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SECTION 1
PERSONNEL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1A. PROJECT PERSONNEL AND GROUPS

1A-1 GRANT ADMINISTRATION

- There have been several important changes among PIs and central office staff. First, our former PI, Dr. Kim Wilcox, stepped down from his position as Provost at Michigan State and our Acting Provost (formerly Senior Associate Provost), Dr. June Youatt, has stepped in as PI of the MSU Advance Grant. Second, our Grant Director, Dr. Melissa McDaniels, accepted a position with the MSU Graduate School; Julie Rojewski was hired to continue the work as Director of the grant and began managing grant activities effective January, 2013. The ADAPP-ADVANCE Director and staff continues to coordinate and support research, writing articles, serving as a liaison with key stakeholders (Ohio Evaluation & Assessment Center, Institutionalization Action Group, National Science Foundation), and implementing the communications plan.

- We also phased out the support of Graduate Research Assistants (our last graduate student took another position on January 1, 2013), and at the end of year five, we will cease having a full-time budget/administrative support person. In an effort to reflect the gradual institutionalization of our work, staff positions have been eliminated and work responsibilities reassigned to existing staff in other relevant, central administrative offices.

- Two of our co-PIs (Luz and Reid-Bush) have continued to focus their efforts on publishing scholarship that emerged from our grant work. The remaining PIs (Curry, McGroarty, and Roehling) continue to guide the ongoing institutionalization of grant activities, as members of the IAWG (see below).

- As lead Co-PI, McGroarty serves in a leadership capacity among our grant management team and also continues to direct the development of the Faculty Information Tool (FIT). A description of progress on that project (and other projects) is provided in section 2C.

1A-2 INSTITUTIONALIZATION ACTION GROUP (IAG)

- In September, 2011, MSU established a group to facilitate the successful institutionalization of policies and practices and innovative programs of ADAPP-ADVANCE, moving them into existing structures and offices. The Institutionalization Action Group (IAG) includes the following stakeholders: the Deans of the three grant colleges (Deans of Engineering, Natural Science, and Social Science); Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources; Director of Planning; and the Director of the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives. This group met twice in year 5 to
give general guidance and feedback on institutionalization activities, and they provide general guidance to the IAWG (described below).

A subgroup of the IAG—the Institutional Action Working Group (IAWG)—meets weekly. This group includes three co-PIs (Curry, McGroarty, and Roehling), the ADAPP-Advance Grant Director, the Director of the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives and, up until May 1, 2013 before leaving the university, the Director of Planning in the Office of Planning and Budgets. This group is designed to focus on institutionalizing the grant work by making decisions about enacting the “big picture” ideas of the IAG.

The IAG has undergone several important changes during year 5 that have made the work of the IAWG even more important. For example, the Director of Planning left MSU to take a position at another university, and the Dean of the College of Engineering took a position in central administration at MSU. Losing two core members of the IAG had shifted the focus to a more advisory capacity while the IAWG has stepped in to make important procedural decisions regarding institutionalization; it is important to note that two individuals—the Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources (Curry) and the Director of the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (Granberry Russell)—serve on both committees.

The IAG:

  Provides college-level insight on challenges confronting departments and colleges and reports on how institutionalization decisions have impacted unit-based work based on input from the Deans.

  With input from the Council of Deans, sets the agenda for FEA Consortium activities. The focus of this year has been on creating a sustainable FEA program, by examining the institutional funding protocol, training and evaluation of FEAs, and capturing best practices in the FEA role.

The IAWG:

  Makes practical, administrative decisions about institutionalization activities. An example includes determining how to integrate FEA reporting activities into existing college-reporting structures, instead of adding an additional layer of bureaucracy (see Attachment A).

  Coordinates with central administrative offices (e.g., ADAPP-ADVANCE central office, Office of Faculty and Organizational Development, Office of Academic Human Resources, Family Resource Center, Women’s Resource Center) to support college-based efforts.

  Makes recommendations about policy and practice changes, as well as collect or locate data needed to guide decision-making.

  Cultivates best practices among units across campus and disseminate these ideas and activities to other units.
No changes to our Faculty Advisory Committee. This group did not meet in year 5.

We conducted an external advisory committee meeting in December, 2012. Focus of this conversation was on “mutual mentoring,” a concept that has been widely embraced by private business, and the value of translating it to our academic context.

**1B. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**1B-1. GRANT MANAGEMENT TEAM MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.12-15.12</td>
<td>McDaniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What: NSF Joint Annual Meeting: Broadening Participation Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where: Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.25-27.12</td>
<td>Linley and McDaniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What: WEPAN (Women in Engineering Proactive Network) Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where: Columbus, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.14.11– 11.17.11</td>
<td>McDaniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where: Las Vegas, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3-5.13</td>
<td>Rojewski and McGroarty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What: NSF Advance Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where: Alexandria, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.29-30.13</td>
<td>McGroarty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What: STAR Metrics Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where: Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8-9.13</td>
<td>McDaniels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who: McGroarty
What: CIC Data Storage and Management Meeting (FIT Initiative)
Where: Chicago, IL

5.13-14.13
Who: McGroarty
What: Federal Demonstration Project: SciENCV and Star Metrics
Where: Washington, D.C.

1B-2. FACULTY EXCELLENCE ADVOCATES

FEA Consortium Meetings

Topic: Clarifying the FEA Role (9.14.12)
Topic: FEA Reporting Processes (1.28.13)
Topic: Doing the Work: FEA Challenges and Strategies (4.25.13)

Campus Workshops

“College Budgeting and Financial Planning: Things to Consider when asking your Dean or Director for Money” (11.8.12). Co-sponsored by the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development.

“Mind bugs: How implicit bias affects faculty evaluations in academia” and “Mind Bugs: How implicit bias affects teaching and learning” with Nilanjana Dasgupta (11.12-13.12). Served 111 faculty members (including FEAs, Chairs, and Deans) and 20 graduate students.
SECTION 2
INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

2A. OVERVIEW

The focus of year 5, as in year 4, has been on institutionalizing the work of our Advance grant. We continue to embed programs, processes and oversight of policies into existing offices (as opposed to creating a new office or staff line). Thus we continued to ask—and address—questions below as we plan for the end of the grant.

- What are we trying to sustain? What initiatives should not be sustained?
- What evidence do we have that suggests these things are worth sustaining?
- What supports/structures/policies need to be in place?
- What capacity is necessary and where will it come from?

2B. INSTITUTIONALIZING THE FEA ROLE AND THE FEA NETWORK

Last year, we spent time on clarifying the FEA (Faculty Excellence Advocate) role and determining how to support those in the role to be most effective. That conversation continued and expanded in year five.

Deans and FEAs meetings:

At the beginning of the 2013-2013 academic year, the Provost met with all deans to discuss the evolving role of the FEA in each college. The three ADAPP-Advance Deans discussed the program in their particular college. Emerging from this meeting, and echoed in the FEA Consortium meetings, was a request for the Deans and FEAs to meet jointly together.

With the addition of the FEAs in all colleges at MSU in years 3 and 4, there emerged widespread support for opportunities to bring FEAs together (this resulted in the FEA Consortium) and, new in year five, to bring together Deans and FEAs to have open discussion on challenges of defining the role of this position.

We hosted three such meetings; each was led by a Dean and FEA (or FEAs) from our three grant colleges—College of Natural Science, College of Engineering, and College of Social Science—and focused on sharing best practices and fostering conversation among Deans and FEAs. Several themes emerged about FEA work (see Appendix B), including the importance of a close working relationship between a Dean and FEA, the challenges of handling all of the work and expectations for FEAs, and the ways to promote communication and sharing of practices among college FEAs.
**Funding FEsAs**

A tiered FEA funding system was put in place to account for differences in the number of faculty in each college supported by an FEA. The funding ranges from 20-50% of an FEA salary. The ADAPP-Advance grant has historically covered the salaries for FEAs in the three grant colleges while the Provost’s office covers salary for the FEAs in other colleges. Year 5 is the final year that Advance-grant monies will be paid to FEAs; in Year 6, the FEAs in College of Engineering, Natural Science, and Social Science will be paid fully by the Provost’s office.

**Managing FEsAs**

We are several years into the FEA program, and it has been expanded with significant investment from the Provost’s Office. It had previously been determined that FEAs would report jointly to their Deans and to the Provost. However, other management issues have emerged, so the IAWG has focused in year 5 on the management of FEAs: how to onboard new FEAs? Who evaluates FEAs, and how often? To whom does an FEA present problems? The policies and practices that emerged in need of clarity ranged from the mundane (Who needs to be told when an FEA steps down, and a new FEA steps forward?) to the complex (Who conducts exit interviews, and how should that information be used?). Clarifying these difficult issues has been a focus of year five.

We determined that FEAs would report their work to the central administration annually, via existing reports filed with the Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives (OI3) as part of the college-level planning process. The issues to be addressed in these reports by FEAs was updated (see Appendix A) to better reflect the complexity and open-endedness of FEA work; their annual report also offered FEAs a way to present areas in which they were particularly challenged or in which they particularly excelled, some of which are unique to the college environment.

**Publicizing the FEA Program**

As is noted by the evaluation report from the Ohio Evaluation and Assessment Center, we continue to confront the challenge of helping faculty members be aware of the presence and roles of the FEA in their college. Though central administration values this program and the individuals who work as FEAs, only 43% of faculty members who responded to a survey (OEAC, 2013, p. 44) were “aware that my college has a Faculty Excellence Advocate.” Most who knew of FEA work were familiar with their FEA because of work in a search committee. This survey indicates that we continue to be challenged with communicating the other important work done by FEAs. This will be a goal in year 6 and beyond.

As we continue our discussions of institutionalization in all facets of the Advance project, our focus will be on how to best continue to support and institutionalize the FEA network. Because the institution itself, via the Provost’s office, has financially invested so heavily in supporting the FEA initiative, we are confident that the importance of this component of the project will continue to grow. Still, two areas remain for us to address in year 6: The evaluation of the effectiveness of this program and managing the procedural and administrative needs of the program.
The work group for the Academic Profiling Project (APP), a pilot of the FIT tool, has been working with Digital Measures to populate the new instance of Activity Insights (AI) with data for faculty in the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR). The “permanent data,” which includes details about the appointments of these faculty members, have been uploaded into AI. Also, course data linking teaching assignments from our student information system to faculty profiles have been uploaded, and we are in the process of uploading contract and grants data (from our contract and grants database), patent data (from the institution’s intellectual property database), and publication data (downloaded from our Scopus/SciVal system). The work group is in the process of developing links of faculty profiles to 1) data in the Office of Outreach and Engagement’s data base that identifies outreach activity, 2) data on graduate student committee assignments in the Graduate School’s “Grad Info” database, and 3) data on instruction from the non-credit data system. The work plan schedule projects that these uploads will be completed by mid-June. We have identified ~12 faculty in two departments in CANR to beta test the system. The curriculum vitas (CVs) of these faculty members have been collected, and a staff member has been assigned to upload data from the CVs into the profiles for information was not provided by the various systems of record. At the end of June we will meet with these faculty and ask that they review their profiles for problems, errors or issues.

As we develop a faculty profiling system, the project personnel need to be informed of other activities that relate to our FIT initiative. Associated with the Federal Star Metrics project, currently coordinated by the National Institutes of Health, there is the expectation that faculty who apply for federal grants will begin to use a federal CV system, SciENCV, to identify products and outcomes of grant awards. One of the co-PIs, Estelle McGroarty, attended the Federal Demonstration Partnership (FDP) meeting in Washington, May 13 – 14, 2013, to participate in the discussions on electronic Research Administration (eRA) initiatives being developed by NIH and other federal agencies, including Star Metrics, SciENCV and My Bibliography. It appears that the SciENCV project will allow for complete integration with the main commercial faculty profiling tools, including Digital Measure’s Activity Insight. There was also discussion at the FDP meeting about a unique identifier system, ORCID, which we may need to incorporate into the APP/FIT profile because it will be used in conjunction with SciENCV, as well as other eRA systems.

2D. INSTITUTIONALIZING ACCOUNTABILITY STRUCTURES

2D-1. ACADEMIC PLANNING

In 2011-12, Provost Wilcox heightened focus on colleges’ progress with improving faculty diversity by providing incentive funding for colleges that made notable progress on diversifying the faculty, consistent with the goals and objectives of the ADAPP-ADVANCE grant. MSU’s commitment to inclusion and diversity is a hallmark value of the institution. It is important that college and unit-level policies and practices are aligned with MSU’s values of quality and inclusion and that there are effective structures in place to promote the commitment to achieving excellence with diversity. The academic planning process of the University engages all seventeen degree-granting colleges and academic support units;
therefore, integrating ADAPP-ADVANCE best practices into the academic planning process is one of the most effective ways to ensure institutionalization of many of the high impact practices the grant has developed as well as to assure accountability at the college and departmental level for continued progress on diversity metrics.

As part of the planning process, each college is reviewed for some common indicators of success, including the number of underrepresented faculty members within the college, and their distribution across ranks. Beginning in 2012, colleges were asked for additional plans and indicators by which their progress should be evaluated; this helps recognize the unique goals and challenges of individual colleges, while also holding them accountable for moving toward a more diverse and inclusive faculty.

2D-2. DIVERSITY PLANNING MEETINGS

Since the mid-1990s, as a part of the University's diversity initiative, the Provost Office Diversity Team (Associate Provost for Academic Human Resources; Senior Advisor to the President and Director of Office for Inclusion & Intercultural Initiatives; Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, Associate Dean, The Graduate School; and the Director of the Women's Resource Center) has conducted annual College Level Planning (CLP) meetings. These meetings are held with each of the deans of degree granting colleges (currently 17) and separately reporting directors to discuss progress towards achieving unit-specific diversity objectives. In preparation for the meetings and to aid in reporting the university's efforts in achieving diversity, they are each asked to provide brief progress commentary utilizing a template titled, "Creating Inclusive Excellence/College Level Planning Program Review and Allocation Progress Report. The units are asked to report on outcomes associated with existing or new initiatives that advance faculty, staff, and student diversity at MSU, including outcomes associated with receipt of internal grant funds (Creating Inclusive Excellence Grants).

Discussions focus on faculty hiring, advancement and retention, efforts to enhance the recruitment/retention/persistence of diverse students (undergraduate and graduate), infusion of diversity in the curriculum, and opportunities for collaboration with other units on diversity-related activities. With regard to faculty, the Diversity Team will also address faculty work-related equity concerns, including such issues as: start-up packages, laboratory space, work-life balance issues, promotion and tenure related issues (e.g., RP&T process) the role of mentoring in faculty success, and work environment issues, including possible bias and discriminatory treatment.

For the first time, the summer 2012 College Level Planning meetings were tailored to incorporate the college diversity metrics the deans formulated in response to the Provost's annual fall budget planning process (see Section 2D-1 above). The CLP meetings also now incorporate unit efforts associated with ADAPP-ADVANCE grant activities, including the efforts of FEAs in achieving outcomes associated with the grant. FEAs summarize their activities in reports filed for the College Level Planning meetings (see Appendix A) Including FEA reports in this annual reporting process accomplishes two important goals of the grant: 1) to centralize the role of FEAs in supporting diversity in the colleges, and 2) to
institutionalize grant activities (in this case, the creation of the FEA program) by incorporating work into existing administrative structures instead of creating new processes.

2E. INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF COMMUNICATION PRACTICES

The communication portion of this report can be found in Section 4. Determining the long-term effectiveness and value of continuing various communication vehicles has been a focus of our conversation around institutionalizing the work of the grant.
SECTION 3
REPORTING BY GRANT GOAL

3A. INCREASE THE RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF WOMEN FACULTY

3A-1 CROSS-COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS

- On April 18, 2013 Paulette Granberry Russell, Mark Roehling and Terry Curry offered a workshop as a part of the department chair training series (LEAD). This three-hour workshop was titled, “Success in the Academic Hiring Process from Start to Finish: Clarifying Purposes and Procedures, Avoiding Delays, and Increasing Faculty Quality and Diversity.”

- During three separate meetings, Deans and FEAs (Faculty Excellence Advocates) shared best practices related to all areas of FEA work, including faculty searches. These included, for example, the College of Engineering explaining its use of a “Process Fairness Advocate.” One individual on each search committee is identified by the Dean and FEA as the PFA; the Dean and FEA then train that individual on best practices and current policy (and provides them with our Toolkit) to guide the search process. That individual is encouraged to speak to the Dean and/or FEA if he or she believes the search is not following policy, at which point the Dean and/or FEA can intervene. After the conclusion of each search, the FEA and Dean meet with each PFA to assess the search experience to make sure there was compliance with policy to foster an inclusive search. In year 5, the Dean, FEA, and an appointed PFA worked together on searches underway in Civil and Environmental Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering.

ADAPP-Advance leaders will compile emerging best practices and disseminate those via an FEA toolkit, which is currently under development.

- We continue to provide all search committees with hard copies of the faculty search toolkits. These publications have proven to be immensely valuable for raising the profile of the grant work, and are widely sought by search committee chairs. Currently the toolkits are available online, as well as in hard copy, and originally the plan was to house them strictly online. However, because of widespread use and generally positive feedback, the IAWG determined that it is worth our effort to institutionalize this product and to revise and reprint all toolkits (including the faculty search toolkit), with the institution covering costs for revisions and reprinting.

- In their evaluation report (Appendix C), the OEAC provided some findings that will be the focus of our attention for year 6. They acknowledge that hiring during our grant period has not returned to “normal” levels, but that it has picked up in year 5; however, these data indicate a trend that the proportion of women in the hiring pool has steadily declined during the grant period. Exploring and addressing this trend will be a focus of our efforts as we institutionalize the work in support of grant goals.
3A-2 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

- The EGR FEA worked with the faculty search process in several departments (ME, ECE, CEE). This included overseeing the position advertisements, selection of the search committee members, candidate review process, candidate interviews, and reviewing final offer letters. EGR recruited one tenure-stream women faculty in our Mechanical Engineering department, who will start as Assistant Professor in fall 2013.

3A-3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE

- Dean Kirkpatrick, Associate Dean Chivukula and FEA Conrad reviewed outcomes of 2011-12 searches and Dean Kirkpatrick approved searches for 2012-13.
- FEA met with chairs/directors/search committees to review position descriptions and evaluation criteria for the following searches, which took place in 2012-2013: Chemistry (1 position), Plant Biology (1 position), Ecology Evolutionary Biology and Behavior (2 positions), Mathematics (2 positions), Microbiology and Molecular Genetics (1-2 positions).

*Successful searches yielded the following results to date:*

- Senior Hires: 1 (male)
- Assistant Professors: 13 (6 female, 7 male).

3A-4 COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

- The College of Social Science (CSS) revised their tenure track hiring authorization policy to incorporate criteria for searches that will attract diverse faculty (see Attachment D).
- CSS formalized plans to positively impact faculty searches by assigning to each faculty search an Associate Dean to participate in the process by interviewing each candidate brought to campus. During these interviews, candidates are provided with an overview of the College and expectations around research, teaching, and service. Also interviews with all candidates included a discussion of the importance of mentoring and a review of the reappointment, promotion and tenure process in the College. The Associate Dean provides feedback on each candidate to the search committee (see Attachment E for sample feedback form).
- The College of Social Science FEA was engaged in several faculty searches this year in CSS (Political Science, Economics, Human Resource and Labor Relations), as well as the Chair search in the Human Development and Family Studies Department. The FEA’s involvement included reviewing the composition of each search committee, evaluating the process/protocol outlined by each committee, reviewing candidates’ lists, attending departmental meetings to clarify
processes and protocols to the search committee and in some cases, the entire faculty. All of these efforts were made to help ensure that the process was fair, consistent, and equitable for all candidates.

The CSS FEA served on the search committee for the Director of the School of Social Work. She assisted with the review of candidates and participated in screening interviews, reviewed on campus interview protocol, attended presentations and dinners with candidates, responded to inquiries made by faculty about the search process, and led discussions with the search committee to ensure that issues were addressed. The FEA held a special meeting with the search committee to address concerns raised by faculty about inappropriate behavior during the process by a faculty member serving in a leadership role. The time was used to process the issue and plans for ensuring that it did not impede the Director’s search process. The FEA met with both finalists for the position to discuss the role and expectation from the perspective of the Dean’s office. These sessions also included a discussion of ADAPP/ADVANCE with respect to RPT, annual reviews and mentoring.
3B. INCREASE RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT OF FEMALE FACULTY

3B-1 CROSS-COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS

- ADAPP-Advance co-sponsored a workshop on March 28, 2013 about “Women in Leadership: Pathways and Problem Solving” which featured a diverse panel of women leaders, from across disciplines and across campus, to share their experiences and advice for women to hone their skills and abilities and pursue leadership opportunities. (Appendix F)

- On April 9, 2013, Julie Rojewski (Director, ADAPP-Advance) partnered with Deborah DeZure and Allyn Shaw of the Office of Faculty and Organizational Development to deliver a workshop, “Cultivating a Pipeline into Academic Administration: Implications for Administrators and Faculty.” See Appendix G for a list of recommended practices designed to engage faculty members in considering leadership opportunities and broaden participation in academic leadership.

- On August 16, 2011 a new University Faculty Mentoring Policy went into effect and requires that all colleges develop and implement a mentoring program. Since then, mentoring resources were expanded to assist colleges and units as they develop unit-level mentoring programs. Via our FEA Consortium meetings and FEA reports, we have started to develop modes of understanding how different units have implemented the mentoring program.

One area that has drawn our attention is the need to evaluate different mentoring policies as they are implemented at the college- or department-level. The ADAPP-Advance Grant program has partnered with two departments in the College of Social Science to assess their mentoring programs. An initial report from the Department of Psychology can be found in Appendix H; based on additional analysis, rubrics will be developed and disseminated in year 6. This will help support individual units interested in determining the effectiveness and value of their particular program, as well as provide feedback to central administration on the value of the institutional policy.

- Mentoring toolkits were reprinted and disseminated widely to support the growing engagement with the mentoring policy. Since it was first required in 2011, there have been refinements of unit-level policies, and increased engagement in implementation. Our focus for year six will be to refine the assessment rubrics and determine how best to support institution-wide mentoring policies into the future.

3B-2 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING CONTRIBUTIONS

- During the Summer of 2012, a small work group of six faculty formed by the EGR FEA explored mechanisms to formally assess the college’s mentoring programs, define good mentoring practices that may address challenges unique to College of Engineering faculty, and look into
new opportunities to enhance our mentoring approaches. The group collected information from pre-tenure faculty which led to policy improvement and clarification, the development of a web-based assessment tool, which is still under development.

- On Tuesday April 9, 2013 the ADAPP-Advance grant hosted a Women’s Leadership Luncheon for the women faculty in the College of Engineering. There was little formal agenda, but the conversation revolved around the need for senior women faculty to be mindful of the ways in which they can empower and advocate for junior women faculty, especially in environments when the number of women is small.

- The EGR FEA participated in the *Keeping our Faculty of Color Symposium* held Minneapolis in April 14-16, 2013. Some of the best practices that were discussed in the symposium are being evaluated for possible adoption at MSU. Among them is a postdoctoral program for advancing faculty diversity.

3B-3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

The college hosted the second year of the 2012-13 STEM Teaching Essentials Workshops (details and video are available at http://teachingessentials.msu.edu/):

- Thursday, Aug. 23, 2012: Starting Off on the Right Foot: Organizing Your First Day of Class
- Monday, Oct. 8, 2012: Active Learning: Engaging Students in the Classroom
- Tuesday, Nov. 13, 2012: Big and Effective: Successful Teaching in Large Classrooms
- Wednesday, Jan. 1, 2013: Moving Forward using Backward Course Design: Alignment of Goals
- Monday, Feb. 11, 2013: Making the Case: An Introduction to Case-Based Learning

- On March 20, 2013 the CNS FEA, Dean, and Associate Dean offered an RPT workshop for 2013-14 tenure and reappointment candidates. This workshop focused on demystifying and clarifying expectations around reappointment and tenure process, and was a chance for junior faculty members to ask pointed questions to college leadership (i.e., how many publications, what is the role of teaching evaluations, etc.). On April 5, 2013, Associate Dean Chivukula met separately with those who could not make it on to the workshop.
In April, 2013, the Associate Dean and FEA in CNS hosted a Spring Mentoring Meeting with first-year faculty members. The focus of this conversation, led by Acting Dean of Engineering Leo Kempel, was on how to cultivate connections with different funding agencies and how to prepare funding proposals. The group also discussed policies and practices to empower junior faculty to engage with, and maximize the value of, their mentoring experiences.

The CNS FEA also participated in the Keeping our Faculty of Color Symposium held in Minneapolis in April 14-16, 2013 (see description above; the EGR FEA also attended this symposium).

3B-4 COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

- The CSS FEA and Dean focused on reviewing/revising aspects of the annual review process and convened a committee to design guidelines/protocol for all annual review letters in the college.
- College-level leadership also reviewed department mentoring policies, preparing to provide feedback to the departmental chairs/directors for revisions and finalization. This included providing preliminary feedback to the mentoring assessment reports requested by ADAPP-Advance grant leaders (see Appendix G).
- On April 10, 2013 the CSS and ADAPP-Advance Grant co-sponsored a Women’s Leadership Luncheon. This event attracted 60 women from across the College. The program was designed from feedback provided from last year’s luncheon. This year’s luncheon included panelist representing the following aspects of professional organization leadership: (1) across ranks—represent different stages of careers; (2) across organization types/roles—disciplinary associations, journal editorial roles and national educational organizations (CIC, ACE, NADOHE, others); and (3) across aspects of the discipline—research and curriculum development. The following individuals served as panelist at this year’s luncheon: Kelly Klump, Merry Morash, Sheryl Kubiak, Shelia Contreas, Michelle Kimanski and Paulette Granberry-Russell.
- Overwhelmingly women noted that they would like to see these luncheons continue beyond the grant; CSS will fully fund the continuation of this program. Plans are already underway for next year’s event that will include a discussion with a prominent leader on an issue of specific concern to women in our College.
- The College of Social Science FEA is currently participating in the newly created Leadership Learning Community (LCC). Based on learning communities to support faculty interested in topics related to teaching, for example, this group explores leadership opportunities for faculty members. Three meetings were held during year 5.
- DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA in CSS) worked with the Dean to begin the process of revitalizing the annual review committee. The revitalization is needed partly because the updated by-laws that the Dean’s office received from several units included inclusive and innovative practices in support of the annual review process that the Dean’s staff thought deserved further attention and broader implementation. Using
the newly created model from Political Science and the current structure in Psychology, the College held a spring meeting to review the protocols used in the respective units. This will include a thorough review and understanding of the aspects that are required to be included in unit level review of faculty. A task force committee seeks to establish guidelines/policy to assist other units with better annual review practices that will lead to quality annual review letters which provide clear expectations and feedback to faculty.

- The College-level leadership in the College of Social Science continues to be involved in ensuring that all RPT files are reviewed in consistent and transparent ways. Marietta Baba (Dean of the College of Social Science), DeBrenna Agbényiga (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies & Inclusion and FEA), and Chris Maxwell (Associate Dean for Research) together review files prior to the CSS RPT meeting. After the CSS RPT meeting, the college-leadership team met to review the decisions made by the committee and to review their notes on each candidate to ensure compliance with policy and to ensure that they were properly reviewed and that they had the necessary support structures prior to and during the review.

- The FEA has worked with each unit to identify faculty members who left at the end of the current academic year (not including retirements) to conduct exit interviews.
3C. IMPROVE THE WORK ENVIRONMENT FOR FEMALE FACULTY

3C-1 CROSS-COLLEGE CONTRIBUTIONS

- In April-May 2013, the ADAPP-Advance grant administered the second Work Environment Survey. The first was administered and evaluated in Year 2 of our grant. This 2013 WES will be compiled and analyzed during year 6 of our grant, and findings will be reported after we have analyzed all data. Preliminary results can be found in the OEAC Evaluation Report (Appendix C).

- ADAPP-Advance Leadership met with the MSU Women’s Advisory Committee to the Provost to update them on ADAPP-Advance work, and see how the WACP can partner with us to implement and institutionalize the grant work in year 6 and beyond. Members of the group include female leaders from the Women’s Resource Center as well as female faculty leaders from both tenure-stream and fixed-term organizations.

3C-2 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING CONTRIBUTIONS

- Last year, the College of Engineering introduced its “WorkLife at Engineering” web site (http://www.egr.msu.edu/WE), which links to various policies and programs at the University. Many of these resources are available to all university faculty, but some are unique to EGR.

- In year 5, EGR fully implemented the College of Engineering Child Care Initiative. There are two areas of support available (below). As of May 31, 2013, three women graduate students have participated in this program.

\textit{Child Care Support for Faculty Travel to Conferences}

The College of Engineering will provide up to $2,000 annually for each of its probationary tenure system faculty with primary care responsibility who require child care by a child care provider, other than a family member, when the faculty member needs to attend professional conferences to present research papers. This reimbursement will be provided by making a formal request to the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Faculty Development with appropriate documentation (receipt from child care provider) after attending the conference.

\textit{Infant Care Support for Graduate Students}

The College of Engineering will provide a one-time $2,000 support for its graduate students with primary care responsibility towards cost sharing for an infant up to one year of age for child support by a licensed child care provider other than a family member. This one time support will be provided by making a formal request to the graduate program of the college, with appropriate documentation.
The FEA in the College of Engineering met with all pre-tenure faculty for a listening session, where the goal was to identify and figure out how to remove barriers they faced. Included in this conversation were topics related to recruiting and managing graduate students, connecting with faculty from outside the College to foster inter-disciplinary research efforts, and others.

3C-3 COLLEGE OF NATURAL SCIENCE CONTRIBUTIONS

The Dean and FEA became aware that there was a lack of clarity across the college about the various supportive policies available to faculty after the birth or adoption of a child, and how to enact the policies if desired. For example, some individuals mistakenly thought only birth mothers were eligible for leave, that tenure-clock extensions were automatic, or that if you requested an extension, you had to take it instead of submitting a tenure-dossier “on time.”

The College developed a chart (see Attachment I) and distributed it widely among departments, also posting it on the web site, so that Chairs can accurately describe available policies and faculty members can find information for themselves when needed. This is featured on their website, which directs faculty members to other health-related and family leave policies: http://ns.msu.edu/index.php/faculty/worklife-balance-and-family-resources/.
3D. OTHER ADAPP-ADVANCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

3D-1 COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

- **Dr. Rane Johnson-Stempson talk on March 22, 2013**

  The Department of Computer Science and Engineering, the School of Criminal Justice, and ADAPP-Advance co-sponsored a talk by Dr. Rane Johnson-Stempson titled “Human Trafficking and Technology: A framework for understanding the role of technology in the commercial sexual exploitation of children in the U.S.” Dr. Johnson-Stempson is Rane Johnson-Stempson is the Education and Scholarly Communication Principal Research Director at Microsoft Research, and she explained how this organization brings together scholars from across academic, non-profit, and for-profit sectors to tackle multi-faceted problems and the role of technology in both contributing and solving these problems.

- The College of Engineering has several programs in place to actively encourage the participation of women in Engineering. Among them is the Engineering Summer Undergraduate Research Experience (EnSURE). This program has nearly doubled in size over the last two years to about 100 students in summer 2013, with about 1/3 of the participants being women.

- **Featured Female Faculty Member: Dr. Laura Dillon, Professor of Computer Science and Engineering (CSE)**
  1. Elected Vice Chair of the ACM (Association for Computing Machinery) Special Interest Group on Software Engineering.
  2. Invited to participate in the Big 10 Women’s Workshop 2013 as a Senior Faculty Role Model, April 3-5, 2013.
  3. Selected to receive an Outstanding Achievement and Advocacy Award (OAA) in the area of Outstanding Achievement in Education by the faculty of the Department of Computer Science at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.
SECTION 4
COMMUNICATION GOALS AND STRATEGIES
During YR4 of MSU’s ADAPP-ADVANCE initiative, we created and implemented a plan that was structured around five communication goals:

1. Institutionalization
2. Resource Dissemination
3. Outcomes Dissemination
4. Enhance Faculty Networking
5. Increase Faculty Input

4A. COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES AND RELATED COMMUNICATION GOALS

4A-1 INSTITUTIONALIZATION

In our Year 4 report, we identified a communication strategy designed to support the institutionalization of ADAPP-Advance work. These have been successful to varying degrees, but

Strategy I: Institutionalization Action Group (IAG) meetings

Due to changes in the composition of the IAG (see section 1A-2), the IAG has met less frequently than in years past. The IAWG (a subgroup of the IAG) continues to meet each week, to move the agenda of the grant forward and make important practical decisions about the institutionalization of grant work as our Advance grant comes to a close. We anticipate that the IAWG will continue to meet weekly in year 6 (and perhaps beyond), while it is not clear how frequently the IAG will continue to meet, given the loss of two central members of this advisory group.

Strategy II: Sustainability Retreats

These retreats have not proven to be an integral part of our communication strategy and are not an activity we pursued in year 5, thus they are not an activity we will seek to continue in year 6 and beyond.

Strategy III: Grant Management Team (GMT) meetings

These meetings bring together all of the Co-PIs and the Grant Director. The GMT met twice during year 5: one meeting was with our Ohio Evaluation team, and the other was an “update” meeting with just the GMT. Several co-PIs meet weekly as part of the
IAWG; these meetings will continue. However co-PIS Bush and Luz have both shifted their involvement to focus on scholarship to share findings from the grant. We anticipate bringing this group together one more time in year 6 to celebrate the findings of our collective work at the end of year 6.

**Strategy IV:** *Faculty Excellence Advocate (FEA) Consortium meetings*

These meetings have proven to be very valuable and are something we anticipate continuing for many years to come. We met four times this year (one meeting was to participate in the “Implicit Bias” workshops reported in section 1B-2), and each provided a chance for central administration to share developments that had a direct impact on FEA work, but it was perhaps even more importantly an opportunity for FEAs to come together to network with each other, and share best practices in their roles. As the FEA role is relatively new, and the expansion across campus has been only in the last couple of years, the work is being enacted in new and exciting ways: providing formal opportunities to share these changes is seen as very valuable.

**Strategy V:** *Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) meetings*

Though this is a great opportunity to help faculty members on campus “tell our story” in the Advance grant, we did not host any FAC meetings in year 5. We anticipate conducting one such meeting in year 6 to thank our FAC members and celebrate the accomplishments of our grant.

**4A-2. RESOURCE DISSEMINATION**

As of May 2012, Michigan State University has a comprehensive set of Faculty Toolkits:

- Annual Review (print & online)
- Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure (print & online)
- Mentoring (print & online)
- Faculty Search (print and online)

Three of our resource dissemination strategies were related to Toolkit dissemination.

**Strategy VI: Send tenure-stream faculty (university-wide) a copy of the Mentoring Toolkit.**

*This was accomplished. We also ensure that all incoming faculty members receive copies of all four toolkits.*
Strategy VII: Send all chairs and active search committees a copy of the Faculty Search Toolkit.

This was accomplished. Search committee members were sent a copy of the Faculty Search Toolkit. It is worth noting that some search committee chairs proactively sought copies from the Advance office, which suggests that these toolkits have proven themselves to be valuable.

Strategy VIII: Package all four toolkits in hard copy & online.

This has been accomplished; see www.adapp-advance.msu.edu to locate electronic copies of the toolkits.

Toolkit dissemination for YR5 is summarized in the table on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Toolkit Box (Folder)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>Purpose</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Academic Unit, CAL (Prestel), COMM (Telecom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
<td>College, All MSU Chairs, Deans and Directors (T. Curry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>FEA, FEA Consortium meeting (T. Curry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>FOD Admin, New Administrator and New Faculty Orientation in August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grant Admin, Advance Meetings, outreach requests, Conference travel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Folder only. Each folder contained 4 toolkits. See each toolkit below for number disbursed in a folder.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Annual Review Toolkit</strong></th>
<th><strong>365</strong></th>
<th><strong>See Toolkit Box (Folder above) for itemization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td>COMM (Telecom, Journalism)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>CSS (Dean Baba)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA</td>
<td>CAL (Harrow, Prestel), LBC (Millenbah)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD Admin</td>
<td>Workshop: Survive &amp; Thrive ... 2/18/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 606

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reappointment, Promotion &amp; Tenure Toolkit (Revised)</strong></th>
<th><strong>365</strong></th>
<th><strong>See Toolkit Box (Folder) for itemization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td>COMM (Telecom), LBC (Fisheries &amp; Wildlife)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>LBC (for all faculty in college)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA</td>
<td>CAL (Harrow, Prestel), COMM (Folu)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD Admin</td>
<td>Workshop: Survive &amp; Thrive ... 2/18/13, meetings on hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 656

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Faculty Search Toolkit</strong></th>
<th><strong>365</strong></th>
<th><strong>See Toolkit Box (Folder) for itemization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td>CVM (Small Animal), CSS (Social Work) CAL (Linguistics), CNS (Geoscience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA</td>
<td>CNS (Conrad), BUS (Anderson), CAL (Prestel, Harrow) search committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD Admin</td>
<td>Training, meetings on hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Admin</td>
<td>Co-PI use for search committees, I3 (Granberry Russell)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 567

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Faculty Mentoring Toolkit</strong></th>
<th><strong>365</strong></th>
<th><strong>See Toolkit Box (Folder) for itemization</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Unit</td>
<td>COMM (Telecom, Journalism), CHM faculty request</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>LBC (Millenbah) for all faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Cyclotron Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>CSS (Dean Baba) presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA</td>
<td>COMM (Folu), CAL (Harrow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOD Admin</td>
<td>FOD: Sept 9/13/12 (teachers), CVM workshop 2/28/12, Cyclotron meeting 2/6/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 571

Total Toolkits Disbursed YR 5 2,400
We also implemented three additional resource dissemination strategies in YR4:

**Strategy IX: Maintain resource repository online via ADAPP-ADVANCE website.**

Online (www.adapp-advance.msu.edu), we host a wide variety of resources for different audiences. Resources are grouped by target audience (faculty, FEAs, Advisory Committees, and administrators) and by topical areas (mentoring, annual review, RP&T, faculty search, and our new online resource – parenting & caregiving). We continue to update our website to provide comprehensive access to all of our materials, and to direct individuals to important resources on campus.

The IAWG will make a decision about the long-term maintenance of this website, and how to best archive our work and where to best relocate important resources online. Since our goal with this grant is to fully institutionalize our work, we are unlikely to maintain into perpetuity an “Advance-branded” web site; rather we plan to integrate these resources (e.g., online access to updated toolkits) with web sites of another central administration unit.

**Strategy X: Create ADAPP-ADVANCE listserv and Blog for interested faculty. Make scheduled communication with faculty about news and opportunities related to faculty diversity and inclusion.**

In February 2012, we created a listserv to announce news and opportunities related to faculty diversity and inclusion to be sent on the first Monday of each month. The monthly listserv highlighted the work and accomplishments of faculty, and resources/best practices that are available to help them succeed in their research, teaching, and service. There are currently 296 people subscribed to our listserv.

The ongoing value of this listserv is to be determined; while there is a large audience subscribed to the list, the value of this resource is not proven. This is likely to be phased out in year 6 to focus our efforts on disseminating our work in more pointed ways.

The blog was never launched, as we realized that it would be difficult to generate enough content to keep it lively, engaging, and useful. As we are trying to wind down the staff needed to maintain the work of the grant (and not generate new positions or products that need maintenance), we decided to focus our efforts elsewhere.

4A-3. **GRANT OUTCOMES DISSEMINATION**

Our team presented at regional and national meetings describing the uses of data and results of grant-related inquiry. These presentations have led to increased visibility of our work and scholarship, both on-campus and nationally.
4A-4. ENHANCE FACULTY NETWORKING

One of the strategies to promote resource dissemination was our sponsorship of a series of in-person and on-line spaces for faculty voices. These spaces facilitated conversation among faculty members as well as feedback for the ADAPP-ADVANCE team.

Strategy XII:

Facilitate faculty networking opportunities within each of the grant colleges (women faculty luncheons).

ADAPP-ADVANCE hosted women faculty luncheons in two of the three grant colleges.

- On April 9, 60 faculty attended the ADAPP-ADVANCE College of Social Science faculty luncheon. Dean Marietta Baba and FEA DeBrenna Agbenyiga also attended. The program consisted of a panel of women leaders (after a welcome from the Senior Associate Provost June Youatt).

- The College of Engineering luncheon was held on April 10 and 10 faculty attended. Co-PI Tamara Reid Bush was in attendance.

Strategy XIII: LinkedIn

Facilitate intra- and cross-college faculty networking online via LinkedIn.

We created a group on LinkedIn (www.linkedin.com/groups?about=&gid=4083287). This was an opportunity to develop a community network and facilitate communication across a wider group of faculty seeking to promote inclusive excellence.

Though we have several members in the group, maintaining active engagement in this enterprise—like the blog we discussed above—was going to require attention that we felt was not a good use of our limited staff time. The LinkedIn community exists, but is not being actively maintained.

4A.4 INCREASE FACULTY INPUT

It has been a priority of the project to increase faculty involvement with the project. We are involving faculty from other colleges (outside the grant) including Dr. Karen Patricia Williams (College of Human Medicine), co-investigator on a research project that is examining grant productivity of junior faculty in STEM colleges at MSU and Dr. Isis Settles (Associate Professor of Psychology) on a research project exploring the experiences of URM faculty. We encourage our team to involve faculty whenever possible in ADAPP-ADVANCE projects.
We remain visible at key events (e.g., Women’s Advisory Committee to the Provost, Conversation with Female Faculty) to listen to and solicit feedback (e.g., evaluation instruments) from the faculty in attendance.

Individual ADAPP-ADVANCE team members meet with chairs and unit faculty to discuss various aspects of the project.
SECTION 5
EVALUATION

5A. OVERVIEW

ADAPP-ADVANCE is a data-intensive, policy-focused project. As a result, formative and summative evaluation strategies continue to constitute a large part of the project. This section will outline the combined efforts of the Ohio Evaluation Team, the Grant Management Team (GMT), and the Institutionalization Action Group (IAG) to promote long-term use of data for continuous evaluation of project goals. The Ohio Center for the Evaluation and Assessment of Mathematics and Science Education submitted its full evaluation report (Appendix A). The NSF indicator data can be found in Appendix J.

Please note: The evaluation report was sent to us in the days leading up to the submission of this annual report. We were eager to see the data, as it helps us identify ways in which our work continues to be needed, and we will respond to the findings in our next quarterly report. In the interest of time, we have not responded to the various issues raised by our evaluators, but this is a matter of timing, not of us refusing to acknowledge the areas that still need attention. We also noted that several issues raised in this report relate to data that appear to be inaccurate or otherwise misaligned with data that we have gathered internally. We will be working with the Ohio Evaluation and Assessment Center personnel to revise and refine the evaluation report and will submit a revised analysis at a later date.

5B. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

To reach the project’s overarching goals, the Strategic Human Resources Management Model (SHRM) has shaped formative evaluation processes. Several formative evaluation questions have been developed to assess MSU policies and practices as they relate to the guiding principles used by the ADAPP-ADVANCE project: Alignment, Transparency, Consistency, Objectivity, Quality, and Inclusiveness.

- To what extent are unit-level policies aligned with university-level policies? To what extent are unit-level policies accessible to faculty and transparent?
- To what extent do results of policy analyses agree with chair and faculty perceptions of AR and RP&T policies and practices?
- To what extent have AR and RP&T policies and practices become more aligned with university expectations and best practices?
- To what extent are chair descriptions of policies and practices consistent with faculty perceptions of AR and RP&T policies and practices?
To what extent are college-level mentoring policies aligned with university-wide mentoring policy?

What are the characteristics and outcomes of two different models of faculty mentoring and to what extent are they transferrable to other colleges and units?

To what extent has the HR intervention in faculty search committee practice resulted in change in perceptions of search committee members and in change in hiring outcomes?

What are the historic retention rates of faculty subgroups in each college/unit?

What is the predicted rate of retention of each subgroup if current practices and policies are not changed?

To what extent are HR and work environment issues pervasive and problematic in units of ENG, CNS, and CSS?

What are the characteristics and outcomes of three different models of FEA and to what extent are they transferrable to other colleges and units?

It is anticipated that the data and analysis processes used to answer these evaluation questions will be used for long-term data collection and continuous evaluation strategies beyond the life of this grant. See Appendix C for a complete table describing data, analyses, and action steps to be taken based on formative evaluation findings. In particular, the actions steps within the evaluation table demonstrate how the data/findings are being used for intervention decision-making.

5C. EVALUATION MEETINGS

Reflecting the focus on data collection and analysis, our project hosts several project evaluation meetings every year. Evaluation meetings are venues used within this project’s structure to keep project personnel on track with the collection, analysis, and continued use of data to inform decision-making with various stakeholders. We describe each of the 2012-2013 meetings in the paragraphs below.

5C-1. 2-DAY EVALUATOR VISIT (9.19-20.12)

Associated with a series of meetings with Grant leaders, the OEAC team met with each of our three college Deans, senior administrators in academic affairs, and faculty members who have begun engaging with the Advance grant. As with the rest of our work in year five, these meetings were focused on assessing what we have accomplished in the first four years to guide our institutionalization processes in years 5 and beyond.

These included, for example, updates on how the data we collect in the grant could be used by faculty to spur additional research opportunities, updates to academic leaders about what the data tells us about the utility and effectiveness of policies, and areas that the data suggest are areas of concern.
5C-2. 2-DAY EVALUATOR VISIT (12.10-11.12)

During this visit, the OEAC evaluators met with the GMT, and individually with the Deans to present “Boutique Reports,” which go into greater detail about individual colleges and share the experiences of faculty in EGR, CNS, and CSS. These data emerged from several sources, including the 2009 Work Environment Survey, the FEA surveys, and college-specific instruments.

5C-6 EVALUATION TELECONFERENCE CONVERSATION (5.25.13)

In this phone conversation, we discussed some very preliminary findings to the 2013 Work Environment Survey, as well as added institutional background to help contextualize the findings the OEAC team were preparing to share with us in our evaluation report (Appendix C).
SECTION 6
RESEARCH

6A. ADAPP-ADVANCE RESEARCH PUBLICATIONS IN PROGRESS

Advancing Faculty Inclusion and Excellence: An Examination of Faculty Socialization Tactics toward and Perceptions of Institutional Embeddedness among Underrepresented Faculty of Color.

a. Contacted all tenure-track Black/African-American, Latino/Hispanic, and Native American faculty and invited them to participate.

b. Conducted 54 interviews to date and are continuing to schedule individuals.

c. Working to reach target numbers for each race-gender group (36% - same as W/E survey)

d. Transcribing interviews (50% complete)

Title: The importance of the disciplinary society in leadership skill development and advancement
Authors: Tamara Bush, Laura Genik
Publication status: 1) Accepted to the ASEE Conference (American
2) Paper has now been accepted for publication in ASEE
3) Podium presentation for the Women in Engineering Division of ASEE.

Abstract:

Several opportunities arise in the disciplinary societies for faculty to begin to develop leadership skills. The importance of involvement in the disciplinary society not only pertains to skill development but also promotes research expertise, can establish national recognition, and provides opportunities for collaboration.

The objectives of this work were to gather data, both in qualitative and quantitative forms, regarding the importance of disciplinary society involvement. Because this work was supported by an NSF ADVANCE grant, focus was given to Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) areas and women in these areas.

Both survey data and focus group data were collected for this research. Survey data were collected from female faculty at Michigan State University. Survey questions addressed levels of involvement in societies, pros and cons of involvement, how involvement affected promotion, differences (both positive and negative) between leadership in academia and the professional organization. Additional data were collected through focus groups containing faculty in leadership positions. These participants were either in titled roles such as Dean, Assistant/Associate Dean, Chair or Director or were faculty who held leadership positions in their disciplinary society or professional organization. Also, gender specific questions were asked regarding leadership opportunities, aspirations and mentoring for leadership.

Results of the survey on disciplinary involvement indicated that there was no prescribed method for
success and the time-commitment/reward balance should always be evaluated. However, the female faculty indicated multiple benefits including networking with faculty at other institutions, establishing research collaborations, being aware of the latest standards in the field and research topics, and providing the opportunity for leadership positions. It was noted that these opportunities for leadership were available for multiple individuals including graduate students and junior faculty.

Leadership in the professional organization and disciplinary societies was deemed more desirable, particularly by women. The disciplinary society was perceived as an opportunity to try leadership positions. In the society, flexibility was a positive, allowing movement in and out of positions as desired, whereas, the titled roles on campus were not associated with this flexibility.

In the focus groups, the women agreed that having more women in administrative positions might be a positive goal for the institution; everyone agreed that having only male administrators was undesirable. However, performing research (for individuals) and getting grants (for units) were seen as more positive and prestigious than doing administrative work. In other words, some participants challenged the assumption on which many of the focus group questions were predicated. Namely, that more women in leadership positions in STEM disciplines is an unqualified good.

Overall, the disciplinary society was viewed to have many positive associations, one being the ability to become involved in leadership positions and develop leadership skills. Disciplinary involvement has the potential to serve many roles throughout academic advancement.
Purpose: Although valued, achieving inclusivity and faculty diversity is challenging for most universities. One reason is a lack of formal faculty mentoring. This article describes the process of implementing a formal, university-wide faculty mentor policy and program at a large research institution. Conceptual Model: As part of a National Science Foundation funded project to increase the number of women and underrepresented faculty recruited, appointed, and advanced in the tenure system, this initiative was based on a conceptual human resource management model that contends a high quality, diverse workforce and positive environment requires aligning academic human resource policies/practices with institutional values of quality and inclusiveness, and creating structures that reduce bias. Applied to recruitment, annual review, tenure and promotion, leadership development, and mentoring; key strategies included evaluation of existing policies/practices, their refinement and development, and dissemination of information and practical tools. A mentor workgroup conducted a gap analysis to determine desired formal mentoring outcomes and strategies to achieve them. Findings: All short-term goals were met. This case underscored the critical role of leadership, a designated champion to spearhead efforts, resources and data to support change, a solid communication plan, and respectful relationships. Implications: Establishing a university-wide faculty mentoring policy and program is possible and a good starting point for reaching other, more challenging goals. Mentoring is supported by data and it is relatively easy to develop visible outcomes with immediate impact. It is an emergent concept that can lead to improved inclusivity, diversity, and thereby quality of higher education.

Manuscript in Progress: Evaluating Formal Faculty Mentoring in a University Setting
Author: Clare Luz

Description: This paper focuses on a systematic compilation of all known evaluation tools used for academic formal faculty mentoring programs; and analyses of best practices for evaluation of mentoring at different levels [university, college, unit, mentor/mentee].

A solid draft is being distributed for review at the end of Spring 2013.

Tentative Title: Importance of External Funding in Promotion and Retention of Assistant Professors in STEM Disciplines and Differential Impact by Gender

Authors: Estelle McGroarty, Tiffeny Jimenez, Lodi Linley, Yue Li, Paulette Granberry-Russell, and Karen Patricia Williams

Journal: Advances in Gender Research (Submitted 5/20/13)

Abstract:

This study examines the external funding patterns of two cohorts of recently hired science, technology, engineering, and mathematics assistant professors at Michigan State University and the differential outcomes of grant success by gender, as well as gender differences in the correlation between grant activity and reappointment, promotion and tenure (RPT). Three propositions were explored: 1) that differences exist between pre-tenure women and men in their grant activity during their first and
second probationary periods; 2) that a correlation exists between grant activity and RPT, and that the correlation may differ for women and men; and 3) that there are gender differences in the composition of principal investigators on grants submitted by and awarded to pre-tenure faculty. We found significant gender differences in grant submissions, average number and average size of awards, and percentage of grants submitted to federal agencies in the first cohort, but not the second cohort. Results also showed that grant activity during the first cohort’s second probationary period was significantly correlated with RPT for both men and women with some gender differences, but there were no correlations between grant activity and RPT during the first probationary period. In addition, women submitted proposals as the lead principal investigators less often than men, and the average number of co-investigators was higher on proposals submitted by women principal investigators, compared to men. There were no differences in the number of co-investigators on grants awarded to men and women as lead investigator. Implications of the results are discussed.
SECTION 7
FINANCIAL REPORT

In this section, we provide an overview of grant fund expenditures on senior personnel, other personnel, fringe benefits, travel, and other direct costs. Please note that we have shown actual expenditures from September 1 through April 30 and estimated costs from May through August 31, 2013. After describing these expenses, we include an overview of Michigan State University expenses as we continue to implement the initiative and plan for institutionalization.

GRANT EXPENDITURES – YR 5

A. Senior Personnel

- Kim A. Wilcox. He served as Michigan State University’s provost starting in 2005. He stepped down as the chief academic officer effective June 30, 2013 (but he was on leave for a special assignment as of January 1, 2013). During time, Senior Associate Provost June Youatt was named Acting Provost & Vice President of Academic Affairs and was assigned as PI of ADAPP-ADVANCE. Her work on the project is considered a part of her academic leadership at the institution and is paid by MSU (not the grant).

- Theodore Curry, M.B.A. (co-PI). His effort was also considered part of his job responsibilities as the head of academic human resources at MSU. His effort was paid by MSU (not the grant).

- Estelle McGroarty, Ph.D. is Associate Vice President, Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and Associate Vice Provost, Libraries, Computing and Technology (lead co-PI). Dr. McGroarty’s effort was increased from .96 person months (12 x .08 = .96) (AN, 8%) to 1.44 person months (12 x .12 = 1.44) (AN 12%) beginning Sept. 1, 2012.

- Mark Roehling, Ph.D. is Professor of Human Resources and Labor Relations (co-PI). His effort remains the same as the prior year (AY, 14.5%). He devoted 58% effort during 3 summer months (3 x .58 = 1.74 person months).

- Clare Luz, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor –Tenure System, Department of Family Medicine (co-PI). She devoted 1.013 person months for year five as follows:
  - September 2012 she remained at 12% (AY) for one month, or .12 person months (1.0 x 0.12 = 0.120).
  - Oct 1 through May 15 she decreased her effort to 8.5% (AY) for 7.5 months or .64 person months (7.5 x 0.085 = 0.638).
• May 16 through August 15, she devoted 8.5% effort during 3 summer months or .26 person months. (3 x 0.085% = 0.255)

• Tamara Reid Bush, Ph.D. is Assistant Professor –Tenure System, Mechanical Engineering (co-PI). Her effort on the grant decreased.

  o Her effort in the prior year was 54% during the 3 summer months (3 x 0.54 = 1.62) or 1.62 person months (AY, 14%). Year five she decreased time/effort to 27% during the 3 summer months (3 x 0.279 = 0.837) or 0.84 person months (AY, 7%).

• Summary – Senior Personnel (YR 5 Expenses: $68,880)

Considering the above adjustments in effort (McGroarty Luz, and Bush), the Senior Personnel expenses were closely aligned with the award amount of $69,000.

B. Other Personnel

• Melissa McDaniels, Ph.D., served as administrative director for the project through December 31, 2012. Her effort was 100% for four months of a 12 month appointment equal to 4.0 person months. (4 x 1.0 = 4.0) paid on the grant. She began a new position on campus January 1, 2013.

  o January 1, 2013 through June 30, 2013, her effort was 20% for six months of a 12 month appointment equal to 1.2 person months (6 x 0.20 = 1.2) paid by MSU (not the grant).

  o July 1, 2013 through August 31, 2013, her effort was decreased to 10% for two months of a 12 month appointment (2 x 0.10 = 0.20), 0.20 person months paid by MSU (not the grant).

• Julie Rojewski was hired as administrative director beginning January 1, 2013 at the employment percent of 75% on a 12 month appointment (AN). Her total effort during year 5 equals 6.4 person months as follows:

  o January 1 through May 31 she was paid 90% on the grant for 5 months equal to 3.4 person months. (5 x 0.75 x 0.90 = 3.375)

  o June 1 through August 31 she increased her employment percent as well as her funding on the grant to 100% effort/time equal to 3 person months. (3 * 1.0= 3)

• Mary Jane Robb served as the administrative assistant for the project. Her effort was paid by MSU (not the grant) and equivalent to 12 person months (AN, 100%).
• Jennifer Sweet is data analyst in the Office of the Dean, College of Natural Science. Her effort on the project was decreased from 15% to 10% for eight months (September 1, 2012 through April 30, 2013) with effort at .80 person months (8 x 0.10 = 0.80) (AN, 10%). Her employment percent changed from 100% to 90% May 1 through Aug 31, 2013 equal to .36 person months (4 x 0.90 x.1 =0.36).

• Isis Settles, Associate Professor-Tenure System, Psychology is conducting research with Paulette Granberry Russell, Director of Office of Inclusion, Intercultural Initiatives, on inclusion and embeddedness for faculty of color. Her research continued with finalizing data collection and analysis on non-Asian faculty at MSU (180 faculty). Her time/effort was 62.6% of one month (AY, 7%) or 0.63 person month (9 x 0.0695 = 0.626).

• Faculty Excellence Advocate – College of Social Science (CSS)
  o Agbenyiga, Debrenna, Associate Dean, Graduate Studies and Inclusion, continued as FEA for the college with effort equal to 3.0 person months (AN, 25%) (12 x 0.25 = 3.0)

• Faculty Excellence Advocate – College of Natural Science
  o Susan Conrad, Professor, Microbiology and Molecular Genetics and FEA for the college. She devoted 9 months (AY, 22%) time/effort (9 x 0.223 = 2.0 person months) and 3 summer months at 33% time/effort to the project (3 x 0.333 = 1.0 person months). Her total time/effort equals 3 person months.

• Faculty Excellence Advocates – College of Engineering
  o Manooch Koochesfahani, Associate Dean, Faculty Development and Graduate Studies and Professor of Mechanical Engineering, was FEA for the college with effort equal to 3.0 person months (AN, 25%) (12 x 0.25 = 3.0)

• Graduate Student on the project
  o Jodi Linley continued as a Research Graduate Assistant on a 50% basis (20 hours/week) for fall semester only. She left the ADAPP position December 31 to accept an assistantship in the College of Education beginning January 1, 2013. Her efforts during fall were focused toward communication and dissemination of grant activities as well as building capacity of the academic faculty at MSU.
Summary – Other Personnel (YR 5 Expenses: $212,328)

Other Personnel expenditures were under the award budget of $248,730 by $36,402.

Amounts expended for salaries over award amounts totaled $101,436. This includes the project director, management analyst, and support toward research activity equal to $12,073 over budget. The FEA’s salaries for the three colleges resulted in $89,363 over budget. This includes the award budget for three equity officers.

Under budget award amounts totaled $137,838. Graduate assistant pay for year five decreased significantly leaving $17,114 under budget. Other personnel positions not used in the award budget (change manager, programmer and internal evaluator) totaled $120,724.

The differences in the above salaries leave this section under budget in the amount of $36,402. See the chart below.

B. Other Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALARIES</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>McDaniels, Rojewski</td>
<td>56,275</td>
<td>61,630</td>
<td>(5,355)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgt. Analyst</td>
<td>Sweet</td>
<td>7,460</td>
<td>8,377</td>
<td>(917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settles</td>
<td>Data Research; Faculty Inclusion</td>
<td>5,801</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,801)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEA's (Equity officers)</td>
<td>CNS, CSS, CEGR</td>
<td>39,393</td>
<td>128,756</td>
<td>(89,363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount over award budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(101,436)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistants</td>
<td>Linley</td>
<td>24,878</td>
<td>7,764</td>
<td>17,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(Change Mgr.)</td>
<td>59,652</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(Programmer Sal)</td>
<td>33,765</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(Internal Evaluator)</td>
<td>27,307</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount under award budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>137,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total B. Other Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td>248,730</td>
<td>212,328</td>
<td>36,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C.  Fringe Benefits (YR5  Expenses: $71,080)

Our fringe benefits for YR5 came under budget by $39,923. As we described in last year’s report, fringe expenses were lower than the award budget due to changes in personnel structure that occurred between the award of the proposal and current personnel employed in YR5 of the grant.

E.  Travel (YR5  Expenses: $7,750)

Travel expenses covered the costs of our senior/other personnel to attend ADAPP/ADVANCE meetings/workshops. The bulk of the travel this year was expended on ADVANCE-related conferences and workshops at other institutions totaling $5,384. Scholarly conferences (ASHE) totaled $675, and for a non-MSU consultant, Dr. Nilanjana Dasgupta, from University of Massachusetts, Amherst. She presented Implicit Bias workshops (4) over two days on campus. Her travel expenses were $1,691 on the grant. The total expended for travel was $7,750 and under the award budget of $14,367 by $6,617.

G.  Other Direct Costs

- **G1: Materials and supplies:** Office operations spent $1,287. The award budget of $25,480 left $24,193 under budget. This amount was redirected to **G5: Subawards** for subcontracting evaluator services.

- **G2: Publication/Documentation/Dissemination:** Printing of the fifth ADAPP toolkit, Faculty Excellence Advocates (a resource for college administrators) was completed in year five at the cost of $1,800 and other minimal printing for ADAPP meetings and promotion materials totaled $420. The total printing expense of $2,220 was under the budget amount of $20,000 by $17,780. This amount is redirected to **G5: Subawards** for subcontracting evaluator services.

- **G3: Consultant Services:** YR5 expenditure of is as follows:
  - Design, media and layout fees totaled $3,453 as follows:
    - the cost $428 (50% also paid by MSU contribution) for 100 USB drives loaded with the PDF versions of the four toolkits, mailed in October 2012 to 130 Deans, Chairs, Directors & FEAs.
    - Services toward design, media and layout of the fifth ADAPP toolkit, Faculty Excellence Advocates (a resource for college administrators), $3,000.
Miscellaneous design fees toward ADAPP promotional materials, $25.

- Copier services were for a leased machine from MSU and billed monthly. This totaled $3,698.

- Services of other independent contractors (Non-MSU): ADAPP expended $3,300 toward a third of the speaker fee of $10,000 for Dr. Nilanjana Dasgupta’s campus visit. She presented four workshops on Implicit Bias. The Office for Inclusion and Intercultural Initiatives and the Office of the Provost, Academic Human Resources, also co-sponsored this fee.

G3: Consultant services (excluding subaward, see G5) totaled $10,451. The award budget was $14,432 and the grant was under budget by $3,981.

- G4: Computer Services: ADAPP continued computer maintenance and repair with the Division of Engineering Computer Services (DECS). DECS’s annual expense totaled $500. Academic Tech Services charged minimal monthly services for two list serves. The award budget of $20,000 and expenditures of $584 left the amount $19,416 under budget and redirected to G5: Subawards for subcontracting evaluator services.

- G5: Subawards: Ohio’s Evaluation and Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education (OEAC), Miami University, continues to be subcontracted for YR5 in the amount of $164,019. Subaward fees beyond the initial $25,000 spent are not included in the Facilities and Administration calculation. The overage was as planned. (See the chart below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSF YR</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Actual Exp. 1/1/10-4/30/14</th>
<th>Encumbered 5/1/13-8/31/14 (NCE)</th>
<th>Total Exp.</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OEAC AY10 YR 1</td>
<td>51,155</td>
<td>22,367</td>
<td>22,367</td>
<td>28,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>OEAC AY11 YR 2</td>
<td>63,150</td>
<td>59,094</td>
<td>59,094</td>
<td>4,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OEAC AY12 YR 3</td>
<td>64,479</td>
<td>73,455</td>
<td>73,455</td>
<td>(8,976)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal OEAC AY10-12, YR 1-4</td>
<td>178,784</td>
<td>154,915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OEAC AY13 YR 4</td>
<td>140,150</td>
<td>68,481</td>
<td>71,669</td>
<td>140,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Balance (OEAC YR1-3, 8/31/2012) encumbered</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,869</td>
<td>23,869</td>
<td>(23,869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cumulative Expenditure 8/31/2013</td>
<td>140,150</td>
<td>68,481</td>
<td>95,538</td>
<td>164,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal OEAC AY13 YR 4</td>
<td>140,150</td>
<td>68,481</td>
<td>95,538</td>
<td>164,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE</td>
<td>OEAC AY14 YR 5</td>
<td>74,815</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74,815</td>
<td>74,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Subaward (Amendments #1-4)</td>
<td>393,749</td>
<td>223,396</td>
<td>170,353</td>
<td>393,749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G6: Other Direct Costs:

- **Tuition remission:** Graduate Assistant tuition waivers are a fringe benefit extended to all graduate assistants on campus. Tuition and fees are not included in the Facilities and Administration calculation (I: Indirect costs). The amount expended for tuition and fees waived, $3,968, was under the award budget of $12,488 by $8,520.

- **Workshop/Meeting Expenses:** Meeting expenses significantly decreased as we focused on the research and evaluation goals during year five. All costs associated with FEA Consortium meeting expenses were paid by the Academic HR and Provost budget. Meeting expenses totaled $3,727. The award budget of $17,700 left $13,973 under budget.
  - FOD workshops (2) were supported by ADAPP. Business meeting food and beverage and other expenses (room, av, and misc.) totaled $807.
  - Non-MSU speaker, Dr. Dasgupta, presented workshops (4) on Implicit Bias and met with faculty and graduate students in business meetings during her two day campus visit. Total expenditure for food and beverage and other expenses (audio visual, and misc.) totaled $1,444.
  - ADAPP Leadership events: Two of the three grant colleges held College Women Faculty Networking Luncheon meetings. Total expenditure for food and beverage and other expenses (meeting room, audio visual, and misc.) totaled $1,190.
  - OEAC Evaluation visited campus to meet with grant management, faculty and deans. Meeting food and beverage expenses totaled $286.

- **Summary – Other Direct Costs (YR5 Expenses: $186,256)**

  The total spent for **G: Other Direct Costs** was over the awarded budget of $110,100 by $76,156. See chart below.
### G. Other Direct Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Other Direct Costs</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies (Office, Software and Computer)</td>
<td>25,480</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>24193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2</td>
<td>Publications (Printing)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>17,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3</td>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td>14,432</td>
<td>10,451</td>
<td>3,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4</td>
<td>Computer Services</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>19,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5</td>
<td>Subawards</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164,019</td>
<td>(164,019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6a</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant Tuition Waiver</td>
<td>12,488</td>
<td>3,968</td>
<td>8,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6b</td>
<td>Workshop/Meeting expenses</td>
<td>17,700</td>
<td>3,727</td>
<td>13,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>110,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>186,256</strong></td>
<td><strong>(76,156)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SUMMARY OF GRANT EXPENSES – YRS 4 AND 5**

In YR5, total expenses were $743,014. We were under the award amount of $834,371 by $91,357. After applying the YR4 carry forward of $59,236 the ending balance is $150,593.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Year 4 Expenses*</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Revised Budget</th>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>Difference Award Minus Expenses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Senior Personnel</td>
<td>66,990</td>
<td>71,568</td>
<td>(4,578)</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>68,880</td>
<td>68,880</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Other Personnel</td>
<td>241,485</td>
<td>268,713</td>
<td>(27,228)</td>
<td>248,730</td>
<td>206,964</td>
<td>212,328</td>
<td>36,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>106,274</td>
<td>74,682</td>
<td>31,592</td>
<td>111,003</td>
<td>67,680</td>
<td>71,080</td>
<td>39,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Travel</td>
<td>13,950</td>
<td>20,195</td>
<td>(6,245)</td>
<td>14,367</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>7,750</td>
<td>6,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>104,227</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>104,095</td>
<td>110,100</td>
<td>167,460</td>
<td>186,256</td>
<td>(76,156)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>532,926</td>
<td>567,409</td>
<td>(34,483)</td>
<td>553,200</td>
<td>518,429</td>
<td>546,294</td>
<td>6,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Indirect Costs</td>
<td>271,109</td>
<td>246,481</td>
<td>24,628</td>
<td>281,171</td>
<td>194,641</td>
<td>196,720</td>
<td>84,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct and Indirect</td>
<td>804,035</td>
<td>813,890</td>
<td>(9,855)</td>
<td>834,371</td>
<td>713,070</td>
<td>743,014</td>
<td>91,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Forward</td>
<td>69,091</td>
<td>69,091</td>
<td>59,236</td>
<td>69,091</td>
<td>59,236</td>
<td>59,236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>873,126</td>
<td>813,890</td>
<td>59,236</td>
<td>893,607</td>
<td>713,070</td>
<td>743,014</td>
<td>150,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Year 4 Expenses revised after submission of annual report due to annual closing expenses after June 2012 report preparation.
## All Grant Years: Summary of Income/Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Year</th>
<th>C/F</th>
<th>NSF Award</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance YR 1 (9/15/08 - 8/31/09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>803,135</td>
<td>517,919</td>
<td>285,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance YR 2 (9/1/09 - 8/31/10)</td>
<td>285,216</td>
<td>765,423</td>
<td>814,349</td>
<td>236,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance YR 3 (9/1/10 - 8/31/11)</td>
<td>236,290</td>
<td>776,708</td>
<td>943,907</td>
<td>69,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance YR 4 (9/1/11 - 8/31/12)*</td>
<td>69,091</td>
<td>804,035</td>
<td>813,890</td>
<td>59,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance YR 5 (9/1/12 - 8/31/13)</td>
<td>59,236</td>
<td>834,371</td>
<td>743,014</td>
<td>150,593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                  |      | 3,983,672 | 3,833,079    |         |
SUMMARY OF *MSU EXPENDITURES* (other than ADVANCE grant) in support of grant-related activity

**By Grant Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Yr 1 Expenses</th>
<th>Yr 2 Expenses</th>
<th>Yr 3 Expenses</th>
<th>Yr 4 Expenses</th>
<th>Yr 5 Expenses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>60,322</td>
<td>342,740</td>
<td>237,406</td>
<td>318,336</td>
<td>463,254</td>
<td>1,422,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Direct Costs</td>
<td>7,582</td>
<td>7,655</td>
<td>7,801</td>
<td>7,339</td>
<td>10,320</td>
<td>40,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>67,904</td>
<td>350,395</td>
<td>245,207</td>
<td>325,675</td>
<td>473,574</td>
<td>1,462,755</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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