7 through 9 also address SPH's interpretation of language in the Faculty Code ([Section 24-34](#)) for appointment to the associate and full ranks (i.e., new appointments and promotions) that form part of the assessment for each track.

6.4 Overall Process for Academic Review and Reappointment

Academic personnel appointed on a quarterly, annual, or multi-year basis have a fixed appointment length with an established end date. Appointments with end dates include all appointments to the teaching and research tracks. The end date is set at the time of the initial appointment or reappointment. To continue in the academic appointment beyond the end date, the individual must be evaluated and approved for reappointment. This evaluation is at the department level, using a process and criteria determined by the department. The process is concluded by a vote of eligible voting faculty and the reappointment recommendation is submitted to the Office of the Dean for the final decision. A positive reappointment decision results in an extension of the end date. Reappointment decisions do not result in a change of academic title or rank. More information can be found on OAP's [Reappointments](#) web page.

Academic Review (tenure/tenure-track, WOT, and research tracks only)

Assistant professors in the tenure/tenure-track, WOT, and research tracks are clock-managed. A clock-managed position has mandatory reappointment and promotion dates defined based on the date of hire of the faculty member. During the second year of a faculty member's initial three-year appointment at the assistant professor rank, they must be reviewed for consideration of a second three-year appointment at that same rank. The process and criteria for which faculty are reviewed is determined by the department. There are three possible outcomes: renew, postponement, or non-renew. Faculty are notified of outcomes by June 30 of the second year of their initial appointment. More information can be found on OAP's [Academic Reviews](#) web page.

Upon hire, the candidate should work with their department chair and senior mentors to develop and implement a plan for meeting expectations for reappointment based on this academic review (see Sections 7.1 and 8.1 for tenure/tenure-track/WOT and research track, respectively). The department chair and senior faculty mentors of the faculty candidate will provide guidance for assembling materials to demonstrate effectiveness in scholarship/research, teaching, and service that will be reviewed and voted upon by senior faculty within the candidate's primary department.

Reappointment (research track)

Research track faculty are multi-year and fixed term with an established end date. Research assistant professors are appointed for an initial term of three years. The second appointment term must include a promotion decision, as noted above.

Reappointment (teaching track)

Teaching track faculty are not clock-managed, meaning there is no mandatory review period for promotion. The teaching track appointment is multi-year and fixed-term with an established end date.

6.5 Overall Process for Granting of Tenure

The granting of tenure at the University of Washington provides a faculty member with the right to hold her/his/their position, without discriminatory reduction in salary or loss of position, except for serious infractions as defined in the Faculty Code, [Chapter 25](#). The American Association of University Professors ([AAUP](#)) states, "the purpose of tenure is to safeguard academic freedom. When faculty members can lose their positions because of their speech, publications, or research findings, they cannot properly fulfill their core responsibilities to advance and transmit knowledge. Tenure provides the conditions for faculty to pursue research and innovation and draw evidence-based conclusions free from corporate or political pressure."

For faculty candidates in the tenure-track that are being considered for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor, promotion and tenure decisions must be made concurrently. For faculty candidates in the tenure-track whose initial appointment at UW is made at the level of associate professor, the appointment may either be made with tenure or not. Faculty in the WOT track who are at (or will be at) the rank of associate professor and professor titles are qualified for tenure by virtue of their rank, given that both the tenure-track and WOT share the same expectations for scholarship and research, teaching, and institutional and professional service (see UW Faculty Code, [Chapter 25](#)).

As outlined in Section 3.4 above, some faculty are eligible for track changes. Specifically, when WOT faculty wish to switch to tenure-track, with an award of tenure, the department chair must first discuss with the dean if there is resource availability. The department must follow the processes outlined in FCG [Section 25.41B](#). It is important to note this process spans two academic years. Additional information can be found on the UW OAP web page, [Changing Professorial Tracks](#). Departments in SPH have begun to adopt local policies, developed through shared governance, for track changes to tenure-track for WOT-track faculty.

The process for WOT-track faculty candidates to convert to the tenure-track is separate from, but similar to, the promotion process. The materials required mirror the materials required for a promotion, including a CV, self-assessments, and course evaluations. Packets also contain letters from the department chair, departmental APT committee, and external reviewers. Departmental faculty votes, and dean/vice provost/provost approvals are all required. Information on track changes can be found on OAP's [Changing Professorial Tracks](#) web page. Faculty should consult with their department chair about specific department-level processes.

6.6 Identifying and Mitigating Bias in Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review

We acknowledge that all assessment and judgment is influenced by a person's lived experience, expertise, knowledge, and familiarity of the scenario under consideration. The process of review of faculty candidate effectiveness across scholarship and research, teaching, and institutional and professional service is not exempt from this subjective bias. Structures and systematic processes are put into place to minimize such bias and these structures and processes must be continually interrogated to ensure they are functioning equitably. Key sources of bias in faculty review, promotion, and tenure decision making include:

1. Basing assessments on qualities that are more easily measured and ranked.
2. Using impressive or familiar data points as benchmarks.
3. Elevating achievements based on attachment to highly-rated or prominent institutions or journals.
4. Relying on historical norms and habits in review processes.

There are also several levels of checks and balances in the systems of reappointment, promotion, and tenure review. First, the department chair and senior faculty mentors should clearly communicate expectations for faculty candidates and provide open coaching to work with faculty candidates to prepare for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. Second, all department faculty who are senior in rank review and vote on faculty candidate reappointment, promotion, and tenure packets. (Typically, this occurs after the departmental APT committee review and recommendation.) Finally, the SPH Faculty Council, Office of the Dean, and the UW Office of the Provost provide review levels to help ensure that UW Faculty Code is followed.

The following paragraphs briefly describe common biases across scholarship and research, teaching, and institutional and professional service that faculty reviewers should consider during the review process.

Scholarship/Research

Evaluation of a faculty candidate's breadth of scholarly and research activity requires multiple considerations. First, faculty may or may not conduct scholarly and research activities in partnership with interdisciplinary colleagues or practice- or community-based partners. Conducting partnered, clinical trials, or interdisciplinary scholarship takes more time and may not result in first authorship on dissemination products. Second, faculty may or may not engage in scholarship and research prioritized by large funding bodies or prominent journals. It is well established that community-engaged scholarship and research related to health disparities or underserved populations have lower award rates from large federal funders like the National Institutes of Health (NIH) [Hoppe et al 2019], a funder often used as a benchmark for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. Furthermore, women and faculty of color are more likely to pursue these lines of scholarly inquiry. [Hoppe et al 2019] Finally, faculty themselves may be less likely to receive funding or be published due to legacies of acknowledged structural racism and discrimination by both funding agencies like the NIH [Collins et al 2021] as well as prominent journals. [Jones et al 2023] These issues have significant implications in terms of the ability to generate and disseminate results for the evaluation of quality, impact, and sustainment of scholarship and research.

Teaching

Evaluation of teaching effectiveness of faculty candidates also requires multiple considerations. First, teaching effectiveness in course instruction is often based on student end-of-course evaluations. Yet, it is well established that student evaluations are influenced by gender [Aragon et al 2023] and racial biases, as well as biases against discipline and subject area. [Heffernan et al 2022] Furthermore, women and faculty of color are more likely to teach courses in subject areas that critically challenge student beliefs (e.g., health disparities, social determinants of health) [Christine 2006]. To call attention to this bias, and prevent negative consequences of this bias, department Human Resources managers currently highlight this issue for external letter writers when soliciting letters. Second, women and faculty of color are more likely to engage in informal mentoring of students [Rose et al 2005], which is associated with student success, yet takes time and is not explicitly recognized through current SPH definitions of non-

course teaching. Finally, students of traditionally underrepresented or marginalized groups tend to be drawn to mentors who are racially similar. [Rose et al 2005] As the relative diversity of students far exceeds the relative diversity of faculty, this results in a disproportionate demand on faculty of color. Promotion file evaluators must recognize that these burdens significantly impact the ability of women and faculty of color candidates to advance in areas such as scholarship and research in comparison with their white male counterparts.

Institutional and Professional Service

Women [O'Meara et al 2018] and faculty of color [Trejo 2020] candidates are more likely to be asked to perform more institutional service activities relative to their white male counterparts in units where they are underrepresented. Many of these activities are required for unit culture and climate, yet devalued within reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes. Promotion file evaluators must recognize that these burdens have implications for career progression and success given the time taken from other domains of the faculty role, especially scholarship and research.

6.7 Evaluation of Effectiveness in Scholarship/Research

6.7.1 Introduction

Scholarship is defined as rigorous and detailed study and is recognized as essential to effective teaching and research within the UW Faculty Code. Scholarship, therefore, is inclusive of research as defined by the [Common Rule definition](#), but not synonymous. To broaden the norm that all scholarship of SPH faculty must be research, we will refer to this domain of the faculty role as 'scholarship/research' in keeping with the UW Faculty Code. (See [Section 24-32](#)).

Scholarly activities may fall across a spectrum ranging from research, to practice (i.e., to generate new knowledge about the state of public health, the design, implementation, and impact of public health strategies and interventions, as well as methods to examine issues related to public health), to dissemination of methods for education and pedagogy (i.e., to advance knowledge of how best to prepare the public health workforce). Some SPH faculty, therefore, may choose to focus their scholarly activities within traditional research, while others may focus their activities within educational practice/pedagogy or academic public health practice (APHP) areas.

SPH values scholarly activity in all three of these areas (research, practice, pedagogy) and seeks to ensure that faculty feel supported and are recognized for their activities, regardless of area. SPH faculty recognize that the kinds of activities a faculty candidate engages in, as well as their record of scholarship/research, will vary by discipline. The role of the department chair and senior mentors is to communicate those departmental norms clearly and consistently to all faculty candidates.

6.7.2 Elements to Consider in Evaluating Effectiveness in Scholarship/Research

All four of the criteria (productivity, quality, impact, and sustainability) should be considered in evaluating a candidate's scholarship/research. Candidates and reviewers should consider the questions associated with each criterion in considering whether each has been met. (See Section 6.2 above)

The activities in Appendix 2 are examples of activities that should be considered as elements that comprise a candidate's scholarship/research portfolio. While not all candidates are expected to engage in all example activities within the scholarship/research domain, those that the candidate addresses will be evaluated in terms of the four criteria.

Each criterion must be considered in light of the others. For example, productivity can be assessed, in part, by considering the number of products and outputs. However, the number of scholarship products needs to be considered with a holistic perspective of the nature of the products (e.g., breadth/reach of work, organization/investment required to bring them to fruition) and the candidates' entire portfolio of activities. For example, an assistant professor who chairs four MPH theses per year and teaches two new courses per year will not have the time to complete the same number of research publications as an assistant professor who mentors one PhD student every four years and serves as an instructor in the same annual course every year. Similarly, a methods development paper or a product from a long-term study (e.g., a clinical trial) may require much more effort to come to fruition, than a less demanding project such as a secondary data analysis. Thus, Appendix 3 provides average numbers of credit hours taught and students formally mentored, alongside average numbers of research publications, for faculty who promoted successfully in recent years. These quantitative metrics are given as a guide for candidates to assess their own readiness for promotion.

Evaluation of quality and impact of scholarship/research will require examination of the scholarship documentation, including the CV, self-assessment, and scholarship examples. Consideration of engagement in activities listed in Appendix 2 can help support this assessment of quality and impact. Documentation of activities may include, for example, reprints of peer reviewed journal articles, agendas and slides for workshops led, reports of methods undertaken in research (e.g., protocol papers), or formal reports for departments of health. Documentation can be described in the self-assessment and scholarship examples cover sheet. Documentation is also included in the CV. Furthermore, documentation may be included as three to five examples of scholarly products within the promotion packet (recommended). The self-assessment and/or scholarship examples cover sheet can attest to the public health impact of the scholarly work. Examples of work included in the packet can be evaluated for quality, impact, breadth of readership/audience, and rigor.

Evaluation of sustainability will consider both funding history and trajectory as well as the candidate's investment in one or more scholarship/research areas over time. Specifically, candidates should describe their track record of scholarship/research.

Special note for teaching faculty and faculty with APHP activities: Many of the scholarship of teaching and learning examples in Appendix 2 were taken from the June 1, 2022 memo from Provost Richards on teaching track expectations regarding scholarship. In addition, publication in peer-reviewed journals is not required for teaching faculty. Teaching activities, teaching scholarship, academic public health practice, and service activities oftentimes overlap. Faculty should indicate whether they are considering these activities as service or scholarship.

6.7.3 Demonstration of Effectiveness in Scholarship and Research

Details of specific expectations for scholarship or research for tenure/tenure-track/WOT, teaching, and research tracks are provided in Sections 7, 8, and 9, respectively. This includes how SPH operationalizes Faculty Code qualifications for promotion. Example faculty activities that qualify as scholarship/research are provided in Appendix 2. Articulation of SPH's minimum standards for promotion are in Appendix 3. As noted elsewhere, a typical candidate's record will far exceed SPH's minimum expectations. Faculty demonstrate their rank-specific effectiveness for scholarship/research by meeting all expectations for effectiveness in that rank within their track.

6.8 Evaluation of Effectiveness in Teaching

6.8.1 Introduction

The scope of faculty teaching is broader than conventional classroom instruction; it comprises a variety of teaching formats and media, including undergraduate and graduate instruction for matriculated students in traditional classroom settings, course (re)design, mentoring and supervision of students and trainees in research and practice settings, mentoring of preceptors and advisors of practica, as well as continuing education for practitioners, community members, and other learners. Therefore, the educational function of a university requires faculty who can teach effectively to a broad range of learners in a broad range of settings. It is recognized that a teaching record, commensurate with a given level of achievement, varies from discipline to discipline within the SPH. Teaching activities may be conducted within academic structures of all UW schools and colleges, including continuing education, as well as across virtual and physical environments, including campus and community venues and sites for practice-based education.

While the emphasis of teaching as part of the faculty role is on contributions within the UW academic units (traditional classroom-based courses as listed in the [UW time schedule](#)), external teaching activities may also be considered in assessing a candidate's effectiveness in teaching. Again, it is important to note that while these external activities can be used by the candidate to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, that compensation for those instructional activities and workload expectations may come from grants, non-tuition-based sources, or the SPH Faculty Compensation Plan (refer to Section 4 above for more information).

Faculty members are expected to provide evidence of a commitment to teaching and learning, competence in their area of instruction, and integrity in matters of course and non-course teaching to further the development of current and future scientists and practitioners.

6.8.2 Elements to Consider in Evaluating Effectiveness in Teaching

Considerations for evaluating effectiveness in teaching should be directly related to the teaching activity itself. All four of the criteria (productivity, quality, impact, and sustainability) should be considered in evaluating a candidate's teaching record. Candidates and reviewers should consider the questions associated with each criterion in considering whether each has been met. (See Section 6.2 above) Further, each of the four criteria are again evaluated in light of the other criteria, where the whole candidate package is examined holistically. This is assessed with metrics that may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Clear and organized course syllabi with appropriate and well-aligned goals, objectives, competencies, deliverables, and grading metrics.
- Thoughtfulness of iterating on course design and having a course revision process that is reflective of feedback and development of one's own teaching practice.
- Use of materials (for teaching, mentoring, and advising) that are written by a wide range of diverse scholars.
- Demonstrated commitment to an inclusive teaching practice.
- Peer evaluations/observations that speak to instruction quality, course materials, and offer constructive feedback for improvement across many teaching domains. Student course evaluations are an important assessment of teaching, and as pointed out in the literature, it is well recognized that these evaluations may not fully capture teaching quality and may be subject to biases, as noted above.
- Teaching awards or other recognitions that highlight high-quality instruction.
- Successful mentoring/advising (including supervision of undergraduate and graduate students) as reflected in student feedback, reports, on-time graduation rates, awards, or other indicators of student progress or development.

Productivity can be assessed by amount, time, and investment in teaching-related activities. For example, the breadth and depth of new opportunities provided to students would be assessed. Quality and impact will require examination of self-assessments. Here, innovation and leadership are encouraged and could take the form of administrative roles assumed in a program, or documentation in peer/student reviews. If development and updates were formally published or presented, then these products would be included under scholarship. Evidence of quality and impact in teaching can be assessed with degrees of accomplishment at each rank with metrics that may include:

- Evidence of curriculum development such as substantive updates to existing courses or new courses.
- Integrating community practitioners in co-teaching practice courses.
- Contributions such as course revisions, participating/leading accreditation processes, revising numerous courses in a degree program.
- Development or implementation of useful new teaching or mentoring approaches.

Finally, sustainability would be evaluated through examination of the candidates track record of high-quality teaching, in terms of building and maintaining high regard for the courses taught, evaluated across multiple sources: students, peers, and/or community partners.

6.8.3 Demonstration of Effectiveness in Teaching

Details of specific criteria for teaching for faculty in tenure/tenure-track, WOT, teaching, and research tracks are provided below in Sections 7, 8, and 9, respectively. This includes how SPH operationalizes Faculty Code qualifications for promotion into the associate and full professor ranks. Examples of faculty activities in the teaching domain are provided in Appendix 2. Articulation of SPH's minimum standards for promotion is in Appendix 3. As noted elsewhere, a typical candidate's record will far exceed SPH's minimum expectations. Faculty demonstrate their rank-specific effectiveness for teaching by meeting all expectations for effectiveness in that rank within their track.

6.8.4 Types of, and Venues for, Teaching Activities

Description of types of, and venues for, teaching activities are described below and in Appendix 2.

UW Course Teaching

- The elements of a teaching experience that qualify it as course teaching for purposes of promotion are:
 - Planning the learning objectives, content, and pedagogies that are aligned with CEPH competencies and/or additional accrediting bodies as appropriate.
 - Includes a pathway (office hours, facilitated study groups, test prep sections, etc.) for students to connect with the instructor and/or instructional team for students to seek support and guidance to understand course material. This support can also include tutoring and writing support offered at the School and University levels.
 - Being evaluated by registered students.
 - Being evaluated by peers according to department procedures and School-wide criteria for peer evaluations appropriate to a candidate's rank.
- Course teaching can be done as a sole instructor or as a co-instructor. Teaching activity at both levels of teaching responsibility are eligible to demonstrate teaching effectiveness. Faculty teaching as a co-instructor must be evaluated separately by both students and peers with the required frequency defined by the candidate's rank.

Other Course Teaching

- Non-UW-degree courses, including courses taught in the current rank at a prior academic institution, may count toward the course-teaching criteria for promotion provided that they meet all the above criteria and are approved in writing by the faculty candidate's department chair. This communication should describe the course, the number of quarters or years it was or is expected to be taught, and state that the course is part of the faculty member's regular duties, rather than additional faculty duties. It is the faculty member's responsibility to present documentation at the time of consideration for promotion that courses taught other than UW-degree courses have met all the above criteria.
- Guest lectures in UW courses may be considered if they represent a substantial contribution and the other elements of UW course teaching are met.
- Courses taught in other formal settings, such as continuing education programs, trainings in collaborating institutions (e.g., Ministries of Health, National Health Systems), or grant-funded training of community partners, can also be considered as part of teaching activities for promotion, as long as the elements of the teaching experience that qualify it as a course are met. (See the above list, 'UW Course Teaching'.)

Non-Classroom Teaching

- Faculty members also participate in various training activities outside of formal course teaching. These activities may involve long-term or short-term commitments to students, trainees, or professional or community-based learners. Examples activities of non-course teaching include:
 - Extended Mentoring: responsibilities in which the faculty member is the major supervisor and mentor for a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow (e.g., serving as chair of a student's dissertation (PhD), master's thesis (MS, MPH), or capstone (MPH, MS) committee).

- Project Mentoring: responsibilities in which the faculty member supervises a student or fellow for a project of limited activity or duration (e.g., serving as faculty mentor for student practicum or independent study, supervising a graduate student, medical student or postdoctoral fellow).
- Advising and mentoring community partners who offer experiential learning to students to ensure learning competencies are met.
- Advising and Committees: responsibilities in which the faculty member is not the primary supervisor and mentor for a graduate student or postdoctoral fellow (e.g., serving on a graduate degree committee in a capacity other than chair or formal academic advisor to graduate student).
- Coordinating Training: responsibilities that coordinate training or advising. This includes serving as Undergraduate or Graduate Program Coordinator and serving as PI of a training grant.
- Supervision and training of teaching assistants.
- Short-Term Instruction: responsibilities in which the faculty member serves as short-term instructor (e.g., developing a UW-sponsored course that does not meet the criteria for course teaching or guest lectures).
- Clinical Teaching: responsibilities in which the faculty member engages in instruction that is driven by patient/client problems rather than by pre-planned curricula. Clinical teaching may also take place in the clinical setting. SPH faculty members whose primary appointment is in another school (including Department of Global Health faculty members whose primary appointment is in the School of Medicine), may substitute the clinical teaching criteria for promotion from their primary school for the SPH course-teaching criteria for promotion.
- Mentoring of Practice or Community Partners: responsibilities in which the faculty member serves as a project mentor to individuals from practice- or community-based organizations. Mentorship may take the form of training and support for intervention design, program evaluation, data analysis, grant proposal development, and report writing. Faculty may provide short courses for community organization staff on research methods, data analysis, and evaluation designs.

6.9 Evaluation of Effectiveness in Service

6.9.1 Introduction

SPH faculty are a community of scholars. As members of the larger University community and the broader community outside the University, this membership comes with benefits and responsibilities.

Responsibility to the School includes an expectation that all faculty will serve the community at large in a professional capacity that enhances the standing of the School, the University, and that provides benefits to the broader society. In addition, faculty are expected to work to maintain the School's operation and contribute to its reputation through efforts to improve its programs and resources. Responsibilities to the faculty member's profession include the expectation that faculty will contribute to the maintenance and growth of their profession and public health more broadly.

Expectations regarding the quantity and quality of service to the School, University, and community reflect rank. The criteria for service activities are productivity and impact at all ranks, and sustainability at the associate and full professor ranks. Participation alone is not a sufficient criterion. Other aspects, such as active engagement and leadership are also important in the assessment of productivity, impact, and sustainability. As an example of impact for service to the community, the candidate may be able to provide or cite evaluations from collaborating organizations or outcomes based on their service.

6.9.2 Demonstration of Effectiveness in Institutional and Professional Service

The expectations to engage in service activities pertain to all professorial tracks (tenure/tenure track, WOT, teaching, and research). Specific expectations for service domain are below in Sections 7, 8, and 9. This includes how SPH operationalizes Faculty Code qualifications for promotion into the associate and full professor ranks. Example faculty activities for service are provided in Appendix 2. Articulation of SPH's minimum standards for promotion is in Appendix 3. As noted elsewhere, a typical candidate's record will far exceed SPH's minimum expectations. Faculty demonstrate their rank-specific effectiveness for service by meeting all expectations for effectiveness in that rank within their track.

Note that faculty should consider whether some or all of their activities that meet the definition of APHP should be included as part of their scholarship activities or as service. Regardless, any single activity should be considered in only one domain.

Section 7—Expectations for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion: Tenured, Tenure-Track, and WOT Tracks

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the scholarship/research, teaching, and service domains. Faculty in tenure-track and WOT tracks are expected to demonstrate substantial contributions in both scholarship/research and teaching. This includes contributions to the SPH teaching mission via UW course instruction on a regular and ongoing basis.

7.1 Reappointment to Assistant Professor

Assistant Professors are appointed for an initial term of three years and are reviewed for reappointment to a second term during the second year of appointment (i.e., academic review). The final year of the second appointment term (i.e., mandatory review year) requires a promotion and tenure (if applicable) decision. See details above in Section 3.

The reappointment process differs substantially from the promotion process. Reappointments are managed at the department level, with review and approval by the School and OAP. The purpose of the academic review is to provide early feedback to the candidate about the candidate's progress towards promotion. The review is holistic with reviewers looking for evidence that the candidate has forward momentum and is not experiencing obstacles that might impede a promotion in the years ahead. As such, SPH has not defined any minimum expectations to apply at the time of the reappointment review.

The following table lists the overarching expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be appointed or reappointed at the Assistant Professor rank. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions and a description of the academic review process are provided in Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4.

Assistant Professor Expectations for Effectiveness for Tenure and WOT Tracks

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	<p>Demonstrates development of area(s) of high-quality research and/or scholarship through research and/or scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University.</p> <p>Demonstrates evidence of research/scholarly partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of research/scholarship appropriate to rank.</p> <p>Demonstrates activity to solicit funding or support in area(s) of research and/or scholarship.</p>	<p>Productivity Quality Impact</p> <p>Productivity Impact</p> <p>Productivity Impact</p>
Teaching	<p>Participates in teaching, course, and curriculum development, and/or student advising, supervision, or mentoring activities commensurate with expectations for faculty title and rank.</p> <p>Demonstrates competence in facilitating student learning as evidenced by peer and student course evaluations and corresponding improvements to teaching approach and activities.</p> <p>Demonstrates competence in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.</p>	<p>Productivity Quality Impact</p> <p>Quality Impact</p> <p>Quality Impact</p>
Service	<p>Demonstrates evidence of participation in service activities within the UW (e.g., department), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.</p>	<p>Productivity Impact</p>

7.2 Appointment or Promotion to Associate Professor

Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#) indicates that substantial records in both teaching and scholarship/research are required for appointment (i.e., new appointments and promotions) into the associate rank for tenure and WOT tracks, and that for this track a substantial record in only one of these domains is allowed in unusual circumstances.

The SPH review will consider whether a candidate has met each of the expectations for effectiveness listed in the *Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table by domain. To be promoted in the tenure or WOT tracks in SPH, a faculty candidate must be determined to meet all expectations for effectiveness in both the teaching and scholarship/research domains at the associate professor rank. Service is also considered. When an assistant professor candidate is assessed to have met all expectations in a domain, this automatically implies that their record has been judged to be substantial in that domain. In accordance with FCG, SPH's consideration of candidates who have failed to meet expectations in either scholarship/research or teaching will address whether this is an unusual circumstance.

The *Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table (below) lists the overarching expectations and the associated criteria that a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be promoted into the associate professor rank. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Pertinent minimum standards applied by SPH for this rank and these tracks are given in Appendix 3. In accordance with the definition of a minimum, the typical promotion candidate's record will exceed these minimum standards. For a general description of the promotion and tenure processes, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4.

Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness for Tenure and WOT Tracks

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates significant contributions to area(s) of high-quality research/scholarship through research and/or scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates evidence of research/scholarly partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of research and/or scholarship appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	Demonstrates sustainment of area(s) of research and/or scholarship, including funding as PI, multiple-PI, or major co-investigator (if PI is not the norm) on one or more competitive government, foundation, or private-sector award(s) or contract(s). Major book contracts will be acceptable in fields where book publishing is the norm.	Productivity Impact Sustainability
Teaching	Participates in teaching, course, and curriculum development, and/or student advising, supervision, or mentoring activities commensurate with or exceeding minimum expectations.	Productivity Quality Impact
	Demonstrates strength in facilitating student learning as evidenced by peer and student course evaluations and corresponding improvements to teaching approach and activities.	Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates strength in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; developing the teaching practice of teaching associates through mentoring, post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates sustained engagement in service activities within the UW (e.g., department, School, University), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact Sustainability

7.3 Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#) indicates that substantial, mature scholarship as evidenced in both teaching and research are required for appointment (i.e., new appointments and promotions) into the full professor rank for the tenure and WOT tracks.

The SPH review will consider whether a candidate has met each of the expectations for effectiveness in the *Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table (below) by domain. To be promoted in the tenure or WOT tracks in SPH, a faculty candidate must be determined to meet all expectations for effectiveness in both teaching and scholarship/research at the full professor rank. Service is also considered. When an associate professor is assessed to have met all expectations in a domain, this automatically implies that their record has been judged to represent substantial, mature scholarship in that domain.

The *Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table lists the overarching criteria/expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be promoted from Associate Professor to Professor. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Pertinent minimum standards applied by SPH for this rank and track are given in Appendix 3. In accordance with the definition of a minimum, the typical promotion candidate's record will exceed these minimum standards. For a description of the promotion and tenure processes, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4.

Professor Expectations for Effectiveness for Tenure and WOT Tracks

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates leadership and excellence over time in area(s) of high-quality research/scholarship through research and/or scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates evidence of research/scholarly partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of research and/or scholarship appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	Demonstrates sustainment of area(s) of research and/or scholarship, including funding as PI, multiple-PI, or major co-investigator (if PI is not the norm) on multiple competitive government, foundation, or private-sector awards or contracts. Major book contracts will be acceptable in fields where book publishing is the norm.	Productivity Impact Sustainability
Teaching	Participates in teaching, course, and curriculum development, and/or student advising, supervision, or mentoring activities commensurate with or exceeding minimum expectations.	Productivity Quality Impact
	Demonstrates excellence in facilitating student learning as evidenced by peer and student course evaluations and corresponding improvements to teaching approach and activities.	Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates excellence in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; developing the teaching practice of teaching associates through mentoring, post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates leadership and excellence in service activities within the UW (e.g., department, School, University), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact Sustainability

Section 8—Expectations for Appointment, Reappointment and Promotion: Research Track

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the scholarship/research, teaching, and service domains. Faculty in the research track are expected to demonstrate substantial contributions to scholarship/research. Research track faculty are allowed to teach courses, and they are not expected to contribute to the SPH teaching mission via UW course instruction on a regular and ongoing basis.

8.1 Reappointment to Assistant Research Professor

Research Assistant Professors are appointed for an initial term of three years and are reviewed for reappointment to a second term during the second year of appointment (i.e., academic review). The final year of the second appointment term (i.e., mandatory review year) requires a promotion decision. See details above in Section 3.

The reappointment process differs substantially from the promotion process. Reappointments are managed at the department level, with review and approval by the School. The purpose of the academic review is to provide early feedback to the candidate about the candidate's progress towards promotion. The review is holistic with reviewers looking for evidence that the candidate has forward momentum and is not experiencing obstacles that might impede a promotion in the years ahead. As such, SPH has not defined any minimum expectations to apply at the time of the reappointment review.

The following table lists the overarching criteria/expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be reappointed at the research assistant professor rank. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4 above.

Research Assistant Professor Expectations for Effectiveness

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates development of area(s) of high-quality research/ scholarship through research and/or scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University.	Productivity Quality Impact
	Demonstrates evidence of research/scholarly partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of research and/or scholarship appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	Demonstrates activity to fund or support in area(s) of research receipt of one or more extramural award(s) or contract(s).	Productivity Impact
Teaching	Demonstrates competence in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates evidence of participation in service activities within the UW (e.g., department), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact

8.2. Appointment or Promotion to Associate Research Professor

Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#) indicates that a substantial record in research is required for appointment (i.e., new appointments and promotions) into the associate rank for the research track. Faculty Code [Section 24-35](#) indicates that research track faculty are not required to participate in the regular instructional program, unless required by their funding source. SPH interprets the regular instructional program to mean formal UW course teaching. Research faculty are still expected to engage in mentoring of graduate students. Further, if research professors in SPH elect to participate in formal classroom instruction, they can “count” this as their contributions to teaching (either to bolster their mentoring activities or in lieu of mentoring activities).

The SPH review will consider whether a candidate has met each of the expectations for effectiveness in the *Research Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table below by domain. To be promoted to research associate professor in SPH, a faculty candidate must be determined to meet all expectations for effectiveness in the scholarship/research domain at the associate professor rank. Teaching and service are also considered. When an assistant professor candidate is assessed to have met all expectations in a domain, this automatically implies that their record has been judged to be substantial in that domain.

The *Research Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table lists the overarching criteria/expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be promoted to the research associate professor rank. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Pertinent minimum standards applied by SPH for this rank and track are given in Appendix 3. In accordance with the definition of a minimum, the typical promotion candidate’s record will exceed these minimum standards. For a description of the promotion and tenure processes, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4 above.

Research Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates significant contributions to area(s) of high-quality research through research activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates evidence of research partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of research appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	Demonstrates sustained funding in area(s) of research and/or scholarship as PI, multiple-PI, or major co-investigator (if PI is not the norm) on one or more competitive government, foundation, or private-sector award(s) or contract(s). Major book contracts will be acceptable in fields where book publishing is the norm.	Productivity Impact Sustainability
Teaching	Demonstrates strength in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates sustained engagement in service activities within the UW (e.g., department, School, University), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact Sustainability

8.3. Appointment or Promotion to Research Professor

Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#) indicates that substantial, mature scholarship as evidenced in research is required for appointment (i.e., new appointments and promotions) into the research professor rank. Faculty Code [Section 24-35](#) indicates that research track faculty are not required to participate in the regular instructional program, unless required by their funding source. SPH interprets the regular instructional program to mean formal UW course teaching. Research faculty are still expected to engage in mentoring graduate students. Further, if research professors in SPH elect to participate in formal classroom instruction, they can “count” this as their contributions to teaching (either to bolster their mentoring activities or in lieu of mentoring activities). To be determined to be eligible for promotion, a SPH research associate professor should meet the non-optional *Research Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* in all three domains.

The SPH review will consider whether a candidate has met each of the expectations for effectiveness listed in the *Research Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table below by domain. To be promoted in the research track in SPH, a faculty candidate must be determined to meet all expectations for effectiveness in scholarship/research at the full professor rank. Teaching and service are also considered. When an associate professor is assessed to have met all expectations in a domain, this automatically implies that their record has been judged to represent substantial, mature scholarship in that domain.

The *Research Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table lists the overarching criteria and expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be promoted to Research Professor. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Pertinent minimum standards applied by SPH for this rank and track are given in Appendix 3. In accordance with the definition of a minimum, the typical promotion candidate’s record will exceed these minimum standards. For a description of the promotion and tenure processes, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4 above.

Research Professor Expectations for Effectiveness

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates leadership and excellence over time in area(s) of high-quality research through research activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates evidence of research partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of research appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	Demonstrates sustained funding in area(s) of research and/or scholarship as PI, multiple-PI, or major co-investigator (if PI is not the norm) on one or more competitive government, foundation, or private-sector award(s) or contract(s). Major book contracts will be acceptable in fields where book publishing is the norm.	Productivity Impact Sustainability
Teaching	Demonstrates excellence in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates leadership and excellence in service activities within the UW (e.g., department, School, University), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact Sustainability

Section 9—Expectations for Reappointment and Promotion: Teaching Track

All faculty members are expected to contribute to the scholarship/research, teaching, and service domains. Faculty in the teaching track are expected to demonstrate a substantial contribution to teaching. Teaching track faculty contribute to the SPH teaching mission via UW course instruction on a regular and ongoing basis.

9.1 Reappointment to Assistant Teaching Professor

The following table lists the overarching criteria/expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be appointed or reappointed at the Assistant Teaching Professor rank. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. For description of the reappointment process, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4 above.

Assistant Teaching Professor Expectations for Effectiveness

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates development of area(s) of high-quality scholarship through scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University. This scholarship may be <i>with primary emphasis on teaching, academic public health practice, or educational practice</i> .	Productivity Quality Impact
	<i>Optional</i> Demonstrates evidence of scholarly partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of scholarship appropriate to rank (see Faculty Example Activities, Appendix 2).	Productivity Impact
	<i>Optional</i> Demonstrates activity to solicit funding or support in area(s) of scholarship.	Productivity Impact
Teaching	Participates in teaching, course and curriculum development, and/or student advising, supervision, or mentoring activities commensurate with or exceeding minimum expectations.	Productivity Quality Impact
	Demonstrates competence in facilitating student learning as evidenced by peer and student course evaluations and corresponding improvements to teaching approach and activities.	Quality Impact
	Demonstrates competence in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations, or student-led practical work products; post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Quality Impact
Service	Demonstrates evidence of participation in service activities within the UW (e.g., department), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact

9.2 Appointment or Promotion to Associate Teaching Professor

Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#) indicates that a substantial record in teaching is required for appointment (i.e., new appointments and promotions) into the associate rank for the teaching track.

The SPH review will consider whether a candidate has met each of the expectations for effectiveness listed in the *Teaching Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table by domain. To be promoted in the teaching track in SPH, a faculty candidate must be determined to meet all expectations for effectiveness in the teaching domain at the associate professor rank. Scholarship and service are also considered. When an assistant professor candidate is assessed to have met all expectations in a domain, this automatically implies that their record has been judged to be substantial in that domain.

The *Teaching Associate Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table below lists the overarching criteria/expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be promoted from Assistant Teaching Professor to Associate Teaching Professor rank. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Pertinent minimum standards applied by SPH for this rank and track are given in Appendix 3. In accordance with the definition of a minimum, the typical promotion candidate's record will far exceed these minimum standards. For a description of the promotion and tenure processes, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4 above.

Associate Teaching Professor Expectations for Effectiveness

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates significant contribution(s) to area(s) of high-quality scholarship through scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University. This scholarship may be <i>with primary emphasis on teaching, academic public health practice, or educational practice</i> .	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
	<i>Optional</i> Demonstrates evidence of research partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of scholarship appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	<i>Optional</i> Demonstrates evidence of funding or support in area(s) of scholarship	Productivity Impact Sustainability
Teaching	Participates in teaching, course, and curriculum development, and/or student advising, supervision, or mentoring activities commensurate with or exceeding minimum expectations.	Productivity Quality Impact
	Demonstrates strength in facilitating student learning as evidenced by peer and student course evaluations and corresponding improvements to teaching approach and activities.	Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates strength in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; developing the teaching practice of teaching associates through mentoring, post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates sustained engagement in service activities within the UW (e.g., department, School, University), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact Sustainability

9.3 Appointment or Promotion to Teaching Professor

Faculty Code [Section 24-34](#) indicates that substantial, mature scholarship as evidenced in teaching is required for appointment (i.e., new appointments and promotions) into the full professor rank for the teaching track.

The SPH review will consider whether a candidate has met each of the expectations for effectiveness in the *Teaching Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table by domain. To be promoted in the teaching track in SPH, a faculty candidate must be determined to meet all expectations for effectiveness in teaching at the full professor rank. Scholarship and service are also considered. When an associate professor is assessed to have met all expectations in a domain, this automatically implies that their record has been judged to represent substantial, mature scholarship in that domain.

The *Teaching Professor Expectations for Effectiveness* table below lists the overarching criteria and expectations a faculty candidate should demonstrate in each of the three domains to be promoted from Associate Teaching Professor to Teaching Professor rank. For an overview of each domain of the faculty role, see Section 6. Example activities across each domain are provided in Appendix 2. Guidelines for evaluating faculty contributions are provided in Section 6. Pertinent minimum standards applied by SPH for this rank and track are given in Appendix 3. In accordance with the definition of a minimum, the typical promotion candidate's record will exceed these minimum standards. For a description of the promotion and tenure processes, see Section 6. Note that while many aspects overlap, the criteria SPH uses to determine compensation are distinct from the expectations for promotion, as discussed in Section 4 above.

Teaching Professor Expectations for Effectiveness

Domain	Expectations for Effectiveness	Criteria
Research/ Scholarship	Demonstrates leadership and excellence over time in area(s) of high-quality scholarship through scholarly activity compatible with mission and objectives of the department, School, and University. This scholarship may be <i>with primary emphasis on teaching, academic public health practice, or educational practice</i> .	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
	<i>Optional</i> Demonstrates evidence of research partnerships or interdisciplinary collaborations and/or dissemination activity for area(s) of scholarship appropriate to rank.	Productivity Impact
	<i>Optional</i> Demonstrates evidence of funding or support in area(s) of scholarship.	Productivity Impact Sustainability
Teaching	Participates in teaching, course, and curriculum development, and/or student advising, supervision, or mentoring activities commensurate with or exceeding minimum expectations.	Productivity Quality Impact
	Demonstrates excellence in facilitating student learning as evidenced by peer and student course evaluations and corresponding improvements to teaching approach and activities.	Quality Impact Sustainability
	Demonstrates excellence in student supervision/mentoring/advising as evidenced by department chair or educational program director reports (annual reviews, letters); student-authored scholarship; student presentations or student-led practical work products; developing the teaching practice of teaching associates through mentoring, post-graduation outcomes/placements; or mentoring/advising awards/nominations.	Productivity Quality Impact Sustainability
Service	Demonstrates leadership and excellence in service activities within the UW (e.g., department, School, University), the profession or discipline, and/or the community.	Productivity Impact Sustainability

Part 3 Navigating the Promotion and Tenure Process

Section 10—Introduction

The purpose of Part 3 is to provide faculty candidates with an overview of all the various steps and aspects of the promotion and tenure process. It begins with an overall summary of the process. The following sections discuss preparing for promotion and tenure review by considering the role and activities of the candidate, the mentors, and the department chair. The final three sections address later aspects of the promotion process, covering the role of the department-level review and the review by the SPH Faculty Council, Office of the Dean, and UW Office of the Provost.

10.1 Summary of the Promotion and Tenure Process

In general, faculty promotion and tenure candidates begin by preparing their materials about one and one-half years before the expected effective date in their promoted rank.

Once the decision to seek promotion and/or tenure has been made, the faculty member reaches out to their Academic Human Resources (AHR) manager to obtain a list of materials and timelines for their due dates. (See Appendix 1 for a list of materials to be included in the promotion packet.)

The candidate prepares their materials (e.g., CV, self-assessment, promotion consideration worksheet (cover sheet), teaching evaluations, scholarship examples and cover statement, and list of potential external reviewers), with the help of their department AHR manager (who can help collate materials). When completed, the candidate submits their application for promotion. See Section 10.3 below for additional details on faculty candidate preparation.

Each department promotion and review committee establishes their own review process and timeline, and meets to review and assess the promotion packet materials at locally determined stages. At a minimum, departmental committees review application materials and decide whether to solicit letters of evaluation. Letters of evaluation can take up to three months to obtain. The committee conducts a review of the letters of evaluation and determines their recommendation to the voting faculty and department chair. This recommendation is provided through a committee report.

Once the department vote has been completed, the department chair prepares the chair's letter, which outlines whether or not they support the proposed promotion or tenure. FCG [Section 24-54](#) specifies when and how the candidate should be notified at various stages of this process. These notifications are included in the submitted packet.

SPH review of faculty promotion packets occurs at the departmental level (by the promotion committee and the full voting faculty eligible), followed by the School-level review by the Faculty Council, and then another School-level review by the vice dean for faculty. Each review includes a faculty vote or approval. It is also common for the faculty in a secondary department where there is a joint appointment to wait for the primary department's recommendation before the secondary department faculty votes.

Which faculty are eligible to vote on a specific action depends on their own faculty title and rank, and the faculty candidate's title and rank. (Faculty titles and ranks who have voting eligibility are defined in the FCG [Section 21-32](#).) Voting faculty are restricted to faculty from a rank more senior than the current faculty candidate's rank. (See Section 1.4 above and/or the SPH Bylaws for more information about the Faculty Council.) Once approved by faculty at these levels, promotion and tenure packets are submitted to the Office of the Dean for review (joint appointments are submitted simultaneously). The Office of the Dean Academic Human Resources team adds additional required materials and compiles the final version of the promotion and tenure packet that is then submitted to the UW Office of Academic Personnel (OAP).

Note that the promotion process for joint faculty follows the same process in both the primary and secondary departments. Both units are responsible for conducting a review in alignment with their individual promotion policies and procedures. The joint unit provides concurrence to the primary unit. This information is included in the record submitted to each Office of the Dean. Only one packet is submitted to OAP.

The process for a tenure-only review mirrors the above process for a promotion review.

Sample timeline of the steps in the promotion and/or tenure awarding process for target date of promotion in July of Year X.

Each department establishes and announces their own timeline each year.*

Season and year relative to Year X	Activity
Winter, year X-1 and annually (typically between December-January) prior to year X-1	Per Faculty Code, eligible faculty should be notified annually of the opportunity to be considered for promotion. It is the faculty member's decision to determine when to go up for promotion, if prior to their mandatory year. In some departments, faculty more senior in rank make recommendations to individual faculty regarding when they suggest they go up for promotion as part of the annual merit review. Faculty can also discuss readiness for promotion in their annual conference with the chair or meetings with their mentors and promotion committee chair.
Winter to summer, year X-1	Candidate compiles materials and submits them to the departmental committee for review.
Spring to summer, year X-1	External letters solicited by the department.
Summer or early fall, year X-1	Department's APT committee (standing or ad hoc) reviews materials and makes recommendation. Voting faculty and candidate are notified of the committee's recommendation.
Early fall, year X-1	Eligible faculty vote on promotion recommendation. Candidate is notified of the outcome.
Mid-fall, year X-1	Final promotion record submitted to SPH Office of the Dean (OD) AHR.
Late fall, year X-1 through spring, year X	Packet is reviewed by SPH OD AHR, Faculty Council, vice dean, OAP, Provost.
April-June, year X	Notification of outcome from Provost.
July 1, year X	Promotion (and/or tenure) effective for those approved.

*Note: There may be department- and school-specific deviations from this typical timeline.

10.2 Faculty Advancement and Success

The success of all faculty members benefits the individual faculty members as well as their departments, and SPH as a whole. Advancement of faculty through ranks occurs over multiple years according to a defined path and following procedures outlined in the FCG and discussed in this Handbook. The processes involved with advancement can be stressful and uncertain. The following information, along with the Faculty Development Program and the outline of activities in Appendix 4, are intended to provide faculty with information that will support their success.

10.3 Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review—Role of the Faculty Candidate

Faculty are advised to keep a record of their activities and update this information, from the beginning of their initial appointment. The one to one and one-half years leading up to the effective promotion date have been perceived to be the most stressful. However, the preparation process for promotion and tenure is multi-year, and it is very helpful for faculty candidates to have their future promotion review in mind as they navigate their careers. This section is intended to provide helpful information to faculty candidates about this preparation process.

Considering Promotion

The final decision about when to go up for promotion belongs to the faculty candidate, except for faculty entering a mandatory promotion year. However, it is advisable for the candidates who are seeking a promotion, other than during their mandatory promotion year, to ascertain whether they have support for this decision from their colleagues, mentors, and/or department chair. In some departments, readiness for promotion is assessed by colleagues more senior in rank during the annual faculty review.

Faculty candidates who have decided to go up for promotion should start preparing their promotion packet when the department sends their announcement with the call to collect materials. The deadline is often in the spring. It is at the department's discretion whether they accept promotion and/or tenure packets received after their communicated deadline.

Regardless of where they are in the promotion process, faculty candidates greatly benefit from advice provided by their mentors, department chair, and colleagues. Further, leveraging the guidance in this AAH, faculty candidates benefit from being aware of the criteria and processes involved in promotion and tenure reviews so that they can be intentional about preparing for their promotion well in advance.

Assistant and associate professors are encouraged to take the following steps starting in the first year of their appointment and to continuously maintain and update their materials:

- Review the AAH criteria in the context of their own activities and products as documented on their CV.
- Talk with their mentors and department chair regularly and in annual reviews about intentions, timing, and qualifications for promotion. Seek the input of mentors and chairs about how their progress aligns with the expectations for the next rank in their track. Discuss whether they are on course for mandatory/non-mandatory promotion. Identify areas that may be strengthened prior to going up for promotion.
- Attend both UW and SPH promotions workshops to understand the processes involved.

It is also highly recommended that a faculty member considering promotion in the next two to three years should additionally take these steps:

- Share their CV and seek feedback on promotion readiness with one or more of the following individuals: the department representative on Faculty Council; a member of the department's appointment, promotion, and tenure committee; their mentors; department chair; and/or program/center director.
- Ask for and examine promotion materials (e.g., CV, promotion consideration worksheet (cover sheet), self-assessments, scholarship products) from recently promoted faculty from the same rank. (Note that other faculty are not compelled to provide these materials, however, many will share them willingly with more junior faculty.)

Please note that overall procedures for promotion and/or tenure cases are identified within the UW FCG, [Chapter 24](#).

Preparing for Promotion

Faculty candidates prepare for promotion by working to achieve the criteria for effectiveness in the rank above their current rank for their professorial track. To be promoted, a faculty candidate must be judged by the voting faculty in their department, external reviewers, the SPH Faculty Council, SPH vice dean for faculty, UW OAP, and the UW Provost to have met expectations in teaching, research/scholarship, and service in the rank they will be promoted into. (Details regarding different tracks are provided above in Sections 7 through 9.) Faculty who believe they have met the University's, School's, and department's criteria for promotion to the next rank should confirm their interpretation with their mentor(s) and department chair and consider their feedback before submitting their materials for promotion.

Components of the Promotion Packet Assembled by the Candidate

The candidate assembles, with support from the department AHR manager, the following materials for inclusion in their promotion packet or use with their promotion review. (See Appendix 1 for a complete list of materials included in the promotion packet.)

All materials will focus on the candidate's time in rank, except the CV, which describes the candidate's entire career trajectory. The materials submitted by the faculty will be included in their promotion packet. It is at the discretion of the department promotion committee and AHR manager to determine whether materials can be updated after their initial submission.

- Promotion consideration worksheet (cover sheet).
- Candidate self-assessment.
- SPH CV.
- Scholarship examples and cover statement.
- Teaching evaluations and peer teaching evaluations (typically compiled with departmental staff support).
- Candidate's list of suggested potential external reviewer(s).

Candidate's Self-Assessment

Candidates are allowed to place in their promotion files any material they feel should be considered, which shall include a self-assessment of qualifications for promotion. For more information see the UW Faculty Code, [Section 24-54B](#).

Writing the Self-Assessment

The self-assessment is one of the most important documents in the promotion packet. It provides a narrative storyline of the faculty member's accomplishments while in rank. The self-assessment is not meant to be a retelling of what is listed on the CV. Instead, this is the document that the faculty candidate writes to contextualize, highlight, and synthesize their significant, high-quality, and impactful accomplishments in the domains of research/scholarship, teaching, and service, ensuring that this addresses their current and potential impact to their field.

The candidate's future plans and career trajectory should also be documented as part of the self-assessment. Note that some departments in the School also require a narrative section related to a candidate's work on issues of equity, diversity, and inclusion. All candidates should confer with their departmental AHR manager to confirm if the department has specific guidance on this.

The suggested format for a self-assessment includes the following:

- The document should be single-spaced, a minimum of three pages, and no longer than necessary. While some self-assessments are considerably longer, if the document is too long (e.g., over ten pages), reviewers may find it difficult to digest and may not successfully identify the candidate's most significant accomplishments.
- There should be separate sections that cover the three domains of research/scholarship, teaching, and service. In addition, candidates may want to include one or more of these additional sections: introduction/overview; equity, diversity and inclusion; national or international stature; future plans; and summary. Some self-assessments integrate these topics into the three separate domains.
 - In the research/scholarship section, topics covered should include research focus areas, research quality, funding, impact, and future plans.
 - In the teaching section, topics covered should include formal teaching, informal teaching, and mentoring.
- The document is meant to be a self-reflection. It should provide context for the candidate's accomplishments and plans going forward. Thus, it is appropriate for it to include not only successes, but also challenges faced by the candidate, how they were addressed, what was learned, and what might change moving forward.

Here are some tips-and-tricks for consideration in writing a self-assessment:

- Be thoughtful and reflective.
- Be succinct and parsimonious.
- Attention to all four of the holistic review criteria (productivity, quality, impact, and sustainability) should be woven throughout the self-assessment.
- Discuss your accomplishments during your time in rank, even if some of this happened at another institution.
- Include a brief narrative about your most impactful scholarship contributions, e.g., why and what you did, and what added knowledge came from your work.
 - Consider responding to the following prompt: How has your work moved the needle in your area of scholarship/research?
 - Address how your work has increased the capacity for longer-term impact, e.g., through mentorship, developing new methods, course development.
- Address your productivity. Consider which metrics you will include in your self-assessment.
- Address the quality of your work.
- Explicitly call attention to the promotion criteria for the rank you will be promoted into and how you exceed or meet these criteria. This will help the external reviewers understand how your packet compares against the expectations in this AAH. This may be particularly important for teaching track faculty as this track is not commonly understood across institutions.
- Recognize that not all reviewers of your promotion packet will be experts in your area of expertise. Present your case accordingly.
- Help the reviewers of your packet understand how your scholarly work fits into the broader context of your discipline or field, and how components of your scholarship fit into your scholarly agenda.
- See the case study example scenarios (Appendix 4) to help frame your self-assessment. Consider addressing the relevant activities from the Example Activities for Effectiveness in the faculty role (Appendix 2). Choose those most relevant to your work in the domains of research/scholarship, teaching, and service. Document your specific contributions that pertain to those example activities.

Considerations for Refining the CV

The candidate's CV should follow the SPH CV template (included in Appendix 1). Candidates preparing for promotion should consider:

- Reviewing the CV to ensure it is completely up to date and consistent with the other materials that would be included in the packet.
- Asking others (e.g., mentors, department chair) to review the CV and suggest changes.
- Candidates who have followed a non-traditional career pathway will want to make sure that their CV appropriately reflects their contributions. Specifically, the candidate should consider how to document activities that could be considered service activities and could alternatively be counted as either APHP or teaching scholarship (depending upon the activity).

- It is sometimes a concern that activities are double counted. If one large activity has curricular and research products, list the activity in parts under both headings. Qualify in accompanying text (i.e., the self-assessment) the aspect of the work that justifies its placement under the heading. For example, if a candidate has an NIH grant with a research capacity strengthening component and a research study component, they could list both activities under separate, appropriate headers for educational activities and research activities.

Advice for Candidates Planning to Feature Academic Public Health Practice Activities in their Promotion Packet

No matter which faculty track, promotion/tenure candidates may choose to include Academic Public Health Practice (APHP) as part of their CV. Appendix 2 lists examples of APHP activities. Sometimes the boundary between APHP and service can be unclear. Typically, if the activity results in a scholarly practice product and has the potential to directly impact public health (e.g., community forum led, report written for department of health, service on a government scientific advisory committee), it would be listed under APHP. If the work does not have a scholarly product and a potential direct link to public health, for example, faculty search committee membership, the activity would be listed under service. Additionally, if the activity has a direct impact on public health, it would be included as APHP, but if the impact is more distant (e.g., committee membership), then the activity would be included as service. Briefly in the CV, and at more length in the self-assessment, the type of work that was conducted should be explained to justify the section it is placed within. As stated above, any single activity should be counted in only one domain.

Scholarship Examples

Candidates can choose three to five products from their work that demonstrate the quality and impact of their scholarship to include in the promotion packet as examples of their scholarship. Providing examples of scholarly work in promotion packets is recommended for all tracks, but not required. A brief cover statement should accompany these examples that includes a short description (~1 paragraph – ½ page per example) to address the candidates' role, contribution to, and impact of each example. The scholarship examples are meant to be a curated subset of the candidate's most important and impactful work. Thus, the candidate should be selective in what they include. Candidates may also want to consider selection criteria beyond impact for this curated subset, e.g., to demonstrate the breadth of their scholarship, or the range of scholarship activities they have engaged in.

Depending on the nature of the candidate's scholarship, the scholarship products may include:

- Research, APHP, or education/curricular publications (published or in press) in peer-reviewed journals. Because the peer review process in some disciplines can take multiple years, in some disciplines articles published on a preprint server (e.g., arXiv, bioRxiv) may be included.
- Technical reports.
- Policy documents.

- Newspaper editorials.
- Links to films, podcasts, other audio-visual media.
- Workshop agendas/slides, with candidate's role documented.

It is not advised to include unpublished drafts of manuscripts or unfunded grant proposals. What is recommended is to include fully completed scholarship examples that show breadth and the impact of the candidate's scholarly work. Since only three to five examples are to be included with the packet, these should be a curated subset of the candidate's most important and impactful work.

Additional/Supplemental Materials

Supporting data or additional materials may be submitted if they are substantive and will be helpful in evaluating a candidate's record. While additional/supplemental documentation is allowed, it is not encouraged at SPH. Reviewers want to see that the candidate can curate their scholarship examples to highlight their strengths. As such, there should be a strong rationale for the inclusion of additional scholarship documentation. If included, it may include workshop agendas/slides, complete with descriptions of the candidate's role in workshop development and implementation.

Teaching Evaluations

Teaching evaluations are required for promotion but are also used to monitor, evaluate, and improve the quality of the coursework. Teaching evaluation inclusion is documented on OAP's web page for [assembling the promotion record](#), as well as the UW Faculty Code [Section 24-57](#).

- **Student Teaching Evaluations**

Student course evaluations are routinely administered by departmental staff through the UW Office for Educational Instruction, [Instructional Assessment System](#) (IAS). It is the faculty member's responsibility to ensure that the requests for the student evaluations are ordered. Student teaching evaluations (qualitative and quantitative) while in rank must be included in a candidate's packet, no matter the frequency by which they are conducted, as they demonstrate a track record of teaching quality. Each faculty member must have at least one student course evaluation for every year in which a course is taught, but if more student teaching evaluations are collected, they must be included. In addition to formal UW course evaluations, teaching evaluations can be conducted and included, following the departmental process, for the following types of teaching activities: formal in-residence courses, online courses offered, guest lectures, and community-based teaching and instruction.

- **Peer Teaching Evaluations**

Candidates who teach must include peer-course evaluations in their promotion packets. While typically the departments inform faculty of (and often manage) their local process for collecting/obtaining peer teaching evaluations, it is the faculty candidate's responsibility to make sure these reviews occur and have been completed. Per Faculty Code ([Section 24-57](#)), assistant professors must obtain at least one review of a course each year in rank, while associate and full professors are required to obtain a review of their course(s) every three years, at minimum. In addition, all faculty who are being considered for promotion must have peer evaluations in the year prior to consideration for promotion. These teaching evaluations can be conducted for credit courses, not-for-credit courses, guest lecturers, teaching materials, and clinical instruction. Departments may conduct peer teaching reviews more frequently in order to monitor, evaluate, and improve the quality of the coursework that is offered. The UW [Center for Teaching and Learning](#) provides a best practice guide for departments, chairs, and instructors on obtaining high-quality peer teaching evaluations.

- **Non-Classroom Teaching Evaluations**

Some faculty may wish to submit documentation of instruction in a clinical practice or offsite in community settings. In these cases, please consult with your department chair for examples on how to document these modes of instruction and how much documentation is necessary. For example, guest lectures can be evaluated by students or primary course instructors, and chairs can provide examples of how many lecture evaluations to include as course equivalents.

External Reviewers

The external reviewers play an important role in promotion and tenure reviews. External reviewers should be able to provide an arm's length assessment of the candidate's scholarly achievements. Typically, these letters compare the candidate's accomplishments to similar candidates at their own institution and use this as a benchmark for their promotion recommendation. The external reviewer should not be asked to assess whether the candidate should be promoted/awarded tenure (but a reviewer may, of course, volunteer such an opinion). While the University requires three to five external letters of review, SPH requires a minimum of four letters of review, one of which can be internal to UW. Departmental APT committees determine who to solicit letters from based on the criteria below (and in Appendix 1), while taking into consideration the candidate's list of suggested reviewers. See Appendix 1 for a the full list of criteria for letter reviewers.

External letters are confidential and not shared with the candidate. These letters are accessible to the eligible voting faculty and are included in the promotion packet that is submitted to the Office of the Dean. Candidates are invited to include a list of suggested external letter writers with their promotion packet materials. The APT committee selects at least one external reviewer from the candidate's list to solicit a letter from. Other external reviewers will be selected by the APT committee from individuals not on the candidate's list. Thus, it is important for the candidate to think strategically about who to include on their list of external letter writers.

Elements the candidate may want to consider in drafting their list include:

- Expertise in the candidate's area of expertise.
- Faculty members who have similar job descriptions (e.g., teaching faculty may wish to select teaching faculty at other institutions, or at least faculty with substantial teaching responsibilities).
- Likely familiarity with the candidate's work, yet still "arms length".
- Ability to objectively assess the candidate's record.
- Seniority and reputation of the external reviewer.
- Length of the list and whether there are other potential letter writers not on the list that the APT committee is likely to be able to identify. (In other words, the candidate's list should not be too long, lest too many potential reviewers may get passed over because they appear on the candidate's list.)

Faculty candidates are encouraged to discuss their thoughts about who to suggest as external letter writers with a mentor and other senior people in their field. Constructing this list is a challenging task, particularly at the assistant level. Thus, candidates will benefit from the advice of others.

Additional information about external letter requirements can be found on the UW OAP web page for [Part 1: Assembly of the Promotion/Tenure Record](#), under the subheading, "External Letters of Review."

What to Expect After Initial the Materials Submission

When there are questions from reviewers or AHR, such as the APT committee, department AHR manager, the Faculty Council, the Office of the Dean AHR/vice dean for faculty, or the UW Office of the Provost, the candidate may be asked to provide additional information or update materials to address a question or concern.

Questions at the various levels of review are common and are intended to help clarify and strengthen the packet. It is at the discretion of the department promotion committee and the AHR manager to determine whether or not materials can be updated after their initial submission.

As indicated in the table in Section 10.1 above, there are steps in the promotion process where the reports or discussion summaries are provided to the candidate, and the candidate is asked to affirm receipt of this information and offered the opportunity to provide additional perspective.

10.4 Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review—Role of the Faculty Mentors

The role of senior mentors is to support their mentees and help them navigate their career.

As a best practice for support of new faculty, department chairs can provide flexible mentorship assignments to faculty at any rank. Mentorship assignments work best when they are flexible (e.g., can be switched if interests do not align), and when a mentoring team is assigned. Mentors are often at a more senior rank, but, at times, faculty of the same rank may be more appropriate as peer mentors. A faculty member may also choose to develop any number of informal mentoring relationships, but one to two formal mentors will serve as the faculty member's primary advocate in the department (one of whom may be asked to document progress toward promotion for said candidate). The role of the mentor is to provide guidance to the mentee regarding career development in domains such as research/scholarship, teaching, and service, but also advise and assist on topics such as (but not limited to): obtaining grant funding, grantsmanship, work-life balance, how to weigh the pros and cons of different professional opportunities, and networking.

Mentoring relationships are often more successful when mentors are chosen, and not imposed. As such, many mentor the mentor (MTM) programs suggest flexibility to switch mentors, as needed, over time. Mentors are expected to provide a mentee with advice on whether targets and objectives for advancement are being met. The relationship between mentor and mentee should be as open as possible, and any subject that may impact the career of the mentee may be open for discussion. Mentors are encouraged to build trust in these relationships and take a multi-directional learning stance, approaching the mentee with a recognition of intersectionality and a position of humility. For example, mentors would acknowledge that they cannot fully know the experience of their mentees, and they learn as much from their students and mentees as they may learn from the mentors, particularly in terms of their lived experiences.

Departmental policies regarding formal mentoring typically recommend meeting frequency. While often it is considered the mentor's responsibility to arrange these meetings, it is in the mentee's best interest to ensure that these regular meetings occur.

Faculty mentors who are approached by their mentees about readiness for promotion should:

- Take the mentee's intentions seriously, and discuss readiness realistically with them, early and often.
- Help them map out a course for promotion, with detailed steps on actions they can take to be ready.
- Help to make the complex process more achievable by providing detail, demystifying the process, and sharing their own experiences with, and observations about, promotion.
- Advocate for them in the department and School, to smooth their experience with promotion.
- Help to identify additional resources as may be needed and work to obtain these resources for the candidate, as needed.

- Review the recommendations for assessment (Section 6 above) with mentees prior to assembling the promotion packet, and in reviewing drafts of the packet, to ensure that the packet will be favorably reviewed.

Should a mentee feel that they are not receiving the level of support they need from their departmental mentor, they are encouraged to have an open dialogue with the mentor to address their concerns and find areas of development for them both. However, if the mentee remains concerned after addressing this opportunity for improvement, they should discuss the matter with their department chair, or chair's designee, who may choose to work to identify a new mentor. The same can be said of the mentor: if a mentor feels the mentee is not a good match, they can discuss with the department chair or chair's designee their perspectives on the mentee's needs and, if determined to be appropriate, recommend a change in mentorship.

10.5 Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review—Role of the Department Chair

The role of the candidate's department chair is to communicate departmental norms and processes clearly and consistently to all faculty candidates. The department chair should also:

- Serve as an advocate for the faculty candidate.
- Help support faculty as they navigate through their career.
- Partner with faculty to ensure teaching evaluations are completed as necessary.
- Conduct regular conferences with faculty.
- Ensure merit reviews are completed annually.

The chair partners with the faculty to ensure that peer teaching evaluations are conducted. Peer teaching evaluations are required once each academic year for assistant professors, and at least every three years for faculty above the assistant professor rank. The faculty member receives a copy of this collegial evaluation of teaching.

The department chair is also responsible for holding regular conferences with faculty, as identified in [Section 24-57C](#) of the FCG. This meeting is required annually with each assistant professor, at least once every two years for associate professors, and at least once every three years for full professors. Faculty at any rank may choose to meet annually with the chair, even if not required. This meeting is a chance for both parties to discuss the candidate's career progress and actions they may take to improve their record before requesting promotion. For example, this conference provides the opportunity for the chair to review and provide feedback on teaching evaluations. The chair is required to provide a written summary of the discussion to the candidate in a timely manner (FCG [Section 24-57D](#)).

Merit review meetings occur toward the end of each academic year. Only faculty eligible to vote on the track and rank being reviewed are allowed to be present for discussion and vote. Eligibility is outlined in the [Merit Voting Matrix](#) on OAP's web site. Associate professors vote on assistant professors, full professors vote on assistant and associate professors, and full professors vote on full professors. During these meetings, the trajectory of a candidate's readiness for promotion is often also discussed. It is good practice, and most common, for chairs to hold their regular conferences with faculty ahead of the merit review meeting so they are informed before the merit review discussion.

Once a candidate has decided to submit their packet for promotion consideration, the department chair takes the following steps, in collaboration with their AHR Manager as appropriate:

- Informs the candidate of the materials needed and schedule to be followed.
- Appoints and orients an APT committee for this candidate. In some departments, this is an ad hoc group of three faculty members more senior in rank. In other departments this is a standing committee.
- Requests external letters from the list of external letter writers provided by the candidate and the APT committee. Follows up with external letter writers that are late or don't follow through.
- Schedules a department faculty meeting with eligible faculty to discuss the promotion/tenure recommendation. Ensures materials are available to eligible faculty for the departmental review.
- Provides a redacted version of the APT report to the candidate for their review and comment at least seven days prior to the scheduled faculty meeting discussion.
- Facilitates the department faculty meeting discussion or delegates this facilitation to the APT committee chair.
- Manages the ballot process for the promotion/tenure decision.
- Provides a summary of the faculty meeting discussion to the candidate for their comment.
- Ensures the promotion packet is submitted to the SPH Office of the Dean by the noted deadline.
- Responds to requests from the SPH Office of the Dean and others regarding this candidate and their packet.
- Provides the chair's letter to the dean.

Please note that overall procedures for promotion and/or tenure cases are described within the UW FCG, [Chapter 24](#).

10.6 Promotion and Tenure Review Process—Role of the Department-Level Review

There are two components of the department-level review: the APT committee's review and the full faculty review conducted by faculty more senior in rank than the candidate. The faculty candidate is given a chance to review and comment on the APT committee's report and the summary of the letter written by the department chair based on the review conducted by the eligible voting faculty in the department. All materials shared with the candidate must have confidential information redacted, such as names of external reviewers.

APT Committee

Depending upon departmental practice, either an ad hoc APT committee is formed for consideration of the candidate, or this role is filled by a standing APT committee. The APT committee carries out the following tasks:

- Conducts an in-depth review of the candidate's packet, including careful reading of the scholarship and teaching documentation.
- Recommends whether or not to proceed with the promotion process.
- Develops the list of external reviewers to be contacted for letters.
- Conducts a final review of the candidate's accomplishments in the three domains after receiving the external letters, and proposes an overall assessment of the candidate through the APT committee report.
- Presents the APT committee report and recommendations to the department voting faculty, more senior in rank to the candidate, who are eligible to review the candidate for promotion.

Faculty Advisory Committee Report

The department promotion committee produces an initial report with their recommendation on the candidate's qualifications for promotion. This committee must be comprised of faculty senior in rank to the candidate. The committee will write a report and recommendation for the department chair. The chair shall provide the candidate with a copy of the committee's report and recommendation. For confidentiality purposes, specific attributions must be omitted, such as external reviewer names. The committee members' names must be included in the letter and not omitted. The candidate, if they choose, may respond in writing to that report within seven calendar days. The department faculty are to receive a copy of the candidate's response before the departmental conversation and promotion vote occurs.

Eligible Voting Faculty Review

Eligible voting faculty in the department participate in the discussion of the candidate's promotion packet and review the promotion materials. Typically, the chair of the APT committee leads this discussion. A ballot is then sent for faculty to vote on the outcome of the promotion. A vote to recommend a candidate's promotion passes at the level of the faculty if it is supported by the majority of all eligible voting faculty.

Faculty Meeting Report and Candidate Response

The eligible voting faculty of the candidate's department shall then meet to discuss the candidate's record and to vote on the promotion question. The department chair shall write a formal report of these proceedings for the candidate, summarizing the discussion and recommendation. For purposes of confidentiality, specific attributions shall be omitted, and vote counts may be omitted from this report. The candidate may respond to the report in writing within seven calendar days. This response should be addressed to the department chair.

Department Chair Review

After the departmental review and vote on the promotion, the department chair reviews the promotion materials and writes a letter with their independent analysis and recommendation. If the chair has a dissenting opinion, the packet still moves forward. In the letter, the department chair is required to include the final vote tally of their faculty (including documentation of all missing votes, abstentions, and votes opposed to the promotion). This letter from the chair, which has both their summary of the departmental review and their independent analysis, is incorporated into the promotion packet that is sent to the Office of the Dean. Additional information on a candidate's packet materials can be found in Appendix 1.

The Office of the Dean requests that the chair follow the SPH template for the letter from the chair to the dean. Note that if there are a substantial number (greater than 25%) of negative votes, abstentions, or absences combined, compared to the total number of eligible voters, the letter from the chair should provide an explanation. (See UW Faculty Code, [Section 21-32](#) for further details about voting eligibility.)

10.7 Promotion and Tenure Review Process—Role of the Department Academic Human Resources Staff

Department AHR managers will coordinate the promotion process for their department. They are responsible for compiling and submitting promotion packets following the School's promotion checklist. Applicable staff, and faculty, should also review the [Promotion Review Process](#) documentation from the OAP.

10.8 Promotion and Tenure Review Process—Role of the SPH Office of the Dean, SPH Faculty Council, and the UW Office of the Provost

Once departmental faculty have voted on the candidate's packet, the department AHR manager submits the promotion packet to the Office of the Dean AHR team. The completed packets are then thoroughly reviewed once more to ensure completeness.

The Office of the Dean team will then share the packet(s) with the SPH Faculty Council for their review during a promotion executive session. (See the [SPH Bylaws](#) for the makeup and role of the Faculty Council during these promotion executive sessions.) During the promotion executive session, only the five departmental representatives or alternates are present. The departmental representative (or alternate) presents each candidate from their department, and then recuses themselves from the discussion and vote of those candidates. For the discussion and vote for each candidate, no faculty appointed to the primary department of the candidate should be present. It is possible for the Faculty Council to determine they need more information before they are able to conduct their vote.

For Faculty Council members who have joint appointments in another SPH department, the following guidelines apply:

- When the faculty member up for promotion holds a primary and joint appointment in two or more SPH departments (this does not apply to adjunct appointments), then both the Faculty Council representative from these departments should recuse themselves from voting.
- When a Faculty Council representative holds a joint appointment in two SPH departments, they should recuse themselves for votes on faculty in both their departments and the alternate should be called upon to vote on candidates belonging to their secondary department.

Once Faculty Council completes their review, the SPH vice dean for faculty is notified of the outcome by the Office of the Dean AHR team. If Faculty Council votes in favor of promotion, the vice dean for faculty conducts their review. The vice dean for faculty provides a second level of review to ensure that all promotion criteria outlined in this handbook and the UW Faculty Code are met. Any concerns regarding candidate promotions flagged by Faculty Council are discussed as needed by the dean, vice dean for faculty, department chair, department AHR manager, and the individual faculty candidates. The information on advancement of the packets is also provided to the faculty candidates.

Finally, candidate packets that are approved by the vice dean for faculty, on behalf of the dean, are expanded by including the OAP [Promotion and/or Tenure Recommendation Checklist](#) and additional materials from the Office of the Dean, completed by the AHR staff.

The packets are submitted to the Office of Academic Personnel (OAP), in central administration for the Vice Provost and then Provost review. The [possible outcomes](#) of the process are reviewed on OAP's web site.

In SPH, the director of Human Resources answers any questions that come from OAP about the file. The department chair and/or department AHR manager is consulted when necessary.

Please note that overall procedures for promotion and/or tenure cases are identified within the UW FCG, [Chapter 24](#).