Dear Faculty,

Per Faculty Code section 24-54, all eligible members of the faculty shall be informed of the opportunity to be considered for promotion. At the request of the faculty member, or if the promotion decision is mandatory, a promotion review shall be conducted following the required procedure.

Resources and Promotion Criteria

1. Faculty Code Section 24-54
2. Updated SPH Faculty Affairs webpage: Materials needed for your promotion review can be found on this updated webpage, along with the recording of our annual SPH Promotion workshop offered to faculty. Your department AHR Manager will provide further instructions as to how/when to complete forms and where/when to upload.
3. School of Public Health Academic Affairs Handbook was updated in August 2024. You should familiarize yourself with Part 2: *Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure of Faculty in Professorial Titles* and Part 3: *Navigating the Promotion and Tenure Process.* These sections include expectations and criteria for promotion based on rank and track. Appendix 2 also includes example activities for effectiveness in areas of research, teaching, and service.
4. Office of Academic Personnel and Faculty (APF) Promotion and Tenure webpage

In efforts to provide transparency and demystify the promotions process, below is a reminder of the materials required for your promotion record that you should be aware of to ensure you have a complete promotion record at the time you submit for consideration:

- **Teaching Evaluations**: The UW Faculty Code Section 24-57 A requires that recommendations for promotion and/or tenure include documentation of teaching effectiveness in 2 forms: student evaluation and collegial (peer) evaluation.
  - o **Student Evaluations:** each faculty member must have at least one student evaluation for every year in which a course is taught.
  - o **Collegial (peer) evaluation** of teaching must be conducted on the following academic year schedule:
    - ▪ Every year for assistant professors, faculty in the associate professor tenure track and professor tenure track titles, and artists in residence.
      - If you buyout of teaching, it is recommended to have a guest lecture evaluated by a peer and/or students so there is some evaluation available for merit and for P&T if teaching is part of your duties per code.
      - Similarly with partial leaves and clock waivers, faculty must still meet the expectations of the position and if that includes teaching responsibilities, teaching evaluations are required.
    - ▪ Every 3 years for associate professors.*
    - ▪ *In addition to the above requirements, all faculty who are being considered for promotion must have peer evaluations in the year prior to consideration for promotion.

- o Connect with your department AHR manager if you have questions on your department's process for coordinating evaluations.
- **Other materials that will be required for your promotion review (your AHR Manager will provide you with current templates):**
  - o [Faculty Council Promotion Consideration Worksheet](#): a cover page for your promotion packet
  - o [Self-Assessment](#): a way to tell a story and share things that may not be apparent from your CV or other materials
  - o [CV](#)
  - o External letters of review suggestions
    - ▪ You will also have the opportunity to suggest names of external reviewers via a form in Interfolio
    - ▪ The department solicits letters confidentially
  - o Scholarship documentation
    - ▪ Publications
    - ▪ Academic Public Health Practice Documentation

Class A Legislation 173: Expanding Candidates' Rights in the Promotion Process

At its meeting on May 30, 2024, the Faculty Senate approved legislation that would amend the Faculty Code related to expanding candidates' rights in the promotion process. The new legislation was approved by a majority vote of the faculty and the approved legislation can be found [here](#).

The are several phases of review and opportunities for faculty response. Changes to the previous process because of Class A Legislation are in **bold** and go into effect for the 2025-2026 promotion review cycle:

1. Department Promotion and Tenure Committee report is shared with the candidate **at least 7 days prior to faculty discussion and vote**
   a. Candidate has 7 days to respond
2. Faculty discussion and **substantial summary** are shared with the candidate and includes any expressed concerns and counter arguments. **The chair's independent assessment (i.e. Chair's Letter) is shared with the candidate concurrently.**
   a. Candidate has 7 days to respond
3. **SPH Faculty Council creates a report that includes a recommendation and summary of discussion and is shared with the candidate**. The Dean's independent recommendation and analysis (i.e. Dean's Letter) is shared with the candidate concurrently.
   a. Candidate has 7 days to respond

Interfolio Review, Promotion & Tenure (RPT) for Enterprise Use

What is Interfolio RPT? The UW has been using Interfolio for Faculty Searches for several years. RPT is a new module in Interfolio that is the designated system for academic personnel promotion and tenure reviews. Interfolio RPT supports a fully digital promotion review lifecycle from the candidate's submission of documents through multiple levels of review to the promotion outcome.

What is changing? Faculty will be expected to upload materials as requested by their department AHR Managers and all corresponding review and approval steps (i.e. promotion committees, chair, faculty, faculty council, dean, etc.) will take place in Interfolio. This means reviewers can no longer view a PDF version of a promotion packet in a OneDrive folder. They must review materials directly in Interfolio RPT, which adds a layer of security. Because of the transparency to the review steps, it is no longer possible to have "internal to SPH only" documents (i.e., documents like the "promotion consideration worksheet" that has been used previously only as an internal document in SPH would de facto be included in the packet that goes to the provost's office). In addition, the solicitation of external referees will now happen through Interfolio RPT.

What is staying the same from a workflow perspective? Everything else! The review process/steps and criteria all remain the same. We are simply moving from PDFs, paper forms, drop boxes, and email, over to one all-inclusive and transparent, user-friendly system.

When will the changes go into effect? Interfolio RPT will be available for use on January 1, 2025, for the 2025-2026 P&T review cycle. All SPH AHR Managers completed user training with OAP in autumn quarter and will be able to guide faculty and reviewers on the appropriate steps and actions to take. The SPH AHR team is creating resources, providing oversight to AHR Managers, and holding monthly meetings specifically for AHR Mangers and RPT implementation as we navigate this new system together.

Promotion Clocks and Clock waivers

Faculty in clock-managed ranks/tracks (assistant professor rank in tenure, WOT, and research tracks) have a specified timeframe for promotion review (i.e. "promotion and/or tenure clock") and are appointed to an initial 3-year term, with an academic review in year 2 to reappoint to a second 3-year term, for a total of 6 years. The mandatory review takes place in year 6. Your clock is determined by your start date and is outlined in your offer letter. You can also view your end date and academic review date in Workday. If you need help locating or understanding your mandatory promotion clock, don't hesitate to reach out to your local level AHR or Dean's Office HR (Charlotte Hentges, johnsc94@uw.edu).

A clock waiver extends a faculty's mandatory and specified timeframe to be considered and reviewed for promotion. Clock waivers provide faculty additional time to build their portfolio and work toward meeting promotion criteria. If you have had significant and unanticipated interruptions to research/scholarship, you may consider exploring a clock waiver. While clock waivers *do* extend the mandatory review date, they do not waive promotion criteria requirements for teaching evaluations.

Guidance regarding funding documentation in promotion materials

In the past, SPH has asked candidates to complete a "funding projection worksheet" that focused on past, current and future support for their own salary. Because candidates expressed frustration that completing this funding spreadsheet was onerous and because it did not explicitly address the amount and type of extramural support needed for the candidate to conduct their scholarship more broadly (*i.e.,* beyond their own salary support), we are removing this requirement and instead providing candidates with guidance about what information be included in other parts of their packet (i.e., candidate's CV and self-assessment; departmental letters) to guide review of their materials.

These changes reflect clarification that Dean Godwin received from Provost Serio in Spring 2024 about what the Provost's office is looking for in promotion packets to help demonstrate that the faculty member being considered for promotion have the necessary track record for promotion. Provost Serio indicated that her office is looking for the candidate's file and supporting letters to demonstrate that the candidate a track record that suggests that they will continue to be a successful and productive faculty member according to the criteria laid out by the institution, school and department for the track that faculty member is in (*i.e.*, tenure-track, WOT, research or teaching). Because tenure-track, WOT and research faculty in SPH are expected to bring in extramural support for a portion their own salary (50%, 70%, and 90% respectively), their promotion packets should provide evidence that they have demonstrated a track-record of bringing in this level of salary support. In addition, tenure-track, WOT and research faculty in SPH are expected to demonstrate that they have a track record of bringing in sufficient extramural funding to cover the costs associated with the type of research in which they are engaged. Based on this input, we have provided guidance below regarding what we recommend should be included and articulated in the materials submitted by the candidate so that a strong case can be made for their promotion by the departmental review committee, the department chair and the dean.

Materials submitted by the candidate. Candidates should be sure to include a detailed description of prior, current and pending extramural support for their salary and scholarship in the CV that is submitted with their promotion materials. This section of the CV should include (at a minimum) for each funding source: the funding source/agency, (e.g., NIH, HRSA), the type of award (e.g., R23, R01), the name of the funded project, the dates that the funding is active, the role of the candidate on the award, the names of the PI of the award (if not the candidate) and/or other co/mPIs, the amount of the award (direct and indirect dollars annually and total), and the percent of the candidate's salary and benefits (if any) covered by the award. (Note that in future years, as additional modules in Interfolio are rolled out, this information will be autogenerated.) Because the institutional support for faculty in different tracks in SPH is different from that in other units across UW, candidates should include in their self-assessment a statement of what percent of their salary is soft money (i.e., 50% for TT, 70% for WOT, 90% for research track faculty) and a description of their track record for bringing in their support (including the percent of their own salary and benefits they have covered from extramural sources for each year in rank). Candidates should also include in their self-assessment a narrative description of any extramural funding for their own salary in future years that has already been awarded to them (including percent salary covered by each source by year) and pending awards and contracts (and the percent FTE that has been requested for their salary in each of those pending awards and contracts). Because the amount of funding needed to cover the costs of research varies enormously from one field to another within public health, candidates should include in their self-assessment a narrative that describes what type/amount of extramural funding is required to support the type of scholarly activities that are important for their field (e.g., do they conduct clinical trials or laboratory research? Do they supervise students, postdocs or program management staff that require financial support?) Candidates should then describe their track record for bringing in extramural support (including funding sources and amounts) to cover their scholarly activities and to support their research team and what support they have already secured or for which they have awards/contracts pending for future years.